



November 1, 2017

Washington State Board of Education
PO Box 47206
Olympia, WA 98504-7206

Dear Washington State Board of Education,

The purpose of this letter is to provide additional contextual information, request the Washington State Board of Education (SBE) consider moving the Annual Authorizer Report due date, and express the Washington State Charter School Commission's (Commission) commitment to collaborating with the SBE in the development of its annual report on the performance of the state's charter schools.

The Charter Schools Act requires each charter school authorizer to submit an annual report to the SBE. Per Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 180-19-210, authorizers are to submit their annual report to the SBE no later than November 1 of each year. WAC 180-19-210 also outlines what content and data the annual report must include.

Enclosed in this letter is the Commission's Annual Authorizer Report to the SBE. Unfortunately, several key data points are not available by the November 1 deadline, which significantly hampers the Commission's ability to "provide academic, organizational and financial performance (data) of each operating charter school based on the authorizer's performance framework" (WAC 180-19-210). For example, Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) growth data is not available until after the November 1 deadline (The Commission's understanding is that SBA growth data will be available during the first week of November). SBA growth data is a critical data point in three of five indicators of the Academic Performance Framework (APF). The Commission's APF states that if more than one of the four indicators is missing, an overall tier rating will not be calculated. This is based on the fact that no single measure provides a full picture of a school's academic program outcomes. However, taken together, the measures provide a comprehensive assessment of the school's academic program outcomes. Incomplete data does not provide sufficient information for the Commission to report on a school's progress under the APF.

In addition to academic performance data, charter schools are currently engaged in two audits, Accountability and Financial Statement, the results of which will not be available until February 2018. The Commission uses these two audit reports, in conjunction with ongoing monitoring, to determine a charter school's performance in relation to the identified metrics, measures and goals associated with the Organizational and Financial Performance Frameworks. As a result, the Commission's authorizer

report contains limited data on the charter schools it has authorized; however, the Commission continues to provide high quality, rigorous and transparent oversight for each of its authorized charter schools.

The Commission requests that the SBE consider moving the Annual Authorizer Report deadline to better align to when all of the data regarding a charter school's performance is available. The ideal due date for the Commission is May 1 to allow all three Performance Frameworks to be published; however, the Commission recognizes that the SBE is legally required to submit annual report in collaboration with the Commission by December 1. Therefore, the Commission stands ready to work with the SBE to identify a due date that works for both the SBE and each authorizer's needs.

Attached to this letter is a review of the Commission's Performance Frameworks with information regarding when data for each measure is available for analysis and when the Commission plans to publish each school's Performance Framework results. While the intent is to provide the SBE a full picture of the Commission's Performance Frameworks and associated timelines, the Commission commits to collaborating with the SBE in the development of its annual report.

I hope this provides additional contextual information as you consider the Commission's request.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Joshua Halsey', written in a cursive style.

Joshua Halsey
Executive Director

Academic Performance Framework Data Availability and Publication Timeline									
Measure	School Name	Data Available	Status	Report to Commission	Status	Publication Deadline	Status	Notes	
% Complete			50.0%		50.0%		0.0%		
1a.1 3-Year Composite Index	Excel	4/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	OSPI may not report for schools that only have 1 yr data---will be determined in winter	
	Green Dot Destiny	4/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	OSPI may not report for schools that only have 1 yr data---will be determined in winter	
	Rainier Prep	4/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	OSPI may not report for schools that only have 1 yr data---will be determined in winter	
1a.2 Annual Composite Index								N/A--remove from framework	
2a. ESSA								N/A--duplicative	
3a.1. Proficiency Comparison to District	Excel	9/18/2017	Available	9/20/2017	Complete	5/1/2018	In Progress		
	Green Dot Destiny	9/18/2017	Available	9/20/2017	Complete	5/1/2018	In Progress		
	Rainier Prep	9/18/2017	Available	9/20/2017	Complete	5/1/2018	In Progress		
3a.2. subgroup Proficiency Comparison to District	Excel	9/18/2017	Available	9/20/2017	Complete	5/1/2018	In Progress		
	Green Dot Destiny	9/18/2017	Available	9/20/2017	Complete	5/1/2018	In Progress		
	Rainier Prep	9/18/2017	Available	9/20/2017	Complete	5/1/2018	In Progress		
3b.1. All student growth comparison to district	Excel	10/31/2017	In Progress	11/16/2017	In Progress	5/1/2018	In Progress	have charter school data analyzed; waiting on district data	
	Green Dot Destiny	10/31/2017	In Progress	11/16/2017	In Progress	5/1/2018	In Progress	have charter school data analyzed; waiting on district data	
	Rainier Prep	10/31/2017	In Progress	11/16/2017	In Progress	5/1/2018	In Progress	have charter school data analyzed; waiting on district data	
3b.2. subgroup growth comparison to district	Excel	10/31/2017	In Progress	11/16/2017	In Progress	5/1/2018	In Progress	have charter school data analyzed; waiting on district data	
	Green Dot Destiny	10/31/2017	In Progress	11/16/2017	In Progress	5/1/2018	In Progress	have charter school data analyzed; waiting on district data	
	Rainier Prep	10/31/2017	In Progress	11/16/2017	In Progress	5/1/2018	In Progress	have charter school data analyzed; waiting on district data	
3c.1 graduation rate comparison to district								N/A for 2016-17; first grad class will be 2018-19	
3c.2 graduation rate subgroup comparison to district								N/A for 2016-17; first grad class will be 2018-19	
4a. Proficiency comparison schools serving similar students (regression)	Excel	9/18/2017	In Progress	TBD	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	TBD; pending data sharing agreement w/OSPI	
	Green Dot Destiny	9/18/2017	In Progress	TBD	Not Started		Not Started	TBD; pending data sharing agreement w/OSPI	
	Rainier Prep	9/18/2017	In Progress	TBD	Not Started		Not Started	TBD; pending data sharing agreement w/OSPI	
4b. Graduation rate comparison to schools serving similar students (regression)	Excel	9/1/2017	Available	9/20/2017	Complete	5/1/2018	In Progress	N/A for 2016-17; first grad class will be 2018-19	
	Green Dot Destiny	9/1/2017	Available	9/20/2017	Complete	5/1/2018	In Progress		
	Rainier Prep	9/1/2017	Available	9/20/2017	Complete	5/1/2018	In Progress		
5. School specific goals academic goals	SOAR	9/1/2017	Available	9/20/2017	Complete	5/1/2018	In Progress		
	Summit: Olympus	9/1/2017	Available	9/20/2017	Complete	5/1/2018	In Progress		
	Summit: Sierra	9/1/2017	Available	9/20/2017	Complete	5/1/2018	In Progress		

Organizational Performance Framework Data Availability and Publication Timeline								
Measure	School Name	Data Available	Status	Report to Commission	Status	Publication Deadline	Status	Notes
% Complete			44%		0%		0%	
1.a. Is the school implementing the material terms of the education program as defined in the current charter contract?	Excel	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
1.b. Is the school complying with applicable education requirements?	Excel	9/18/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	9/18/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	9/18/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	9/18/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	9/18/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	9/18/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
1.c. Is the school protecting the rights of students with disabilities?	Excel	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
1.d. Is the school protecting the rights of English Language Learner (ELL) students?	Excel	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	

2.a. Is the school meeting financial reporting and compliance requirements?	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
2.b. Is the school following Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)?	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
3.a. Is the school governing board complying with governance requirements?	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
3.b. Is the governing board holding the school management team accountable?	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
3.c. Is the school complying with reporting requirements?	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	

4.a. Is the school protecting the rights of students?	Excel	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
4.b. Does the school's recurrent enrollment rate indicate equitable access to the school?	Excel	TBD	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	meeting set up with OSPI to review
	Green Dot Destiny	TBD	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	meeting set up with OSPI to review
	Rainier Prep	TBD	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	meeting set up with OSPI to review
	SOAR	TBD	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	meeting set up with OSPI to review
	Summit: Olympus	TBD	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	meeting set up with OSPI to review
	Summit: Sierra	TBD	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	meeting set up with OSPI to review
4.c. Is the school meeting teacher and other staff credentialing requirements?	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
4.d. Is the school respecting employee rights?	Excel	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
4.e. Is the school completing required background checks?	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	

5.a. Is the school complying with facilities and transportation requirements?	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
5.b. Is the school complying with health and safety requirements?	Excel	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
5.c. Is the school maintaining and handling information appropriately?	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
6.a. Is the school complying with all other obligations (non academic goals)?	Excel	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Green Dot Destiny	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Rainier Prep	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	SOAR	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Olympus	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	
	Summit: Sierra	7/1/2017	Available	3/15/2018	Not Started	5/1/2018	Not Started	

Financial Performance Framework Data Availability and Publication Timeline

Measure	School Name	Data Available	Status	Report to Commission	Status	Publication Deadline	Status	Notes
% Complete			14%				0%	
Measure	School Name	Data Available	Status	Report to Commission	Status	Publication Deadline	Status	Notes
1.a Current Ratio (Near-Term)	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
1.b Unrestricted Days Cash (Near-Term)	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
1.c Debt Default (Near-Term)	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
2.a Total Margin (Sustainability)	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
2.b Debt to Asset Ratio (Sustainability)	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
2.c Cash Flow (Sustainability)	Excel	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Green Dot Destiny	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Rainier Prep	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	SOAR	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Olympus	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Sierra	3/1/2018	Not Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
Enrollment Variance (Informational)	Excel	7/1/2017	Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Green Dot Destiny	7/1/2017	Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Rainier Prep	7/1/2017	Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	SOAR	7/1/2017	Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Olympus	7/1/2017	Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	
	Summit: Sierra	7/1/2017	Available	4/19/2018	Not started	5/1/2018	Not started	



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

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

October 1, 2017

Dear Charter School Authorizer:

RCW 28A.710.100 provides that each charter authorizer must submit an annual report to the State Board of Education, according to a timeline, content and format specified by the Board, and states the information that must be included in the report.

WAC 180-19-210 provides that each authorizer must, no later than November 1 of each year, submit an annual report meeting the requirements of RCW 28A.710.100, and requires SBE to provide a standard form for the report.

Attached is the standard form for submission of the authorizer annual report for 2017, which is for the 2016-17 school year, with instructions for completing and submitting the form.

For any questions concerning the annual authorizer report, please contact:

Kaaren Heikes
Director of Policy and Partnerships
State Board of Education
360-725-6029
Kaaren.Heikes@k12.wa.us

2017 Charter Authorizer Annual Report

Please complete the following report and submit via electronic mail to sbe@k12.wa.us. If the information requested for any part of the report is not available, please enter NA in the space provided. Please identify by item number below any attachments provided for purposes of this report.

Authorizer Name:

Washington State Charter School Commission

Authorizer Address:

1068 Washington St SE

PO Box 40996

Olympia WA 98504-0996

Contact for Additional Information:

Name: Joshua Halsey

Telephone Number: (360) 725-5511

Email Address: joshua.halsey@k12.wa.us

Mailing Address: Same as Authorizer address

1. If a school district, date of approval as an authorizer by the SBE.

N/A

2. Names and job titles of personnel having principal authorizing responsibilities, with contact information for each.

Name: Joshua Halsey

Job Title: Executive Director

Telephone Number: (360) 725-5511

Email Address: joshua.halsey@k12.wa.us

Mailing Address: Same as Authorizer address

Name: Paula Kitzke

Job Title: Deputy Director

Telephone Number: (360) 725-5511

Email Address: paula.kitzke@k12.wa.us

Mailing Address: Same as Authorizer Address

Name: Dr. Catherine Fromme, Ed.D

Job Title: New School Application Director

Telephone Number: (360) 725-5511

Email Address: cathy.fromme@k12.wa.us

3. Names and job titles of any employees or contractors to whom the authorizer has delegated responsibility for the duties of an authorizer as set forth in RCW 28A.710.100, with contact information for each.

Name: Joshua Halsey

Telephone Number: Executive Director

Email Address: Joshua.halsey@k12.wa.us

Mailing Address: Same as Authorizer Address

4. Please provide as an attachment an executive summary of authorizing activity over the 2016-2017 school/fiscal year, including but not limited to the status (RCW 28A.710.100(c)), as well as the academic and financial performance of all charter schools operating under your jurisdiction.

Please title the attachment: Name of Authorizer.Q4

5. Please provide as an attachment your strategic vision for chartering, and an assessment of the progress made in achieving that vision since becoming an authorizer.

Please title the attachment: Name of Authorizer.Q5

6. Please provide as an attachment information on the status of your charter school portfolio, identifying each charter school authorized in each of the following categories:

Please title the attachment: Name of Authorizer.Q6

- a) Approved but not yet operating, including, for each for each charter school:

- i. The targeted student population and the community the school proposes to serve.
- ii. The proposed location of the school or geographic area in which it will be located.
- iii. The projected enrollment at capacity.
- iv. The grades to be operated in each year of the charter contract.
- v. Names and contact information for each member of the governing board.
- vi. Date approved for opening.

- b) Operating, including, for each charter school:

- i. Location (street address if available).
- ii. Grades operated.
- iii. Enrollment, total and by grade.
- iv. Enrollment, by grade, for each student subgroup as defined in RCW 28A.300.042, in totals and as percentages of enrollment.
- v. If charter has been renewed during the last year, please indicate, with date of renewal.
- vi. If charter has been transferred to another authorizer within the last year, please indicate, with date of transfer.
- vii. If charter was revoked during the last year, please indicate, with date and reasons for revocation.

- viii. If the school delayed its opening by more than one year by a grant of extension by the authorizer, please indicate, with date of approval of request for extension.
- ix. If the school voluntarily closed, please indicate, with date of closing.
- x. If the school never opened, with no planned date for opening, please indicate.

7. As **Exhibit A**, please provide information on the academic performance of each charter school operated during the 2016-2017 school/fiscal year. The information must include:
- a) Student achievement, as applicable by grade, on each of the required indicators enumerated in **RCW 28A.710.170**, as applicable by grade:
 - i. Academic proficiency, for continuously enrolled students, as reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
 - ii. Academic growth, for continuously enrolled students, as reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
 - iii. Achievement gaps, for continuously enrolled students, as reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
 - iv. Attendance
 - v. Recurrent enrollment from the prior school year to the year before.
 - vi. Graduation rates, as reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
 - vii. Postsecondary readiness, at such time as it is reported in the Washington Achievement Index.
 - b) Student achievement, as applicable by grade, on each additional indicator, if any, the authorizer has included in its academic performance framework.
 - For each indicator of academic performance, data must be reported as:
 - 1) Absolute values, and
 - 2) The computed differences between actual performance and the annual performance targets set by the charter school in conjunction with the authorizer under RCW 28A.710.170(3).
 - For each indicator of academic performance, data must be disaggregated by major student subgroup as enumerated in RCW 28A.710.170(5).
8. As **Exhibit B**, please provide information on the financial performance of each charter school operated during the 2016-2017 school/fiscal. The information must include performance on each of the indicators and measures of financial performance and sustainability included in the authorizer's performance framework under RCW 28A.710.170(2)(g).
- For each indicator of financial performance, data must be reported as:
 - (1) Absolute values, and
 - (2) The computed differences between actual performance and the annual performance targets set by the charter school in conjunction with the authorizer under RCW 28A.710.170(3).

9. As **Exhibit C**, please create a table that provides information on the organizational performance of the governing board of each charter school operated in 2016-2017. Performance reported must be based on the indicators and measures of organizational performance in the authorizer's performance framework, including but not limited to compliance with all applicable laws, rules and terms of the charter contract.
- Where applicable, please compute and report the differences between actual performance on the indicators and the annual targets set by the charter school in conjunction with the authorizer under RCW 28A.710.170(3).

10. Please provide as an attachment a presentation of operating costs incurred and expenditures made during the 2016-2017 school/fiscal year that are specifically attributable to fulfilling the responsibilities of a charter authorizer under RCW 28A.710.100, as reported in annual financial statements that conform with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and under any applicable reporting and accounting requirements of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Please label the attachment: Name of Authorizer.Q10

11. Please provide as an attachment a list of any contracted, fee-based services purchased during the 2016-2017 school/fiscal year by the charter schools in the authorizer's portfolio. Please include for each:
- a) An itemized accounting of the revenue received from the schools from the services provided;
 - b) An estimate of the actual costs to the provider of providing these services.

Please label the attachment: Name of Authorizer.Q11

NOT APPLICABLE: The charter schools authorized by the Commission did not purchase services from the Commission.

12. Please provide any additional information you believe would assist the SBE in its *"assessment of the successes, challenges, and areas for improvement in meeting the purposes of this chapter (RCW 28A.710), including the board's assessment of the sufficiency of funding for charter schools, the efficacy of the formula for authorizer funding, and any suggested changes in state law or policy necessary to strengthen the state's charter schools."* (RCW28A.710.250(2))

Please label the attachment: Additional Information. Q12.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission.Q4

Please provide as an attachment an executive summary of authorizing activity over the last year (2016-17), including but not limited to the status and performance of the charter schools since becoming an authorizer.

The Washington State Charter School Commission (Commission) was re-established on April 3, 2016 and issued its annual solicitation for new school applications on December 6, 2016. On February 17, 2017, the Commission received four (4) Notices of Intent to apply and on March 31, 2017, the Commission received three (3) applications to open new charter public schools. Of the three (3) applications, one was determined incomplete, and was not reviewed, and another application was withdrawn by the applicant. On June 29, 2017, the Commission, during a regularly scheduled Commission meeting, approved one new school application.

During the 2016-17 school year, six (6) Commission authorized charter schools were in operation. These schools were subject to stringent oversight from the Commission and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). The Commission is committed to providing accurate and complete data on charter schools. While OSPI's Washington State Report Card does contain 2016-17 Smarter Balanced Assessment Proficiency Results for charter school that served grades assessed along with student demographic and teacher information data, given the timing of this report, the Commission is unable to provide a complete and accurate assessment of the performance of its operational charter schools. Data regarding the performance of charter schools (Academic (specifically growth and Achievement Index outcomes), Organizational and Financial) is currently incomplete. Some of the most important data regarding the performance of charter schools come from three sources, the accountability audit, financial statement audit and the Achievement Index. The audits reports will not be available until February 2018 and the Achievement Index will not be released until April 2018. Despite these data delays, the Commission continues to closely monitor each charter school outcomes and performance.

Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission.Q5

Please provide as an attachment your strategic vision for chartering, and an assessment of the progress made in achieving that vision since becoming an authorizer.

Per the Charter Schools Act, the Commission has established its strategic vision for authorizing to guide its work, within its Mission, Values, and Vision:

The Washington State Charter School Commission seeks to authorize high quality schools that will significantly improve student outcomes, particularly for at-risk students. The Commission will hold schools accountable for student learning using multiple measures of student achievement.

The Commission seeks to build a diverse portfolio of school delivery models that expands the authority of teachers and school leaders and encourages and accelerates the identification and use of best practices in teaching and learning. It also seeks to develop, test, and document innovative, new ideas that can be replicated in other Washington schools.

The Commission expects schools to have authentic and sustainable connections to the communities they serve. These connections are evidenced by strong commitments from community and business stakeholders, systems for ensuring cultural sensitivity, responsiveness to all students and their families, and effective, engaged governance boards.

Using this strategic vision for chartering as its cornerstone, the Commission believes it has made substantial progress towards realizing its vision. This belief is predicated upon the fact that the Commission has conducted four (4) new school solicitations in the past four years. These solicitations have resulted in eleven (11) charter public schools authorized, each intentionally positioned to serve at-risk students. Of the eleven (11) charters authorized, one voluntarily closed, two are planning to open in the fall of 2018 and eight (8) are currently serving, approximately 1,700 students. As our data shows, the vast majority of students being served are students of color and students that qualify for free and reduced priced lunch.

Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission Q6

Q6(a) Approved but not yet operating						
School	Student Population	Location	Projected Enrollment	Grades	Governing Board	Date Approved to Open
Impact Puget Sound Elementary	At-Risk	Tukwila	168	2018: Grades K-1 2019: Grades K-2 At capacity: K-5	Tony Byrd, Anthony.byrd@teachforamerica.org Sara Morris, Saramo808@yahoo.com Tatiana Epanchin, tepanchin@gmail.com Micaela Razo, micaela@quantumed.org Patrick Methvin, Patrick.methvin@outlook.com	September 4, 2018
Willow Public School	At-Risk	Walla Walla	225	2018: Grades 6-7 2019: Grades 6-8	Jennifer Beckmeyer, jbeckmeyer@willowpublicschool.org Nelly Pilares-Manrique, npilares@willowpublicschool.org Cynthia Selde, cynthia.selde@gmail.com Rick Aguilar David Brauhn, david.brauhn@willowpublicschool.org	August 13, 2018
Q6(b)(i)-(iii) Operating						
School	Location	Grades Operated		2017 Total Enrollment*	2017 Enrollment by Grade	
Green Dot Excel	19300 108 th Ave SE Kent, WA 98055	2017: 7-9 2018: 7-10 2019: 7-11	2020: 7-12	157	7: 47 8: 75 9: 36	
Green Dot Destiny	1301 East 34th Street Tacoma, WA 98404	2017: 6-8 2018: 6-8 2019: 6-8	2020: 6-8	278	6: 64 7: 96 8: 117	
Green Dot Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	6020 Rainier Avenue S., Seattle, WA 98118	2017: 6 2018: 6-8 2019: 6-8	2020: 6-8	99	6: 99	

Rainier Prep	10211 12th Ave S. Seattle, WA 98168	2017: 5-8 2018: 5-8 2019: 5-8	2020: 5-8	334	5: 87 6: 85 7: 85 8: 77
SOAR	2136 MLK Jr. Way, Tacoma, WA 98405	2017: K-3 2018: K-4	2019: K-5 2020: K-6	180	K: 46 1: 43 2: 47 3: 44
Summit Atlas	9601 35th Ave SW Seattle, WA 98126	2017: 6 and 9 2018: 6-7 and 9-10	2019: 6-11 2020: 6-12	181	6: 103 9: 78
Summit Olympus	409 Puyallup Ave. Tacoma, WA 98421	2017: 9-11 2018: 9-12		167	9: 36 10: 55 11: 76
Summit Sierra	1025 S. King Street Seattle, WA 98104	2017: 9-11 2018: 9-12		297	9: 106 10: 88 11: 103

Q6(b)(iv) Operating

School	American Indian %	Asian %	Black %	Hispanic /Latino %	Caucasian %	Pacific Islander %	Multiracial %	Low Income	Bilingual % (ELL)	Migrant %	Sp Ed %	504 %
Green Dot Excel	0	6	48	3	39	1	1	48	6	0	16	0
Green Dot Destiny	2	2	27	24	27	6	12	73	18	0	22	0
Green Dot Rainier Valley Leadership Academy	0	3	75	5	13	0	3	75	34	0	17	0
Rainier Prep	0	9	36	28	18	1	7	77	34	0	10	2
SOAR	2	1	31	17	19	2	28	79	3	0	15	0
Summit Atlas	0	3	30	19	35	0	13	49	8	0	16	2
Summit Olympus	1	2	1	35	28	2	12	67	6	0	19	4

Summit Sierra	1	10	40	12	25	0	12	33	7	0	16	4
Q6(b)(ix) Voluntarily Closed												
School	Location		Date Closed									
First Place Scholars Charter School	172 20 th Ave, Seattle, WA 98122		June 1, 2016									

* Accessed via October Enrollment Report

Exhibit A

The Commission collaborated with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA), in partnership with Public Impact, to develop the Academic Performance Framework (APF). The starting point for the APF was NACSA's Core Academic Performance Framework, which is based on NACSA's Principles & Standards. Development of the APF included a review of publicly-available information related to the Washington State Charter School Act, agency rules, and regulations.

Based upon the Charter School Act's requirements, the Commission adopted the following agency rules, which are codified in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). These WAC provisions contain following definitions specific to the APF:

'Performance framework' means the standards that will be used by the Commission to evaluate the performance of each charter school. The Performance Framework will be a source of information used by the Commission to make decisions involving corrective action, renewal, modification, revocation, and/or termination of a charter school." WAC 108-30-020 (1).

Academic performance and compliance measures whether the charter school meets or is making sufficient progress towards academic performance expectations. The APF evaluates the question: Is a charter school's academic program a success? Academic performance and compliance includes, but is not limited to:

- Student achievement. Evaluation of student achievement includes evaluation of student academic proficiency in English language arts, science, and mathematics; evaluation of student achievement gaps in both proficiency and growth. In addition to overall data, this information must be disaggregated by major student subgroups including gender, race and ethnicity, poverty status, special education status, English language learner status, and highly capable status.
- Comparative performance. Comparative performance is evaluated by comparing charter school students' performance on required state and federal assessments to performance of students in traditional public schools and charter schools with similar demographics. This is a comparison of overall student performance in English language arts (reading and writing), math, and science, as well as any other subjects that will in the future be tested. To the extent data is available comparison schools may include, but are not limited to, district-of-residence schools and peer or comparable schools whether charter or noncharter. As additional data for comparisons become available, the comparative performance evaluation will be adjusted. In addition to aggregate data, when available, this information must be disaggregated by major student subgroups including gender, race and ethnicity, poverty status, special education status, English language learner status, and highly capable status.
- Student progress. Student progress is evaluated using the school's median student growth percentile in reading and mathematics. As additional growth-related data become available, this evaluation will be adjusted. In addition to aggregate data, when available, this information must be disaggregated by major student subgroups including gender, race and ethnicity, poverty status, special education status, English language learner status, and highly capable status.
- Post-secondary readiness (high school evaluation). Evaluation of post-secondary readiness includes overall graduation rates in accordance with the state of Washington reporting

requirements; comparison of charter school to district-of-residence graduation rates; comparison of charter school to peer or similar school graduation rates; and enrollment in post-secondary institutions. As additional comparison data such as dual credit accrual, industry certification, 11th grade assessments, or others, become available, this evaluation will be adjusted. In addition to aggregate data, this information must be disaggregated by major student subgroups including gender, race and ethnicity, poverty status, special education status, English language learner status, and highly capable status.

- **State and federal accountability.** Evaluation of the charter school's compliance with state and federal accountability rules, regulations, and laws and whether the school has met the targets set forth by the state accountability system including, but not limited to, provision of basic education, instruction in the essential academic learning requirements, statewide student assessments, performance improvement goals. In addition to overall data, this information must be disaggregated by major student subgroups including gender, race and ethnicity, poverty status, special education status, English language learner status, and highly capable status.

- **Mission specific accountability.** Evaluation of whether the charter school has met mission specific goals identified in its contract.

WAC 108-30-020 (3).

Academic Performance Framework Indicators, Measures and Format

The Commission aligned its APF with Washington State by adopting the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) as the primary APF measure. Using the SBA, the Commission considers both proficiency and growth as measures in its APF. The SBA is administered annually to students grades 3 through 10 and provides students, parents, schools and the public with information regarding student knowledge of core subject and how much student knowledge is increasing from year to year. For the purposes of the APF, the Commission uses the term proficiency which means is the student's knowledge of core subjects at a level that is expected based upon the Common Core learning standards. The Commission also uses the term growth which means how much a student learns within a school-year.

RATING SCALE

As outlined in WAC 108-30-030, for each APF measure, a charter school receives one of four ratings: "Exceeds Standard," "Meets Standard," "Does Not Meet Standard," or "Falls Far Below Standard."

- ***Exceeds Standard*** – Schools that earn this rating exhibit exemplary performance. They are on track for charter renewal and could warrant consideration by the Commission for expansion or replication.
- ***Meets Standard*** – Schools in this rating category meet the minimum expectations for charter school performance. They are performing well and are on track for charter renewal.
- ***Does Not Meet Standard*** – Schools in this category fail to meet minimum expectations for academic performance. The Commission could consider closer monitoring, and their status for renewal could be in question.
- ***Falls Far Below Standard*** – Schools that fall into this rating category are on par with the lowest-performing schools in the state and may be subject to non-renewal or revocation.

INDICATORS AND MEASURES

The APF evaluates schools based on: state accountability, federal accountability, proficiency rates, student growth, career and college readiness, subgroup performance, comparisons to district schools and schools statewide serving similar students, and school-specific goals.

Indicator	Measure	K-8 Weight Measure	K-8 Indicator Weight	HS Weight Measure	HS Indicator Weight
State and Federal Accountability	3-Year Composite Index	15%	55%	15%	55%
	Annual Composite Index	40%		40%	
	Pending state ESSA Consolidated Plan	TBD		TBD	
Geographic Comparisons	Proficiency comparison to district	3%	15%	3.75%	15%
	Subgroup proficiency comparison to district	3%		3.75%	
	Growth comparison to district (K-8 only)	4.5%		NA	
	Subgroup growth comparison to district (K-8 only)	4.5%		NA	
	Grad rate comparison to district (HS)	NA		3.75%	
	Grad rate subgroup comparison to district (HS)	NA		3.75%	
Comparison to Schools Serving Similar Students (Regression)	Proficiency comparison to schools statewide serving similar students	15%	15%	7.5%	15%
	Graduation rate comparison to schools statewide serving similar students	NA		7.5%	
School-Specific	School-Specific Goals	15%	15%	15%	15%

Note: Weights across all indicators total to 100%.

Subgroups include race and ethnicity, current and former English Language Learners, students with disabilities, free and reduced price lunch, and “highly capable status.”

Note on missing data: If a school does not have at least one year of SBAC data or if more than one of the four indicators is missing, an overall tier rating will not be calculated. No single measure will give a full picture of a school’s academic program outcomes. However, taken together, the measures provide a comprehensive assessment of the school’s academic program outcomes.

If any metrics within an indicator are missing, an indicator rating will not be calculated. The only exception will be made in the first two years that a school receives an Achievement Index annual rating. In these years, the 3-year composite Achievement Index will not be available and the Commission will calculate the State and Federal Accountability indicator rating and overall tier rating

using only the annual Achievement Index rating. Achievement Index ratings are released in the spring of the following school-year.

Commission authorized charter schools completed their first year of operation, and many continue to grow and add grades each year until they reach their full capacity. Given that the school just completed their first year and the state’s delay in providing SBA results, the Commission does not have access to the SBA results or the Achievement Index results necessary to fully and accurately determine how each school has done in relation to the identified APF metrics and measures. While the Commission cannot provide the requested information now, the Commission will provide academic performance data for each of its charter schools when that data becomes available. Please see below for when the Commission anticipates indicator and measure level data to be available:

Indicator	Measure	Data Availability
State and Federal Accountability	3-Year Composite Index	Spring 2018
	Annual Composite Index	Spring 2018
	Pending state ESSA Consolidated Plan	TBD
Geographic Comparisons	Proficiency comparison to district	Fall 2017
	Subgroup proficiency comparison to district	Fall 2017
	Growth comparison to district (K-8 only)	Late Fall 2017
	Subgroup growth comparison to district (K-8 only)	Late Fall 2017
	Grad rate comparison to district (HS)	Spring**
	Grad rate subgroup comparison to district (HS)	Spring**
Comparison to Schools Serving Similar Students (Regression)	Proficiency comparison to schools statewide serving similar students	Late Fall 2017
	Graduation rate comparison to schools statewide serving similar students	Spring
School-Specific	School-Specific Goals	Fall

**No Commission authorized charter schools had a graduating class during the 2016-17 school year so no relevant data will be available.

Exhibit B

Commission authorized and operational charter public schools just completed their first full year of operation. Charter public school, as with any public school in Washington, adhere to a fiscal year that begins on September 1 and ends August 31. Given the reality of work and timelines associated with closing out a fiscal year, including dependent data reports from agencies such as the Department of Retirement Services, the Commission requires its charter school to complete their financial statement audits by February 28, 2018, at which time we will be able to run their financial performance against the performance framework. The estimated time for completion will be May 1, 2018.

Introduction

The Washington State Charter School Commission (Commission) has collaborated with the National Association Charter School Authorizers (NACSA), in partnership with CliftonLarsonAllen (CLA), in the development of the Commission's *Financial Performance Framework (FPF) & Guidance*.

The Commission and NACSA have reviewed publically available information related to the State of Washington's Charter Schools Act to determine if any of the measures in NACSA's Core FPF would need to be modified given the State of Washington's legislative, political, and financial charter school environment.

Some of the information reviewed includes:

- Publicly available information from the Washington State Board of Education:
www.sbe.wa.gov/charters.php
- Publicly available information from the Washington State Charter School Association:
www.wacharters.org
- Publicly available information from the Washington State Charter School Commission:
www.charterschool.wa.gov
- Initiative 1240: www.sos.wa.gov/_assets/elections/initiatives/FinalText_274.pdf
- Spokane Public Schools Authorizer Application:
www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/CharterSchools/SpokaneCharterAuthorizerApplication.pdf

Why a Financial Performance Framework?

The FPF is a reporting tool that provides the Commission with the necessary data to assess the financial health and viability of the charter schools in its portfolio for the purposes of an annual review. The framework summarizes a charter school's financial health and viability while taking into account the school's financial trends over a period of three years.

The FPF's measures are designed to be complementary. No single measure will give a full picture of the financial situation of a school. However, taken together, the measures provide a comprehensive assessment of the school's financial health and viability based on the school's historic trends, near-term financial situation, and future viability.

One of the Commission's core responsibilities is to protect the public interest by ensuring the highest standards of accountability and oversight for charter schools in its portfolio. The FPF is the primary lever

for carrying out this responsibility with respect to the allocation and use of public funds by charter schools.

Financial Performance Framework Structure

The FPF includes five main levels of information:

- Indicators
- Measures
- Metrics
- Targets
- Ratings.

Component	Definition	Example
<i>Indicators</i>	General categories of financial performance	Near Term
<i>Measures</i>	General means to evaluate an aspect of an indicator	Current Ratio
<i>Metrics</i>	Method of quantifying a measure	Current ratio is the school's current liabilities over current assets
<i>Targets</i>	Thresholds that signify success in meeting the standard for a specific measure	Current ratio greater than 1.1
<i>Ratings</i>	Assignment of charter school performance into one of two categories, based on how the school performs against the framework targets	If school meets the target of 1.1 the rating category is "Meets Standard"

INDICATORS

The FPF includes two indicators, or general categories, used to evaluate schools' financial performance.

Near-Term

The portion of the FPF that tests a school's near-term financial health is designed to depict the school's financial position and viability in the upcoming year. Schools meeting the desired standards demonstrate a lower risk of financial distress in the coming year. Schools that fail to meet the standards may currently be experiencing financial difficulties and/or are at higher risk for financial hardship in the near-term. These schools may require additional review and immediate corrective action on the part of the Commission.

Sustainability

The FPF also includes longer-term financial sustainability measures and is designed to depict a school's financial position and viability over time. Schools that meet the desired standards demonstrate a lower

risk of financial distress in the future. Schools that fail to meet the standards are at higher risk for financial hardship in the future.

MEASURES

Measures are the means to evaluate an aspect of an indicator. Six measures are used for evaluation in the FPF. One additional measure is used for informational purposes only.

The measures for the financial framework are as follows:

- **1.a** Current Ratio (Near-Term)
- **1.b** Unrestricted Days Cash (Near-Term)
- **1.c** Debt Default (Near-Term)
- **2.a** Total Margin (Sustainability)
- **2.b** Debt to Asset Ratio (Sustainability)
- **2.c** Cash Flow (Sustainability)
- Enrollment Variance (Informational)

METRICS

Metrics are the methods for calculating measures. An example of a metric is “Current Ratio equals Current Assets divided by Current Liabilities” ($Current\ Ratio = \frac{Current\ Assets}{Current\ Liabilities}$). Each metric is detailed in the “Measures in Detail” section of this guidance.

TARGETS

Targets are the thresholds that signify success for a specific measure. An example of a target is “Current Ratio is greater than 1.1.” ($Current\ Ratio > 1.1$). For each of the measures, targets are based on authorizer best practices, industry standards, and ratios that reflect the financial health of the school. The Commission will use data from the year-end audited financial statements for each school along with current financial data gathered through quarterly financial reports to calculate each measure. In order to depict the overall financial health of the school, these calculations are based on *all funds* of the school, not just the general fund.

The Commission believes that the life stage of a school should be taken into consideration when reviewing the financial viability of schools. Therefore, a number of the financial measures have two sets of targets. One set for schools in year 1 or 2 of operations, and one set for schools in year 3 or beyond.

RATINGS

The FPF ratings are either *Meets Standard* or *Does Not Meet Standard* (WAC 108-30-030). The Commission will consider any relevant context for the school's financial position that informs the causes for any perceived financial shortcomings. Appropriate monitoring and/or intervention will be determined, in part, by how the rating on the measure in question fits within the school's overall financial performance based on *all* evidence examined.

Meets Standard

A *Meets* rating indicates sound financial viability based on the overall financial record. The school may have already met the absolute FPF standard based on the financials under review, or any concerns have

been adequately addressed based on additional information such that the Commission concludes that performance indicates sound financial viability.

Does Not Meet Standard

A *Does Not Meet* rating means that even based on the most current financial information (recent audited financials and more current unaudited financials), the school is not currently meeting the standard, and/or concerns previously identified with the need of heightened monitoring and/or intervention have not been adequately corrected and/or, if not currently manifested, have been of a depth or duration that warrants continued attention. A *Does Not Meet* rating indicates that upon evidence from the FPF, quarterly reports, notice of concerns, and investigation and review, the Commission identifies significant financial risk such that heightened monitoring and/or intervention is warranted. Appropriate monitoring and or interventions will be determined on a case by case basis, and, in part, by how the rating on the standard in question fits within the school's overall performance on the FPF.

The overall final rating of a school will document the Commission's assessment of the school's financial viability based on cumulative evidence from the quarterly reviews, State Auditor and independent audits, annual budgets, cash on hand, the FPF, and/or more detailed examination of the school's financial position, as needed.

Exhibit C

Introduction

The Washington State Charter School Commission (Commission) Organizational Performance Framework (OPF) was developed by NACSA in collaboration with the Commission. The starting point for the draft was NACSA's Core Organizational Performance Framework (OPF), which is based on NACSA's Principles & Standards and experience from the field (RCW 28A710.170). NACSA reviewed publically available information related to Washington State charter law to align NACSA's Core OPF with Washington's laws, rules, regulations, and charter contract, and vice versa.

The purpose of the Organizational Performance Framework is to communicate to the charter school and public the compliance-related standards that all charter schools authorized by the Commission must meet. The Organizational Framework lists the standards which align to state and federal law, rules, regulations, and the charter contract that charter schools are required to meet.

The Commission's Organizational Performance Framework is intended to lay out the legal requirements for charter schools. It is designed to treat all charter schools as though they are the same only in terms of meeting minimum legal and ethical requirements. This enables charter schools to retain the flexibility and autonomy to be different in the ways that matter most for a school's mission, vision, and educational program. The expectations set out in the Organizational Framework derive from state and federal law as well as the operating terms in the charter application. Of the three frameworks, the Organizational Framework is most closely aligned with the charter contract in terms of documenting operational expectations such as special education, accounting practices, reporting requirements, and the like.

One of the Commission's core responsibilities with respect to charter schools is to protect the public interest, and the Organizational Framework is the primary lever for carrying out this responsibility. It enables the Commission to ensure that charter schools are respecting rights of students, staff, and families within the schools as well as the interests of the general public in ensuring that charter schools meet the legal obligations that state and federal legislatures have determined should apply.

The central premise of charter school autonomy is that the authorizer will articulate the expected outcomes, and the school will have maximum flexibility to determine the best way to achieve those outcomes. In other words, the authorizer articulates the ends and the school decides the means of getting there. Whereas the Academic and Financial Frameworks focus almost exclusively on results, the Organizational Framework inevitably mandates process. Whether it is meeting requirements for minimum instructional days and minutes or ensuring that the facility meets applicable health and safety codes, the Organizational Framework is the place where the school becomes externally accountable for how it operates.

The Commission intends to maximize school operational autonomy by articulating the base set of state and federal laws, rules and regulations with regard to legal, operational and ethical expectations that are common to all public schools. Everything else related to school operations can remain within the school's purview to manage, control, and change as school leadership sees fit.

The Organizational Framework is not intended to incorporate the Commission's process for monitoring and holding schools accountable against these requirements. The Organizational Framework establishes

the standards; the Commission's evaluation/review process is a secondary process that stipulates reporting and compliance review procedures.

The Commission is developing an evaluation/review process that will determine whether the school is meeting each expectation and how best to evaluate the school's overall organizational effectiveness. Some measures in the Organizational Performance Framework require periodic monitoring to ensure compliance, while others will be analyzed annually during site visits. There are a number of ways the Commission will collect data to evaluate a charter school's organizational performance and effectiveness in order to determine a school's rating on each measure as well as a rating for the framework as a whole.

Additionally, while the Commission provides oversight to charter schools, many of the state and federal program compliance requirements will be monitored and/or audited by OSPI and SAO program staff. Charter schools will be required to submit to the Commission, OSPI and SAO program review and audit reports so that all agencies may work in collaboration regarding state and federal compliance.

Rating Scale

For each measure a school receives one of two ratings (WAC 108-30-030).

Meets Standard: The school materially meets the expectations outlined per state and/or federal laws, rules and regulation, or the charter contract

Does Not Meet Standard: The school failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance to the satisfaction of the authorizer

Ratings will be determined through the data collected by the Commission at board meetings, site visits, and through desk audits of compliance submissions made via the Commission's Annual Compliance Calendar. The State Auditor's Office Accountability Audit and each school's financial statement audit as well as OSPI monitoring will also inform ratings against the Organizational Performance Framework. Given the timing of completion of these audits, the estimated time for completion of this section will be May 1, 2018.

Organization Framework Indicators and Measures:

1. Education Program
 - a. Material Terms of the Charter Contract
 - b. Education Requirements
 - c. Students with Disabilities Rights
 - d. English Language Learner Rights
2. Financial Management and Oversight
 - a. Financial Reporting and Compliance
 - b. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles
3. Governance and Reporting
 - a. Governance Requirements

- b. Management Accountability
 - c. Reporting Requirements
- 4. Students, Parents, and Employees
 - a. Rights of Students
 - b. Recurrent Enrollment
 - c. Teacher and Staff Credentials
 - d. Employee Rights
 - e. Background Checks
- 5. School Environment
 - a. Facilities and Transportation
 - b. Health and Safety
 - c. Information Management
- 6. Additional Obligations
 - a. All Other Obligations

Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission Q10

OFM

3590 - Washington Charter School Commission

Allotment Management Flexible

(Charter School Commission Expenditures July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017)

Report Number: AEF07

Biennium: 2017

Date Run: Oct 9, 2017 2:31PM

Transactions Through: Oct 6, 2017 8:00PM

Allotment Content: Approved & Adjusted

Revenue Content: Cash, Accr(All)

Fiscal Months: Jul FY2 Through: Adj FY2

Estimated Revenue Content: Approved & Adjusted Expenditure Content: Cash, Accr(All), Encum

(For a complete listing of all input parameter values, please see the last page of the report)

		Current Period		Biennium-to-Date		Total Biennium	
	Alotments	Expenditures	Variance	Alotments	Expenditures	Variance	Alotments
							Remaining Balance
							Amount
							%
By Account/Expenditure Authority Index							
001 - General Fund							
011 - Salaries & Expenses	0	0	0	497,000	497,000	0	497,000
17F - WA Opportunity Pathways Account							
050 - Salaries & Expenses	546,000	546,000	0	546,000	546,000	0	546,000
19L - Charter Schools Oversight Account							
030 - Salaries & Expenses	177,278	184,960	(7,682)	276,000	227,092	48,908	276,000
Total for Agency	723,278	730,960	(7,682)	1,319,000	1,270,092	48,908	1,319,000
By Account/Expenditure Authority Index							
By Object							
A - Salaries and Wages	244,338	269,619	(25,281)	478,683	504,510	(25,827)	478,683
B - Employee Benefits	80,649	86,599	(5,950)	153,576	158,130	(4,554)	153,576
C - Professional Service Contracts	77,759	39,129	38,630	111,168	43,580	67,588	111,168
E - Goods and Other Services	262,024	290,227	(28,203)	476,285	491,855	(15,570)	476,285
G - Travel	50,008	32,660	17,348	86,996	51,556	35,440	86,996
J - Capital Outlays	8,500	12,726	(4,226)	12,292	20,462	(8,170)	12,292
Total for Agency	723,278	730,960	(7,682)	1,319,000	1,270,092	48,908	1,319,000
By Object							48,908
							3.71

Attachment: Washington State Charter School Commission Q12

In an effort to provide additional information that would assist the SBE regarding RCW 28A.710.250(2), we have provided information regarding changes to RCW 28A.710 that would strengthen the state's charter schools.

- 28A.710.050(3): Change, "approved by the commission" to "approved by the authorizer," which appears to be the intent of the provision.
- 28A.710.250(1): Change "By December 1st of each year" to a later date to enable the authorizer annual reports and the SBE annual report to include graduation and Achievement Index data. Amend WAC 180-19-210(1) to change "no later than November 1st of each year to later date TBD."
- 28A.710.280(2): Change, "based on the statewide average staff mix factor" to align to Engrossed House Bill 2242's basic education funding changes. Under EHB 2242, the state will no longer use the common schools staff mix formula but will instead use a regionalized allocation formula. This change will allow for RCW 28A.710.280(1) to be met: The legislature intends that state funding for charter schools be distributed equitably with state funding provided for other public schools.