Accountability:
A Partnership for Improving Charter Schools
Academic Performance

TAMMIE KNIGHTS:

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Tammie Knights from the National Charter School Resource Center, and I’m pleased to welcome to you to our webinar, Accountability: A Partnership for Improving Charter Schools Academic Performance.
The Resource Center is funded by the Department of Education’s Charter School Program and serves as a national center to provide resources and information on charter schools and to disseminate information about successful practice within the charter schools.

I want to quickly remind you about our webinar platform. You can listen to the audio portion either through your computer or over the phone. If you do join by phone, please mute your computer speakers to prevent the echo effect. If you are not prompted to enter your phone number for the presentation, feel free to type them in as you think of them and I will keep track of them for us. You will also find a copy of today’s PowerPoint as well as some additional resources in the File Share directly below the chat. As a reminder, the webinar is being about yourself so we know who’s on the phone. So, if you could just take a moment….

[Pause]

Great. Thank you, and one more question before we get started.

[Pause]

Great, thank you. This helps our presenters know who’s on the phone with us today and [unrecorded gap—Eileen Sigmund, CEO of] New Schools for Phoenix and DeAnna Rowe, who is the executive director for the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools. I welcome them both today, and I’m going to turn it over to them.
EILEEN SIGMUND:

[unrecorded gap] charter movement. My name is Eileen Sigmund, and I have led the Arizona Charter Schools Association since June of 2007. The Arizona Charter Schools Association is a nonprofit membership and professional organization providing the best in comprehensive support and services to Arizona’s 535 charter schools. The association’s mission [unrecorded gap]...sustainable, strong, and incredible organization.

DEANNA ROWE:

Hi, I'm Deanna Rowe, and I'm the executive director of the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools, which is an independent chartering board. Together, as a team of eight, we monitor and provide oversight of 515 of those 535 schools. Organizations were at a point where strategic and organizational changes were necessary in order to succeed in the new directions our organizations were heading. The State Board for Charter Schools was over ten years old but just in the early stages of developing a renewal process for our soon-to-expire 15-year contract. The board had come to realize that it needed to find better ways to utilize its access to each school’s academic data [unrecorded gap].
EILEEN SIGMUND:

[unrecorded gap] And realized the data to show how charters were improving student achievement did not exist because we could not compare students to their academic peers. What I mean by this is that I could not compare the academic growth of students to the academic growth of other students who started at similar performance levels. Is this a strong school because it grows students, [unrecorded gap]...to add an extra data staff person to meet this need.

DEANNA ROWE:

Today, we’ll walk you through how our partnership formed and how that partnership led to the use of a growth model not just for charter school accountability but for all public schools. I will speak from the authorizer viewpoint and introduce you to the board’s academic performance framework and share how it is used to [unrecorded gap]...expand our perspectives, you need to understand our mission.
EILEEN SIGMUND:

Simply put, a charter is a contract to improve student achievement. I knew we needed data to find out if charters were meeting the statutory mandate. Because the charter board [unrecorded gap]…, which are closely aligned: the Arizona Charter Schools Association, the Center for Student Achievement, and New Schools for Phoenix have aligned all their missions to meet the [unrecorded gap—statutory?] achievement was founded on the principle that all students deserve a quality education no matter where they attend school. Through professional development, coaching, and support, the center’s mission is to improve student achievement in all schools. [unrecorded gap] and charter school autonomy and lead the Arizona charter school movement in sustainable, strong, and credible organization.
DEANNA ROWE:

In 2011 [unrecorded gap] to publicly announce that the board was shifting its focus from authorizing a large quantity of schools—thereby flooding the market with choice—to building a portfolio of quality schools—thereby ensuring quality choices and improving educational options across the state. The board recognized that to ensure a quality portfolio of schools, it needed to institute a new application process, which is the gatekeeper of new quality growth. Second, to create an evaluation system that would identify [unrecorded gap]…, using the same evaluation system to create transparent processes for monitoring poor-performing schools and closing those that don’t meet or demonstrate sufficient progress toward the board’s academic performance expectations. Clearly, in order to accomplish this work, we needed reliable academic data.
EILEEN SIGMUND:

[unrecorded gap] school quality grant that was to strengthen performance management among schools, authorizers, state charter support organizations, and funders. A key goal of this grant was to demonstrate and implement student growth to standard performance measures [unrecorded gap] growth model. Arizona created its vision and pursued the development and implementation of the Arizona Growth Model. Through the [unrecorded gap] and create graphic representations of individual school performance for the board's use in evaluating school performance.

DEANNA ROWE:

Another key goal of this grant was the creation of the Performance Management Institute to strengthen the capacities of charter schools, charter management organizations, state charter associations, and charter school authorizers to pursue effective performance improvement [with] individual performance measures built in. Schools were provided opportunities to develop performance management plans using guidelines established by the board and [unrecorded gap] for all public schools.
EILEEN SIGMUND:

We had some early successes in spite of obstacles, which we positively refer to as lessons learned. One of the keys to our early success was having access to student-level data, which we did. It was math. Several states still do not have level math data on a separate server in addition to contractually agreeing to keep all information very safe and very secure. It would have been preferable to have it in a usable form. There’s the first lesson learned. Next, you need team members who know how to make meaningful decisions with the student-level data. When we started, Colorado and its resources through the center [unrecorded gap] two Ph.D.’s who were both former directors of resource—excuse me, directors of research—at our state education department. It took time to build and it took resources. So, there’s lesson number two. Third: data is everywhere, but how is data used for teachers to make meaningful adjustments to learning? There you go, lesson number three; don’t have your data sit on a shelf, but have it work and have it be meaningful for your students. Finally, we meet with our teachers union, our district leaders, our legislators [unrecorded gap]…. Therefore, that’s our final lesson here. Lesson number four, make the acceptance ground-up, not top-down.
DEANNA ROWE:

It’s easy to get sucked into the excitement of a grant and the grandiose visions that are discussed when like-minded, ambitious individuals gather around the table. Creating a reasonable vision with sustainable steps for implementation were two keys to our success that produced lessons learned of their own. First, internal policy changes may occur more quickly and easily [unrecorded gap]… setting yourself up for a lawsuit. Picture this: We had this great new data. We had made procedural changes that incorporated the data into our decision-making process in part because we had buy-in from a number of stakeholders and we were ready to take action. And the board did. It wasn’t until the [unrecorded gap] school decision was challenged that we discovered, while good-intentioned, we’d made the [unrecorded gap] others who impact your processes are on the same continuous timeline. Access to clean data is great, but only if you can get that access to clean data timely. You can find yourself unable to implement the best of processes if you don’t account for others’ ability or interest in meeting your timeframe.

EILEEN SIGMUND:

So, we’ve shared the keys to our success and some lessons learned along the way. Let’s shift gears a bit and tell you how what started as a partnership became a formula for change in the evaluation of all public schools four years later. In 2011, the Arizona Growth Model was adopted statewide for the evaluation of all our schools. Today, 50 percent of Arizona’s A through F letter grade is now based on the Arizona Growth Model.
DEANNA ROWE:

The implementation began with charter schools because the board determined [unrecorded gap] data use in the decision-making process and, as an independent board, we had the ability to adopt our own alternative measures for evaluating charter school academic performance. The growth data was integrated into both the five-year interval review process and the renewal application process—two years before the state even considered using the growth model in the evaluation of all public schools.

EILEEN SIGMUND:

While the board decisions around renewal, the association raised $15,000 for the state department of education to upload all of our association’s cleaned-up data into the Arizona Department of Education system. So this data was the growth data for all public schools, district and charter. Because the association took this step, all of K–12 education was exposed to the value of incorporation into the A through F letter grade.

The last part of the equation was advocacy for the inclusion of the growth model into the accountability system. So, what we did is, the association through its lobbying compact, we took the time to have lunch, coffee, whatever was necessary to build this grass-roots support.
DEANNA ROWE:

[unrecorded gap] continued to refine it to be even better. This is the representation of our original academic graph produced by the association. The $x$-axis represents growth and the $y$-axis represents the percent of students passing the assessment, creating a snapshot of overall percent passing and schoolwide growth for a set of years.

[inaudible] not going to go into the detail of each measure, but, as I reflect on the amount of information we now have access to, I'm reminded that this was all possible because of the partnership that we created. Someone in the partnership needs to have the expertise in running the data and then the ability to explain it in layman’s terms. In our partnership, the association [unrecorded gap] our school’s website, and in this presentation as one of your attached documents.
Skipping the details of the measures, I do want to spend a few minutes walking through our intervention schedule and how we use the data. While academic performance [inaudible] when poor performance without signs of the improvement requires high-stakes decisions.

As you can see, when a school meets the board’s academic performance expectations, they are left alone to continue to do their good work. If a school is not meeting the board’s academic performance expectations, the school is required [inaudible] demonstrates the school has other measures of improved student performance beyond what can be demonstrated in each of the state’s math and reading assessments. Demonstration documents would discuss curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development in each of the dashboard areas where a school does not meet the board’s expectations.

The demonstration document is reviewed by staff. All information presented is verified during…[unrecorded gap]. If that information is not presented, the board will be, will consider whether the school should be permitted to continue or whether the charter should be considered for revocation.
As you can see, although the contract is for 15 years, there are multiple opportunities for assessment of the performance of a school over the life of the charter. Because there can be changes in the charter holder organization over time, the demonstration process occurs throughout the term of the charter. As we move forward, the expectation is that schools that open strong will remain strong, schools that open with challenges will correct to meet those challenges and proceed to be strong.

One of the reasons that the board has been able to implement its framework with the success that it has, is because the association has been there to support the charter schools in understanding their data and using their data to tell their improvement story when necessary. It goes back to our overlapping missions and the determination to provide quality educational choices for kids.

Let's look at how this plays out. The application process is the authorizer’s tool to ensure that the applicant understands what a quality academic program will look like and is sufficiently qualified to implement such a program. We use curriculum samples, a detailed business plan, and applicant interviews as part of our rigorous application process.
EILEEN SIGMUND:

[unrecorded gap] for their students. In the three years of our charter starter incubation grant, we learned that we needed to narrow our geographic focus to maximize the impact, so several months ago we started a new nonprofit: New Schools for Phoenix. This will continue the work that we started as sort of a proof of concept for the federal grant and continue our incubation work to take it to scale after the federal grand ends this September.

DEANNA ROWE:

Go ahead and do it all.

EILEEN SIGMUND:

Here is our current reality; we have—in the Phoenix urban area—we have 195 schools. This is district schools, this is charter schools. The vast majority [unrecorded gap] qualified for free or reduced-price lunch, and that’s 159 schools. So, of my 88 percent of the students in these high-poverty schools, only 4 percent attend an A-rated school. That is 12 schools; 10 are open-enrollment and two are magnets. So, it’s only 10 open-enrollment, which is our 4 percent. So, this is an enrolled 12,500 low-income students within the boundaries of Phoenix urban core.
Within the district, 83 percent of the students, and the number of K–12 students are 121,331 students, so of this 121,000 students, 83 percent are low-income [unrecorded gap] critical for our talented workforce to boost the economy and civic life. So the theory behind New Schools for Phoenix is that education is greater than poverty, and we will train leaders to open right and have naturalized impact to show that charters are leading student improvement, student attainment.

DEANNA ROWE:

Continuing with the schools that don’t meet the board’s academic performance expectations are put on corrective action plans and required to demonstrate that progress is being made to remain operational. They may demonstrate that progress through their own initiative. They may seek the help of others, and generally we find they turn to the association.

So, we talked about opening right.

EILEEN SIGMUND:

This could significantly impact professional talent. Hiring a team of experienced trainers and researchers who are capable of develop—delivering customized, high-quality, practical, and actionable data and professional development for teachers and leaders.
So, the center, as we discussed, is really looking for student achievement in our charters. Here is our program effectiveness evidence after year one. Let me just explain what you’re looking at. The green that you’re looking at [unrecorded gap] districts and then 66 percent did not improve. This is based on our 2012 standardized testing, here it’s called the AIMS measure, but this is the standardized testing that we do. Charters: 29 percent increased a letter grade or kept their A, where 71 percent did not improve. Now this is [inaudible] to the schools. So, 54 percent in the first year of this three-year program either increased a letter grade or maintained their A. So, this is a 20 percent increase of our [unrecorded gap].

Part Two

EILEEN SIGMUND:

In addition, we provide workshops for those who are required to do performance management plans and demonstration of sufficient progress. We do this because we are the technical assistance arm, and we want our school leaders and teachers to understand their data and what is required for our charter schools to successfully show improved academic [unrecorded gap].
DEANNA ROWE:

The board wants all students to have quality educational options and believes it has an obligation to the families of Arizona to close those schools that don’t provide a learning environment where student achievement is improving.

EILEEN SIGMUND:

So, the association is publishing—in 2013, we began publishing—a series of reports titled “Oh, the Places They’ll Go.” Very Dr. Seussical. So, the first report was released in January during National School Choice week, and this is our first report that was released in January. This shows how well charter [unrecorded gap]...second report was just published last month. This looked at the statistical underpinnings of Arizona’s A through F letter grades and made recommendations so quantitative analysis was fair for all students. And again, we presented this information [unrecorded gap]. These publications are underneath the comment chat period, if you’d like to look at them in further detail.
Next, we have a Google map on our website with all public schools. Ironically, in 2013 we had 2,013 public schools. So, the home page that you’re looking at comes up with less [unrecorded gap] you can then filter by ZIP code, legislative district, school specialty, and then, if you look at, if you were to go to one of the schools, you would see the academic data. You would also see the per-pupil funding, and it's down to, drilled down to the students. This did receive an award from the Arizona Chamber as the Online Tool of the Year.

DEANNA ROWE:

It’s been less than a year since we’ve implemented the academic performance framework that we’ve been building for a very long time, but because we were strategic in its implementation and had the partnership and support for setting themselves up for closure. Given our review schedule, we’ve evaluated about one third of our charters in the last year. A little less than half meet the performance expectations set by the board. However, when you look at those impacted by the new accountability system, we do see improvement. We also see that we have some serious work to do and will continue to implement this new [unrecorded gap].
We provided you with our contact information, so if you have any specific questions that we don’t get to today, we are happy, you’re welcome to e-mail them to us so that we can address you individually, but at this time, we are happy to answer questions that you may have.

EILEEN SIGMUND:

I’ll take some of the first questions. [unrecorded gap] AIMS in Grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 and then 10th grade, and then there’s the Stanford 10 in second grade and ninth grade, so we use that, those standardized testings, to measure growth. You need 5,000 students in one grade taking the same test in order for the Arizona Growth Model to work. Then Paul Darty of our schools, we have the state board of education, which is in statute only. It’s no longer authorized in schools. Districts may authorize schools within their geographic boundaries. Universities may authorize charter schools, and Arizona State University is the [unrecorded gap] authorized charters, and they are not doing that at all.
DEANNA ROWE:

Paul, to your other question regarding whether we have alternative education campuses and if they are assessed at the same level as the traditional school: I didn’t provide it on the slides, but in our academic performance framework, we did adopt a framework for alternative schools. Some of the measures are the same. [unrecorded gap].

EILEEN SIGMUND:

Your question, Daniel, [mumbles something]. Oh, so, just on that chart, Daniel, we only use the standardized testing data, but certainly [unrecorded gap] and that’s internally what we work with our schools on. Yes, we have alternative education assessed, you answered that one. Did you answer Paul’s?

DEANNA ROWE:

I did answer Paul’s. So we’re at, you have procedures for reviewing the progress of students with disabilities in your charter school. How well that school’s special education population is doing comparative to other schools in the state that have a similar demographic. One of the challenges with that, though, is that the scale of the, the spectrum of the [unrecorded gap].

EILEEN SIGMUND:

In January, authorized the Arizona Autism Charter School, which certainly by its name will focus on autistic students but must be open-enrollment.
DEANNA ROWE:

Got a Galileo question; I'll let you answer.

EILEEN SIGMUND:

What is that measurement question?

DEANNA ROWE:

From a perspective of demonstrating, let me start over. If the charter school wasn’t meeting the board's academic performance expectations and was required to submit a corrective action plan or complete a demonstration document. One source of evidence that they may submit if they use it would be their own benchmark [unrecorded gap].

EILEEN SIGMUND:

Yeah, and Danielle, this is Eileen. You’re preaching to the choir to us. I mean, I brought it back to the slide that talks about looking at the data-driven decision making and we asked to have other performance measures in there. However, like we discussed, this is a six-year partnership that took us this long to be a statutory mandate of improving student achievement. So I brought up this report because there’s some recommendations in there, and we are looking around the country. We’re very active nationally. Like I said, I have two Ph.D.’s, former directors of research. We constantly want to be ahead of the curve in achievement.
DEANNA ROWE:

I think it’s important to think about, though, and discuss the challenges of imposing or implementing a consistent evaluation system across schools, and unless that’s going to be funded, you’re really, we limit ourselves only to that data for which we have access to on a statewide level for evaluation and comparability, but certainly will [unrecorded gap] to demonstrate that they are improving and to tell their own story. I think that, while it would be great if there were multiple measures and multiple assessments that we could use, because of our limited resources, it also is beneficial then to allow each of the charters to make their own decisions, and that is part of what [inaudible] story, and that every school should have the opportunity to tell a different version of the story.

EILEEN SIGMUND:

So Paul’s question is, I think it’s a variety of all, depending on where the charter is in its maturity. And so, I think that as I know our charter schools, having gone to many of them in the last six years [unrecorded gap]. This is something we heavily look at, especially with the demographics in Arizona being majority Hispanic for the K–12 population.
TAMMIE KNIGHTS:

Before the webinar, just wondering what your thoughts are about it, and the question is, how can we use quality and accountability measurements to predict if a charter school will not be successful and intervene early before it’s too late? Do you all know if there is research or success with identifying, employing behavioral measurement that are [unrecorded gap].

DEANNA ROWE:

I don’t. I think that it is key, and as we look at the application process in determining whether or not an applicant is sufficiently qualified and their application meets the requirements, it’s what questions are you asking, and how do you get them to talk about what they know and what recent processes and provide additional training and ensure that we give them the tools for the known challenges. There’s still a lot of work that can be done in that area. I mean….
EILEEN SIGMUND:

Opening right on day one is what we want to see, and our process is incredibly time-intensive. It’s a two-year process that we work with our school leaders to open right. We have a list of about 368 people on a list that we know where they are in the process of thinking about opening a charter, or getting a Ph.D. So we’re working from that list for the next, until 2020 to try to cultivate [unrecorded gap] and work with the state charter board. I mean, they’re looking at schools now every five years, and we’re trying to provide the tools and resources for our schools to make sure that [unrecorded gap], and I think so many of our school leaders are continuing to learn.
TAMMIE KNIGHTS:

Thank you. I was just wondering if you guys could talk a little bit more specifically about the way you handle accountability for students as at-risk populations. So, you’re talking about that you do have a [inaudible].

EILEEN SIGMUND:

So, you want our alternative education campus framework. Let me just pull it up.

DEANNA ROWE:

One of the challenges with the alternative population—or we call them our at-risk kids—is, generally speaking, in our state assessment right now, we have a tenth-grade high-stakes pass. Many of the schools that [unrecorded gap] later and having to catch them up. So, within that process, then, we created some additional measures of—no, I got it. Eileen’s helping me, but I’m going to do [unrecorded gap] of those students, and as I pull it up here, one of the things that we did a little bit differently for those students—am I killing time here?—my staff is going “Deanna!”—so, in our academic framework that [unrecorded gap] the alternative framework is included in that document.
TAMMIE KNIGHTS:

Great.

EILEEN SIGMUND:

[unrecorded gap] for the CEO, educational leader and charter schools, yeah, exactly what it does. And we want it to really be a team. We believe this work is incredibly hard, and you need more of a team to move forward.

TAMMIE KNIGHTS:

One other question that came through before the webinar talked about evaluating different [unrecorded gap].

EILEEN SIGMUND:

So, that is, that is, so, my team, I can’t get that down there.

DEANNA ROWE:

What are you trying to do?

EILEEN SIGMUND:

I’m trying to show it. So, my team, my team have worked extensively in district schools, and what we found is that the growth model is for use, is used in both [unrecorded gap] the work we’re doing is applicable across all public schools, and we don’t really see, at least to date, charters are leading on the accountability and districts are buying into what we’re doing and wanting more coaching and professional development [unrecorded gap].
DEANNA ROWE:

Similar demographics of students and how they’re doing comparatively. It isn’t necessarily a district versus charter because many of our charter schools are not community schools but could be commuter schools and/or are brought to [unrecorded gap]

EILEEN SIGMUND:

Concurrent enrollment with charter schools and community colleges and, yes, we absolutely have that. We, there’s a very extensive community college. We have one part of network that’s actually located in our community colleges, working with them, Arizona Agriculture and Equine. We also have others, Gateway, where the charter holder is concurrent enrollment. We have it. It’s good, its success rate, and they’re the ones that come to mind. I can’t tell you every single charter that does it and tell you its success rate. I know that the ones we’ve seen have been very successful.

DEANNA ROWE:

And I think a part of the key to their success and the value of those programs is it does give those high school students who may not have had family exposure, charter schools that Eileen discussed, many of them, their students when they graduate from high school also graduate with a number of credits toward their first degree.

EILEEN SIGMUND:

Which is important, with the expense right now of college.
TAMMIE KNIGHTS:

I think the people are typing in some more questions, but I have one more from before the webinar which is talking about [unrecorded gap] et cetera.

DEANNA ROWE:

We’re not. We’re not. I think that the language arts and the math are those key indicators at this point in time. I think if and as the state is able to expand its assessments, we will do that, but again, it goes back to the consistency in the evaluation of those schools and what data do we have to do that comparison, and at this point in time, the state doesn’t have the resources to go that [unrecorded gap].

EILEEN SIGMUND:

What’s this, in Arizona we’re a right-to-work state, and increasingly, the legislature over the last couple of years has really looked at unions and removed some of the union protection that [inaudible] tenure. So, where are we with our unions? Really, the unions here are not actively lobbying against charters, and where we are is—I mean, I worked with the teachers union to get acceptance of the growth model—and the bigger issue for the teachers union is the teacher evaluation framework, and there have been some other different issues coming up legislatively that I’ve seen other schools authorizing, excuse me, unionizing. So, we’re watching it, but it’s not, it’s just not out, on the west, it’s not a huge issue or one of our threats. But the biggest threat for our charters is certainly the funding, and that continues to be the biggest threat to the expansion of a quality charter movement. Even—I mean, you heard Deanna start out: She has eight people in her office; I have almost triple.
TAMMIE KNIGHTS:

Are there any other questions from our audience? Please feel free to check them in. We have a couple more minutes.

[Pause]

EILEEN SIGMUND:

[unrecorded gap] our statute states that for teacher evaluations 33 to 50 percent of the teacher evaluation must be based on data. Then, the accountability model also uses data, and DeAnna’s looking as we discuss this to see.

DEANNA ROWE:

So, a component of, [unrecorded gap] What's working well for them or what they’re going to do to improve, and one of the things that we’re looking at is the implementation of an aligned curriculum in their daily instruction and how they’re using their assessments and evaluating the data and then making those changes in the classroom. Those are all kind of best-practices things that when we review [unrecorded gap]. Eileen said it isn’t a standardized form that we have to use, but whether or not a school has a process for evaluating their teachers and are they evaluating the things that would lead to or could support that they’re improving people’s achievement. Those are the kinds of things, that’s how it would be used, but it isn’t a requirement.
**EILEEN SIGMUND:**

So, it could be learning [unrecorded gap]. Carpe Diem is one of our [unrecorded gap] early adopters. We also have virtual schools. So, virtual schools started—in Arizona, we had a cap of seven for a long time. That cap was lifted. So, blended learning, virtual schools, we do see that increasing because students’ demand and parent demand is increasing for different options and how will that impact academic performance indicators?

**DEANNA ROWE:**

I think that we’re seeing—in addition to what Eileen was describing in some of our distance learning opportunities—we are seeing some of our school [unrecorded gap]. So, what’s that impact, or how is it impacting academic performance? We don’t know that on a statewide basis—and again, I would defer back to our demonstration documents—so, those schools that are using blended learning and have the data to support it will be able to show [unrecorded gap] potentially remains a secret.
TAMMIE KNIGHTS:

[Pause]

It looks like we have another question or comment coming in—contact information, so I think they are encouraging folks who are interested in their partnership or the tool that they developed to reach out to them.

Great. Any last words from either Eileen or DeAnna?

DEANNA ROWE:

Thanks, everyone, for your time, please let us know.

TAMMIE KNIGHTS:

We’ve got one more question coming in, so we’ll try to get to that and then we’ll close out. A number of your districts are converting to charters. Has the competitive effect of charters had an impact on traditional schools?

EILEEN SIGMUND:

Not yet. [unrecorded gap]
DEANNA ROWE:

Effect on our districts to the extent that they have created some of their own specialized schools and we are seeing some of our district schools express an interest in converting to charter schools this year, but we’re, again, as Eileen said, we’re not, we don’t know yet.

EILEEN SIGMUND:

The reason they’re converting, Paul, is not because of the competitive effect of charters to compete for the students that are leaving districts for charters.

TAMMIE KNIGHTS:

Great. Well, thank you both so much for taking time out of your very busy schedule to share this partnership and tools with us. I would encourage everyone who is still on the phone, have a great rest of your morning or afternoon, depending on where you are.