Credit Enhancement Webinar Series:

Charter Schools Facilities Project Directors Workshop Webinar
About the National Charter School Resource Center

- Funded through the U.S. Department of Education
- Makes accessible high-quality resources to support the charter school sector.

Please visit the National Charter School Resource Center (http://www.charterschoolcenter.gov) for news, resources and information on charter schools.
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Charter Schools Program Logic Model

Theory of Change: Federal funding for new and innovative approaches to schooling will lead to schools that better meet students’ educational needs and result in improved educational attachment outcomes for students.

- Increased percentage of students achieving proficient or above on state assessments
- Increased percentage of students graduating from high school college and/or career ready
- Enhanced public understanding and support for charter schools
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Credit Enhancement Program Logic Model

Purpose: To ensure the success of the Credit Enhancement Program through an improved understanding of the relationship among program resources, planned activities, and the results achieved.
Credit Enhancement Monitoring Protocol

Purpose: To improve the monitoring of grantee compliance, and the evaluation of program risk.

Monitoring: To examine policies, systems, and procedures to ensure compliance with Federal statutes, regulations, Guidance, grant applications, and performance agreements.
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Credit Enhancement Monitoring Protocol

Current Monitoring Includes:

- Review of APR
- Monitoring Calls
- Establishing Performance Agreements
Credit Enhancement Monitoring Protocol

Possible Monitoring Includes:

- Development of Monitoring Plan
  - On-site
  - Remote
- Review of APR
- Quarterly Data Collection
- Monitoring Calls
- Streamlined Performance Agreements Approval
Credit Enhancement Program Dashboard

Purpose: To display clear and accurate Credit Enhancement grantee data

Categories
- Grant Award Information
- Brief Description
- Schools by Fiscal Year
- Amount Leveraged
- Directly Credit Enhanced
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Credit Enhancement Program Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECT GRANT</th>
<th>8354A020015</th>
<th>Over a five-year period, the Grantee will recycle its Grant to assist 24 schools and leverage $173 million in financing for an estimated 16.1 leverage ratio. Schools benefit from the Grantee’s credit enhancement program by increased lender participation in charter school facility financing transactions and, where possible, securing better terms and rates for these transactions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grantee</strong></td>
<td>America’s Charter/Building Hope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Award Year</strong></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Award Amount</strong></td>
<td>$4,962,499.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Area</strong></td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Schools by Fiscal Year** | **Amount Leveraged & Directly Credit Enhanced** |
|---|---|---|
| **Year** | **New Schools** | **Repeat Schools** | **Total Schools** | **Year** | **Leveraged** | **Directly Credit Enhanced** |
| FY2003 | 2 | 0 | 2 | FY2003 | $10,799,000 | $6,390,000 |
| FY2004 | 4 | 0 | 4 | FY2004 | $27,227,000 | $12,113,600 |
| FY2005 | 3 | 0 | 3 | FY2005 | $30,742,000 | $18,600,000 |
| FY2006 | 4 | 0 | 4 | FY2006 | $20,056,350 | $14,619,850 |
| FY2007 | 3 | 0 | 3 | FY2007 | $26,215,639 | $17,515,639 |
| FY2008 | 5 | 0 | 5 | FY2008 | $37,997,110 | $8,761,110 |
| FY2009 | 9 | 0 | 9 | FY2009 | $151,996,836 | $31,045,671 |
| FY2010 | 4 | 0 | 4 | FY2010 | $26,456,023 | $17,705,023 |
| FY2011 | 4 | 0 | 4 | FY2011 | $21,563,372 | $10,365,000 |
| FY2012 | 3 | 0 | 3 | FY2012 | $27,983,435 | $20,570,000 |
| FY2013 | 2 | 0 | 2 | FY2013 | $20,901,874 | $10,392,000 |
| **Total** | 43 | 0 | 43 | **Total** | $401,937,639 | $167,877,893 |
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Credit Enhancement Program Dashboard

Number of Schools by Fiscal Year

- New Schools
- Repeat Schools
- Total Schools
Credit Enhancement Program Dashboard

Amount Leveraged & Directly Credit Enhanced by FY

Dollars (in millions)


Leveraged Directly Credit Enhanced
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Overview of the Analysis of the CE Data

- Number of CE transactions, schools, and students
- Number of schools by grantee and state
- Instructional level
- Geographic locale
- School enrollment by grantee and state
- Student demographic characteristics
- Math and reading proficiency rates by grantee and state
CE Transactions, Schools, and Students

- 855 transactions since 2001
- 671 unique schools since 2001
- 461 unique schools open in 2012-13
- 221,849 students enrolled in 2012-13
Number of CE Schools Open in 2012-13, by Grantee

- Charter Schools Development Corporation: 78
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation: 52
- Texas Public Finance Authority: 46
- Self-Help: 45
- NCB Capital Impact: 41
- Raza Development Fund: 34
- America's Charter/Building Hope: 28
- The Reinvestment Fund: 22
- California Charter School Association: 21
- Community Loan Fund of New Jersey, Inc: 14
- Michigan Finance Authority: 14
- MassDevelopment: 14
- Low Income Investment Fund: 12
- Housing Partnership Network: 10
- IFF: 9
- KIPP: 8
- DC State Education Office: 7
- Civic Builders: 2
- Charter Schools Development Corporation/IN: 2
- California School Finance Authority: 2
Number of CE Schools Open in 2012-13, by State

- Texas: 70
- California: 68
- District of Columbia: 32
- Massachusetts: 27
- North Carolina: 26
- New York: 26
- New Jersey: 24
- Arizona: 23
- Pennsylvania: 21
- Michigan: 19
- Florida: 17
- Minnesota: 16
- Indiana: 15
- Colorado: 15
- Ohio: 12
- Maryland: 6
- Illinois: 6
- Missouri: 5
- Louisiana: 5
- Arkansas: 5
- Georgia: 4

The following states had 1-2 open CE schools: Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and Wyoming.
Instructional Level of the CE Schools Open in 2012-13

- Primary Schools: 193
- Middle Schools: 78
- High Schools: 77
- Other: 113
Geographic Locale of the CE Schools Open in 2012-13

- **City**: 338 schools
- **Suburb**: 93 schools
- **Town**: 15 schools
- **Rural**: 15 schools
Number of Students Enrolled in CE Schools in 2012-13, by Grantee

- Charter Schools Development Corporation: 30,297
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation: 29,276
- Self-Help: 21,884
- Texas Public Finance Authority: 21,315
- NCB Capital Impact: 17,568
- America’s Charter/Building Hope: 14,124
- Raza Development Fund: 13,556
- IFF: 11,832
- The Reinvestment Fund: 11,491
- California Charter School Association: 9,706
- Michigan Finance Authority: 8,275
- MassDevelopment: 7,700
- Community Loan Fund of New Jersey, Inc: 5,850
- Low Income Investment Fund: 5,151
- KIPP: 4,529
- Housing Partnership Network: 3,743
- DC State Education Office: 2,091
- Civic Builders: 1,058
- Charter Schools Development Corporation/IN: 915
- California School Finance Authority: 884
Number of Students Enrolled in CE Schools in 2012-13, by State

- Texas: 35,106
- California: 32,149
- Illinois: 16,360
- New Jersey: 12,736
- Pennsylvania: 12,693
- Massachusetts: 12,552
- North Carolina: 12,364
- New York: 12,313
- District of Columbia: 11,156
- Michigan: 11,126
- Indiana: 9,671
- Arizona: 7,262
- Colorado: 7,025
- Florida: 6,188
- Ohio: 4,504
- Minnesota: 4,327
- Maryland: 1,998
- Missouri: 1,887
- Georgia: 1,458
- Louisiana: 1,360
- Idaho: 1,322
- Arkansas: 1,211
- Hawaii: 894
- Tennessee: 888

The following states had less than 600 students: Delaware, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, and Wyoming.
Free and Reduced-Price Lunch Students in CE Schools in 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-19.9%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39.9%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59.9%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79.9%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100%</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Free and Reduced-Price Lunch Students in CE Schools in 2012-13, by Grantee

- California School Finance Authority: 95%
- Civic Builders: 87%
- IFF: 87%
- Low Income Investment Fund: 86%
- California Charter School Association: 86%
- KIPP: 85%
- Housing Partnership Network: 84%
- DC State Education Office: 84%
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation: 82%
- Charter Schools Development Corporation/IN: 78%
- Raza Development Fund: 77%
- Michigan Finance Authority: 77%
- NCB Capital Impact: 74%
- The Reinvestment Fund: 73%
- America's Charter/Building Hope: 73%
- Community Loan Fund of New Jersey, Inc: 70%
- Texas Public Finance Authority: 63%
- Self-Help: 63%
- Charter Schools Development Corporation: 48%
- MassDevelopment: 42%
Race/Ethnicity of Students in CE Schools in 2012-13

- American Indian / Alaska Native: 0.4%
- Asian: 3.6%
- Hispanic / Latino: 38.3%
- Black / African American: 37.7%
- White: 17.4%
- Hawaiian Native / Pacific Islander: 0.2%
- Two or More Races: 2.2%
Math Proficiency Rate Differences in 2012-13 between CE Schools and All Schools, by State

- Rhode Island: 22%
- South Carolina: 20%
- Nevada: 14%
- District of Columbia: 10%
- Idaho: 10%
- Arizona: 9%
- Georgia: 8%
- Missouri: 4%
- Massachusetts: 2%
- Texas: 1%
- Florida: 0.03%
Math Proficiency Rate Differences in 2012-13 between CE Schools and All Schools, by State
Math Proficiency Rates in CE Schools in 2012-13, by Grantee

- Charter Schools Development Corporation/IN: 81%
- Texas Public Finance Authority: 79%
- KIPP: 75%
- DC State Education Office: 74%
- Community Loan Fund of New Jersey, Inc: 73%
- America’s Charter/Building Hope: 65%
- MassDevelopment: 62%
- California School Finance Authority: 62%
- IFF: 61%
- Raza Development Fund: 61%
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation: 60%
- The Reinvestment Fund: 59%
- Charter Schools Development Corporation: 59%
- NCB Capital Impact: 56%
- Self-Help: 55%
- Housing Partnership Network: 51%
- California Charter School Association: 50%
- Low Income Investment Fund: 48%
- Civic Builders: 30%
- Michigan Finance Authority: 20%
Reading Proficiency Rate Differences in 2012-13 between CE Schools and All Schools, by State

- South Carolina: 19%
- Nevada: 10%
- Rhode Island: 6%
- District of Columbia: 6%
- Idaho: 6%
- Arizona: 6%
- New Mexico: 5%
- Texas: 5%
- Georgia: 5%
- Massachusetts: 4%
- Hawaii: 2%
- North Carolina: 1%
- Arkansas: 0.2%

Proficiency Rate Difference
Reading Proficiency Rate Differences in 2012-13 between CE Schools and All Schools, by State

- Florida: -1%
- Virginia: -2%
- Wyoming: -4%
- California: -5%
- Colorado: -6%
- Missouri: -6%
- Maryland: -7%
- Oregon: -7%
- Louisiana: -8%
- Utah: -9%
- New Jersey: -9%
- Pennsylvania: -10%
- Indiana: -10%
- Illinois: -11%
- Ohio: -12%
- New York: -13%
- Michigan: -15%
- Tennessee: -17%
- Delaware: -18%
- Minnesota: -20%

Proficiency Rate Difference
Reading Proficiency Rates in CE Schools in 2012-13, by Grantee

- Texas Public Finance Authority: 84%
- Charter Schools Development Corporation/IN: 81%
- MassDevelopment: 74%
- KIPP: 68%
- Charter Schools Development Corporation: 66%
- America’s Charter/Building Hope: 66%
- DC State Education Office: 66%
- Community Loan Fund of New Jersey, Inc: 65%
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation: 61%
- Self-Help: 60%
- Raza Development Fund: 59%
- The Reinvestment Fund: 57%
- California School Finance Authority: 56%
- NCB Capital Impact: 56%
- IFF: 54%
- Michigan Finance Authority: 49%
- California Charter School Association: 48%
- Housing Partnership Network: 45%
- Low Income Investment Fund: 40%
- Civic Builders: 25%
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Update on Feasibility Report

A feasibility report has been commissioned to answer these questions:

- How could the lag time between transaction closing and public awareness of a transaction be shortened?
- How could the annual reporting process be made simpler and more frequent to aid in the shortening process?
- What value-added features or content could be offered as part of the process of building a new reporting tool?
Update on Feasibility Report

The *methodology* for the creation of this report is:

- Telephone interviews with select CE grantees
- Webinar polls of all CE grantees (today)
- Review of annual reports from CE grantees
- Reference to source documentation about the CE program
Poll Question

How often does your organization refer a school to another CDFI?

- Less than once per year
- Once per year to once per month
- Once per month to once per week
- More than once per week
Discussion of Poll Responses

How often does your organization refer a school to another CDFI?

- Interview results suggest that:
  - There is no efficient central database for schools to use
  - Larger CDFIs create reports for school use
  - Smaller CDFIs offer recommendations
Poll Question

Approximately how many person-hours does it take for your organization to prepare the annual report required by the Department of Education?

- 0 to 40 hours (zero to one person-week)
- 40 to 80 hours (one to two person-weeks)
- 80 to 160 hours (two to four person-weeks)
- 160 to 320 hours (four to eight person-weeks)
- More than 320 hours
- Unsure
Discussion of Poll Responses

Approximately how many person-hours does it take for your organization to prepare the annual report required by the Department of Education?

- Interview results suggest that:
  - Larger CDFIs require 160 or more hours
  - Smaller CDFIs require 80 to 160 hours
Poll Question

Which of the following is an opportunity for your organization?

- Online searchable database of closed CE transactions
- Online searchable database of CDFIs
- Content that informs schools about the CE process
- A match.com-style exchange for schools and CDFIs
- Other
Discussion of Poll Responses

Which of the following is an opportunity for your organization?

- Interview results suggest that there is the most interest in:
  - A match.com-style exchange for schools and CDFIs
  - Content that informs schools about the CE process
  - Online searchable database of CDFIs
  - Online searchable database of closed CE transactions
  - Other
Poll Question: Select all that apply.

If your organization had to submit both real-time and annual reports, which APR data would be most easily submitted in real time?

- CDFI financial records
- CDFI audit statement
- CDFI effectiveness evaluation
- CDFI activity description
- Description of charter school
- Description of partner financial institutions
Discussion of Poll Responses

If your organization had to submit both real-time and annual reports, which APR data would be most easily submitted in real time?

- Interview responses suggest:
  - Simplified APR is a necessary for real-time reporting
  - Outside information is harder to obtain
Next Steps

- Finish CE grantee interviews by phone
- Finalize and submit the feasibility report
- Optionally, create a specification for a match.com-style exchange

*We look forward to working together!*
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CEPD Workshop Overview

Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities Project Directors Workshop
May 6th and 7th
Ceaser Chavez Building
1244 Speer Boulevard
RM 221
Denver, CO 80204
## CE PD Workshop Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am – 12:30 pm</td>
<td>Optional: Boot Camp / One-on-One Meetings</td>
<td>15 minutes per grantee (please request meeting in your reservation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 pm – 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Optional: Break / Lunch on your own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 6th (Optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm – 1:30 pm</td>
<td>Sign-In</td>
<td>The attendees need to sign in and show a driver’s license or other form of government ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 pm – 2:00 pm</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm – 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Grantee Program Introductions and Presentations</td>
<td>Please be prepared to present items to share on your project, some of which could include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 5 minutes per grantee</td>
<td>- Number of grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Types and structure of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Recent transaction volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Dollars leveraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Amount of credit enhancement available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Anything new or novel that is innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Any new senior lending sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Any challenges they are dealing with lending to charter schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Burning issues that are interested in discussing with the fellow grantees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CE PD Workshop Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am – 8:15 am</td>
<td>Sign-In</td>
<td>The attendees need to sign in and show a driver’s license or other form of government ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 am – 9:45 am</td>
<td>Working Session 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 am – 10:00 am</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am – 11:00 am</td>
<td>Working Group Feedback Session 1</td>
<td>10- to 12-minute share-out and Q &amp; A per working group topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am – 12:00 pm</td>
<td>Working Lunch</td>
<td>Brenna Copeland Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 pm – 12:10 pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10 pm – 1:40 pm</td>
<td>Working Group Session 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40 pm – 1:50 pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50 pm – 2:50 pm</td>
<td>Working Group Feedback Session 2</td>
<td>10- to 12-minute share-out and Q &amp; A per working group topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:50 pm – 3:00 pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm – 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CE PD Workshop Overview
Working Group Session 1

During this session participants are expected to work together, along with the group facilitator, to discuss and respond to the working group topic and guiding questions. The participants should be aware of the topics from the pre-workshop webinar.

The expectation is for the group to be able to develop at least one SMART goal by the end of the session.

- Specific
- Measurable
- Ambitious
- Reachable
- Time-bounded
Each working group will get 10-12 minutes to share out and conduct a Q & A with the entire cohort of grantees about what they accomplished in the working group.

The purpose of this feedback session is to allow all grantees to offer input on topics even if they were not able to participate in that actual group.
Once each of the groups has the opportunity to complete Working Group Session 1 and Working Group Feedback Session 1, the participants will convene into working groups again to begin the process of action planning.

Action planning is a process which helps to focus ideas and to decide what steps need to be in place to achieve the goals. The action planning will involve:

1. Identify measurable objectives.
2. Prioritizing the tasks effectively.
3. Identifying the steps needed to achieve the goal.
4. Completing work to a deadline.
Each working group will get 10-12 minutes to share out and conduct a Q & A with the entire cohort of grantees about what they accomplished in the working group.

The purpose of this feedback block is to allow all grantees to offer input on a particular action plan if they were not able to participate in that actual group.
In order to move forward with charter school driven educational reforms designed to increase access to high-quality instruction for all students, charter school are expected to maintain accountability in their performance. During the initial implementations of the Credit Enhancement grants, academic performance evaluation was difficult for numerous reasons, and over the past few years many States have received waivers for specific requirements of the NCLB adding complexity to academic evaluation.

This working group will engage in a discussion on the use of Credit Enhancement supporting high-quality charter schools determined by academic performance.
Responsible for oversight, charter school boards have a direct impact on the capacity of charter schools to fulfill their mission, and act as stewards of the public’s interest. Key staff positions such as the, Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Academic Officer, and Senior Operations Staff, are crucial in operating a successful charter school and ensuring the school has a strategic operating plan that clearly defines measurable indicators, metrics, and targets for the school’s non-academic performance.

This working group will explore the role of governing boards and operational staff in developing and executing charter schools’ strategic operating plans to ensure progress toward its goals.
There are various and numerous opportunities for Credit Enhancement grant recipients to engage in collaborations and to expand the amount of capital to meet the facilities financing needs of various types of charter school operators (freestanding, independent charter schools –seasoned and unseasoned, emerging/evolving CMOs, established CMOs, etc.).

This working group will engage in discussion on the scope of Credit Enhancement grantees’ collaborative relationships and possible new collaboration opportunities.
Credit Enhancement grantees have expressed a need for access to real time sources of information to increase the understanding of the impact of their Credit Enhancement portfolio. The Department is also trying to address a need to streamline the facility financing data collection and reporting processes.

This working group will explore strategies and innovations that support the seamless collection and organization of real time information which can be used to drive grantee decision making, as well as, evaluation and performance measurement efforts.
Over the past year, several Credit Enhancement grantees have informed the Department of risk to their Credit Enhancement portfolio due to schools’ inability to service debt, refinance debt, or meet authorizer renewal criteria.

This working group will explore several aspects of risk management that have proven helpful in reducing risk to grantee’s Credit Enhancement portfolios, while serving the greatest need charter schools.
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Questions &
Closing Comments
Thank you for joining us!

Contact
Lydia.musher@safalpartners.com
jnakamo@wested.org

Visit
charterschoolcenter.ed.gov

Subscribe
tinyurl.com/ncsrc-subscribe

Follow
twitter.com/safalpartners