



NATIONAL  
CHARTER SCHOOL  
RESOURCE CENTER

# High-Quality Charter Authorizing Policy Profiles: District of Columbia

U.S. Department of Education  
August 2021



NATIONAL  
CHARTER SCHOOL  
RESOURCE CENTER

The National Charter School Resource Center (NCSRC) provides technical assistance to Federal grantees and resources supporting charter sector stakeholders. NCSRC is funded by the U.S. Department of Education and managed by Manhattan Strategy Group in partnership with WestEd.

NCSRC acknowledges the major contributions of Lauren Outlaw and Robin Chait in the development of this profile.

NCSRC would like to thank Charter School Programs State Entity grantee representatives for their reviews and feedback on their respective State's profile.

Suggested citation: National Charter School Resource Center (2021). *High-Quality Charter Authorizing Policy Profiles: District of Columbia*. Bethesda, MD: Manhattan Strategy Group.

This publication was produced in whole or in part with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under contract number GS10FO201T. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the Federal government.

# District of Columbia: Overview of State Law and Snapshot of Quality Authorizing Practices

---

## Introduction and Methodology

The National Charter School Resource Center (NCSRC) created the [Policy Framework for High-Quality Charter Authorizing Practices \(Framework\)](#) as a tool for assessing a State policy environment's support for high-quality authorizing practices. The Framework is based on a review of high-quality authorizing practices referenced in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and literature by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) and the National Alliance of Public Charter Schools (Alliance).<sup>1</sup> NCSRC staff used this review to identify common themes or categories of policies that are essential to State support for high-quality authorizing and incorporated them into the Framework.

NCSRC then created High-Quality Charter Authorizing Policy Profiles (State Authorizing Profiles) that describe states' authorizing policy contexts based on the Framework. As of winter 2020, NCSRC staff created 19 profiles for the States that were awarded Charter School Programs (CSP) State Entities grants between FY2017 and FY2019:

- Alabama
- Arizona
- Arkansas
- Colorado
- Delaware
- Idaho
- Indiana
- Maryland
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Mississippi
- New Mexico
- New York
- North Carolina
- Oklahoma
- Rhode Island
- Texas
- Washington
- Wisconsin

NCSRC created eight additional profiles in the summer of 2021 for the seven states that were awarded CSP State Entities grants in FY 2020 and for New Hampshire:<sup>1</sup>

- California
- District of Columbia
- Florida
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- Nevada
- Pennsylvania
- South Carolina

---

<sup>1</sup> New Hampshire was a 2019 grantee, but because of a delay in accepting grant funds, we created the profile in 2020. Also, Texas was a 2020 grantee, but we had already created its profile since it was a 2017 grantee, as well.

CSP State Entity (SE) Grants provide funding for state entities to support eligible applicants in planning and preparation for the opening of new charter schools and the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools. Grant funds must also be used by the state entity to provide technical assistance to eligible applicants and to improve the quality of authorizing.

More State Authorizing Profiles may be added in the future. In addition, NCSRC may publish updated versions of State Authorizing Profiles to reflect changes in state policy.

The State Authorizing Profiles are intended to be used by state policymakers and practitioners to learn about their own authorizing policy environments and those of their peers. They may also be useful to charter school support organizations and charter management organizations that want to learn about different states' policy contexts.

Each state profile includes (1) a Framework Snapshot, which is an assessment of a state's authorizing practices using the Framework described in the first paragraph above and (2) a more detailed description of the state context for each practice. The basis for the state profiles was a review of the charter law and significant state policies for applicable states. Significant state policies included those issued by the state education agency and/or state board of education. NCSRC used this review to identify whether the authorizing practices specified in the Framework were present in state law or policy. That is, boxes that were checked in the Framework Snapshot indicated that particular aspects of an authorizing practice(s) were included in state law or policy.

The State Authorizing Profiles provide a foundation for understanding authorizing practices in the state. The profiles are not an exhaustive review of the state's authorizing policies and practices; they are intended to describe the key elements of the state's policy context for supporting high-quality authorizing practices. Therefore, it is possible that certain state policies are not reflected in the profiles and that individual authorizers within a state are implementing other practices, as well. In addition, the review does not assess the quality of implementation of the policies; it is possible that state policy or statute articulates a quality practice that authorizers do not implement with fidelity.

Finally, state policy is one strategy for advancing high-quality authorizing practices and is the focus of these profiles. However, there are other strategies and sources of support, including technical assistance and resources provided by state, regional, and local charter support associations. While this report does not address those other strategies, it provides a narrative of the policy context in which authorizers operate. We articulate this context to support authorizers and authorizer support organizations in understanding how to implement quality authorizing practices in their states.

## Overview of State Law

The United States Congress passed the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995, DC’s charter school law, and it has been amended several times since its passage.<sup>ii</sup> This law permits the creation of new charter schools and the conversion of traditional public schools to charter schools.<sup>iii</sup> The law defines an eligible applicant for a charter as “a person, including a private, public, or quasi-public entity, or an institution of higher education.”<sup>iv</sup> The law also established the Public Charter School Board (PCSB), which is an independent government agency and currently the only authorizer in the district.<sup>v</sup> The DC Council passed the Student Fair Access to School Amendment Act in 2018, which changed student discipline processes for charter schools in the district (including discipline definitions and discipline data reporting requirements).<sup>vi</sup>

# State Authorizing Profile: District of Columbia

## Framework Snapshot<sup>2</sup>

### **Authorization**

- Does not cap charter school growth
- Provides for more than one authorizing pathway

*Application includes the following:*

- Specific application criteria
- Timelines
- Evaluation review process
- Process for denied applications

*Performance-based contract includes and provides for the following:*

- Separate post-application agreement
- Rights and responsibilities of authorizer and school
- Academic, financial, and operational performance expectations for schools
- Initial term of not more than five years
- Fiscal, legal, and programmatic autonomy for schools
- Independent charter school governing boards

### **Performance Monitoring**

- Provides for annual authorizer evaluation of schools based on the performance goals and expectations set forth in performance-based contract
- Establishes a comprehensive accountability/monitoring system that includes performance expectations and compliance requirements
- Minimizes schools' administrative and reporting burden
- Articulates authorizer action for schools that fail to meet performance expectations (e.g., probation, sanction, or turnaround)

### **Renewal/Revocation**

- Establishes a clear renewal process and decision-making criteria
- Requires that decisions to renew/revoke be based on student academic achievement
- Requires clear school closure procedures (e.g., parent notification, student enrollment, student record transfer, and disposition of assets)

### **Authorizer Accountability**

- Provides for a registration process for eligible authorizing entities
- Requires the State entity to review authorizers' performance
- Requires authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing

### **Authorizer Leadership, Student Access, and Student Services**

- Requires a mission or strategic vision for authorizing
- Promotes quality authorizing by requiring technical assistance or professional development for authorizers and/or charter school applicants
- Ensures equitable access to all students
- Requires appropriate services for educationally disadvantaged students (e.g., students with special needs, English learners, students in foster care, or unaccompanied homeless youth)

### **Authorizer Funding**

- Provides a mechanism for guaranteed access to authorizer funding
- Includes a process for holding authorizers accountable for how funding is used

**Source(s):** DC Code § 38–1800.01, et seq.

<sup>2</sup> As noted in the Introduction and Methodology, boxes checked in the framework snapshot indicate that aspects of an authorizing practice were included in state law or policy. If individual authorizers create and follow a certain policy that is not in state statute or policy, then the box will not be checked for the entire state.

## Authorization

- ☒ Does not cap charter school growth
- ☒ Provides for more than one authorizing pathway

### Does not cap charter school growth

DC law limits charter school growth to 10 schools per year per authorizer. If one authorizer does not reach 10 approvals by the end of the year, other authorizers can then approve additional applications up to a total of 20 applications per year approved by all authorizers.<sup>vii</sup> However, charter schools are considered a local education agency (LEA) under many provisions of DC law and can operate multiple campuses if permitted by the authorizer; there is no limit on the number of campuses a charter LEA can operate, with authorizer approval.

### Provides for more than one authorizing pathway

The law defines an eligible chartering authority as “the Board of Education; the Public Charter School Board; or any one entity designated as an eligible chartering authority by enactment of a bill by the District of Columbia Council after April 26, 1996.”<sup>viii</sup> The DC Council passed the Public Education Reform Amendment Act of 2007, which transferred all functions and authority of the Board of Education to the mayor and established a new State Board of Education.<sup>ix</sup> The State Board of Education does not have chartering authority. PCSB has assumed authority of all charter schools, and though the DC Council can appoint other authorizers, it has not yet done so.<sup>x</sup>

*Application includes the following:*

- ☒ Specific application criteria
- ☒ Timelines
- ☒ Evaluation review process
- ☒ Process for denied applications

### Specific application criteria

The DC charter school law requires various application criteria, including a statement defining the mission and goals; how the school will conduct any districtwide assessments; proposed instructional goals and methods; a description of the plan for evaluating student academic achievement at the proposed school and the procedures for remedial action that will be used by the school when the academic achievement of a student falls below the expectations of the school; and an operating budget for the first two years.<sup>xi</sup> PCSB also provides application guidance on its website.<sup>xii</sup>

### Timelines

The law also includes timelines related to the application and approval process. For example, the application approval period can commence before or after January 1 and terminates on April 1 each year.<sup>xiii</sup> In addition, the authorizer must hold a public hearing within 45 days after the application is submitted and must issue its decision to approve/deny the application within 45 days after the public hearing.<sup>xiv</sup> The law also enables the authorizer and applicant to mutually agree to extend this deadline by no more than 30 days.<sup>xv</sup> Lastly, the law requires the authorizer

to provide written notice of approval, including a copy of the approved petition and any conditions or requirements, within 10 days after approving the application.<sup>xvi</sup>

### Evaluation review process

DC law prescribes an evaluation process for charter school applications. Authorizers are charged with determining whether a school’s application conforms with the legal application requirements, including whether the school has the ability to meet the educational objectives outlined in the application.<sup>xvii</sup> The law also permits the authorizer to approve applications with conditions, and PCSB’s Charter Application Guidelines include a section titled Standard Conditions of Approval that explains these conditions.<sup>xvii, xviii</sup>

### Process for denied applications

When the authorizer denies an application, it must provide the reasons for its decision in writing and include how the applicant can revise the application to satisfy the requirements for approval, if the authorizer deems it appropriate.<sup>xix</sup> Denied applications can also be appealed to the Office of the State Superintendent of Education or to DC Superior Court.<sup>xx</sup>

*Performance-based contract includes and provides for the following:*

- Separate post-application agreement
- Rights and responsibilities of authorizer and school
- Academic, financial, and operational performance expectations for schools
- Initial term of not more than five years
- Fiscal, legal, and programmatic autonomy for schools
- Independent charter school governing boards

### A separate post-application agreement

In DC, a separate post-application agreement must include the following specific information from the application: (1) a statement defining the mission and goals of the proposed school and the manner in which the school will conduct any districtwide assessments; (2) a description of the proposed rules and policies for governance and operation of the proposed school; (3) copies of the proposed articles of incorporation and bylaws of the proposed school, which shall include provisions governing the distribution of the corporation’s assets upon dissolution; (4) a description of the procedures the proposed school plans to follow to ensure the health and safety of students, employees, and guests of the school and to comply with applicable health and safety laws and all applicable civil rights statutes and regulations of the federal government and the District of Columbia; (5) an assurance the proposed school will seek, obtain, and maintain accreditation; and (6) an explanation of the relationship that will exist between the public charter school and the school’s employees.<sup>xxi</sup> The agreement must also include any conditions or amendments required by the authorizer, and PCSB has outlined standard conditions that must be included in the contract.<sup>xxii, xxiii</sup>

### Rights and responsibilities of authorizer and school

State law does not expressly require that charter school agreements include the rights and responsibilities of the authorizer. As noted above, the agreement must include the rights and responsibilities of the charter school. The charter agreements posted on PCSB’s website, however, do specify the rights and responsibilities of both the authorizer and the school.<sup>xxiv</sup>



## Academic, financial, and operational performance expectations for schools

Under DC law, the charter must include academic and operational performance expectations for the schools. Specifically, it must include the following:

- “A statement defining the mission and goals of the proposed school and the manner in which the school will conduct any districtwide assessments;”<sup>xxv</sup> and
- “A description of the proposed rules and policies for governance and operation of the proposed school.”<sup>xxvi</sup>

In addition, the charter agreements posted on PCSB’s website must include goals for academic achievement, operational expectations, and expectations for financial management.<sup>xxvii</sup>

## An initial term of not more than five years

Under DC law, a charter school’s initial term is for 15 years.<sup>xxviii</sup> However, state law also requires a five-year review of charter schools that could lead to revocation of a school’s charter.<sup>xxix</sup>

## Fiscal, legal, and programmatic autonomy for schools

DC law affords charter schools fiscal, legal, and programmatic autonomy. For example, the school is responsible for the school’s operation, including budget preparation and personnel matters, and has the right to sue or be sued, acquire property, and receive and disburse funds.<sup>xxx</sup>

## Independent charter school governing boards

As stated above, the law grants charter school governing boards the authority to oversee the school’s operations, including preparation of budget and personnel matters.<sup>xxxi</sup> The charter agreement is also executed by the authorizer and the school’s governing board.

## Performance Monitoring

- Provides for annual authorizer evaluation of schools based on the performance goals and expectations set forth in performance-based contract
- Establishes a comprehensive accountability/monitoring system that includes performance expectations and compliance requirements
- Minimizes schools’ administrative and reporting burden
- Articulates authorizer action for schools that fail to meet performance expectations (e.g., probation, sanction, or turnaround)

## Provides for annual authorizer evaluation of schools based on the performance goals and expectations set forth in performance-based contract

The law requires that charter school applications include a “description of the method for conducting annual audits of the financial, administrative, and programmatic operations of the school.”<sup>xxxii</sup> The law also requires schools to submit an annual report to the authorizer with information such as “the extent to which the school is meeting its mission and goals as stated in the petition for the charter school [and] student performance on any districtwide assessments.”<sup>xxxiii</sup>

## **Establishes a comprehensive accountability/monitoring system that includes performance expectations and compliance requirements**

Under DC law, authorizers are required to (1) monitor charter school operations and the school's progress meeting student academic achievement expectations and (2) ensure schools comply with applicable laws, the provisions in their charter, and the annual reporting requirements.<sup>xxxiv</sup> PCSB also includes information on its charter school performance frameworks on its website.<sup>xxxv</sup>

## **Minimizes schools' administrative and reporting burden**

Neither state law nor policy mentions minimizing schools' administrative and reporting burden.

## **Articulates authorizer action for schools that fail to meet performance expectations (e.g., probation, sanction, or turnaround)**

The law allows authorizers to place schools on probation and/or require the school to take remedial actions during the renewal process (see below for additional details).<sup>xxxvi</sup>

## **Renewal/Revocation**

- ☒ Establishes a clear renewal process and decision-making criteria
- ☒ Requires that decisions to renew/revoke be based on student academic achievement
- ☒ Requires clear school closure procedures (e.g., parent notification, student enrollment, student record transfer, and disposition of assets)

## **Establishes a clear renewal process and decision-making criteria**

DC statute establishes a renewal process and decision-making criteria. The law requires a school's governing board to file a renewal application with the authorizer "not later than 120 days nor earlier than 365 days before the expiration of the charter."<sup>xxxvii</sup> In addition, the application must include the following components: (1) a report describing the school's progress in achieving its goals, student academic achievement expectations, and any other terms in its charter; (2) all audited financial statements for the four preceding years; and (3) the articles of incorporation and bylaws for the nonprofit corporation operating the school.<sup>xxxviii</sup>

The authorizer shall approve a school's renewal application unless it determines that the school (1) committed a material violation of applicable laws or its charter (including violations relating to the education of children with disabilities) or (2) failed to meet its goals and student academic achievement expectations. The authorizer is required by law to issue its final decision in writing within either 30 days after providing written notice of the right to a hearing (if a hearing is not held) or within 30 days after the hearing (if a hearing is held).<sup>xxxix</sup> The law also provides alternatives upon nonrenewal which include the authorizer managing the school directly, placing the school in probationary status that requires the school to take remedial actions, and imposing interim conditions.<sup>xl</sup> Decisions to not renew a school's charter are also subject to "judicial review by an appropriate court of the District of Columbia."<sup>xli</sup>

## **Requires that decisions to renew/revoke be based on student academic achievement**

As noted above, one of the reasons for which an authorizer can decide to revoke or not to renew a school's charter is the school's failure to meet the student academic achievement expectations in its charter.<sup>xlii</sup>

## Requires clear school closure procedures

As identified in the separate post-application agreement section above, charter applications must include a statement on dissolution of assets upon closure.<sup>xliii</sup> Upon closure, the authorizer will arrange for the transfer and storage of necessary student records in the possession of the charter school.<sup>xliiv</sup> In addition, the Office of the State Superintendent of Education has a state-level policy for charter school closure.<sup>xliv</sup>

## Authorizer Accountability

- Provides for a registration process for eligible authorizing entities
- Requires the State entity to review authorizers' performance
- Requires authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing

### Provides for a registration process for eligible authorizing entities

While PCSB is the only eligible authorizing entity, the law does permit the DC Council to designate another authorizing entity (though it has not yet done so). The law does not, however, specify a registration process for eligible authorizing entities.

### Requires the state entity to review authorizers' performance

Under DC law, the authorizer must submit a report to the mayor, the District of Columbia Council, the Board of Education, and the secretary of education by July 30 of each year.<sup>xlvi</sup> The report must include elements such as data on the performance and compliance of charter schools, and other authorizer activities such as new school and renewal application decisions.<sup>xlvii</sup>

### Requires authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing

Though DC law does not require authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing, PCSB has worked extensively with National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA).<sup>xlviii</sup>

## Authorizer Leadership, Student Access, and Student Services

- Requires a mission or strategic vision for authorizing
- Promotes quality authorizing by requiring technical assistance or professional development for authorizers and/or charter school applicants
- Ensures equitable access to all students
- Requires appropriate services for educationally disadvantaged students (e.g., students with special needs, English learners, students in foster care, or unaccompanied homeless youth)

### Requires a mission or strategic vision for authorizing

Though DC law does not require authorizers to have a mission or strategic vision for authorizing, PCSB provides both on its website. PCSB's mission is "DC public charter schools are environments where all students, especially those in historically marginalized groups, thrive. As DC's charter authorizer, we:

- Approve monitor and evaluate schools, with an emphasis on equity and academic excellence
- Create policies and conditions to empower educators to do their best work in service of students

- Actively engage families, schools, and communities to inform our decision-making<sup>xliv</sup>

Its vision is “Every DC student receives a quality education that makes them feel valued and prepares them for lifelong learning, fulfilling careers, and economic security.”<sup>li</sup> The mission and vision are also included in PCSB policies.<sup>li</sup>

### **Promotes quality authorizing by requiring technical assistance or professional development for authorizers and/or charter school applicants**

PCSB requires charter applicants to attend various workshops and trainings during the planning year before they receive full charter approval.<sup>lii</sup> In addition, DC Charter School Alliance—a nonprofit charter school support agency—provides various resources for schools, including start-up, operations, and presentation support.<sup>liii</sup>

### **Ensures equitable access for all students**

Under DC law, charter schools are open to all students living in the district.<sup>liv</sup> The law also prohibits schools from limiting “enrollment on the basis of a student’s race, color, religion, national origin, language spoken, intellectual or athletic ability, measures of achievement or aptitude, or status as a student with special needs.”<sup>lv</sup>

### **Requires appropriate services for educationally disadvantaged students (e.g., students with special needs, English learners, students in foster care, or unaccompanied homeless youth)**

PCSB’s policy on charter applications notes it evaluates applications, in part, based on the following: “[E]ach element of the school program is deliberately designed to be inclusive of all students, including students with disabilities, English learners, students who are academically struggling or advanced, homeless students, and any other population(s) specifically targeted in the mission. Each element of the school program must accommodate and serve students who do not fit into the school’s target population but who may be admitted through the enrollment lottery.”<sup>lvi</sup>

In addition, state law permits charter schools to create an admissions’ preference for students with “an [individualized education program (IEP)] or an applicant in a disability category pursuant to [the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)], in order to facilitate the planning, development, and maintenance of high-quality special education programs in the District of Columbia.”<sup>lvii</sup> Schools can also create a preference for at-risk students.<sup>lviii</sup> These preferences must be approved by the authorizer.

## **Authorizer Funding**

- Provides a mechanism for guaranteed access to authorizer funding
- Includes a process for holding authorizers accountable for how funding is used

### **Provides a mechanism for guaranteed access to authorizer funding**

The district’s charter law permits the authorizer to charge schools up to a one percent fee of the school’s annual budget “to cover the cost of undertaking the ongoing administrative responsibilities.” Schools must pay this fee by November 15 each year.<sup>lix</sup>

### **Includes a process for holding authorizers accountable for how funding is used**

The law requires the authorizer to have its financial statement audited by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and government auditing standards for financial audits issued by the comptroller general. The authorizer must share its audit findings and recommendations with the mayor, the Council of the District of Columbia, and the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia.<sup>lx</sup>

## Endnotes

<sup>i</sup> Language in ESSA Framework Details section below was taken directly and adapted from Title IV, Part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), §§ 4301 to 4311 (20 U.S.C. §§ 7221 to 7221j)—<https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-discretionary-grants-support-services/charter-school-programs/state-entities/funding-and-legislation/>; Language in the NACSA: Framework Details section below were taken directly or adapted from the following resources: National Association of Charter School Authorizers: Quality Authorizing Practices; Reinvigorating the Pipeline; Authorizer Accountability Model Language; Higher Education Institution Authorizers; Leadership, Commitment, Judgment: Elements of Successful Charter School Authorizing; Findings from the Quality Practice Project; Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing; Putting an End to Authorizer Shipping; Language in the Alliance: Framework Details section below were taken directly or adapted from the following resources: National Alliance for Public Charter Schools: 2019 State Charter Law Ranking—<https://www.publiccharters.org/ranking-state-public-charter-school-laws-2019>; 2016 Model Charter School Law—<https://www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/migrated/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/2016ModelCharterSchoolLaw.pdf>

<sup>ii</sup> Pub. L. 104-134, as amended and codified at DC Code § 38-1800.01 et seq.

<sup>iii</sup> DC Code § 38-1800.01.

<sup>iv</sup> DC Code § 38-1800.02(16).

<sup>v</sup> The Public Charter School Board, [dcpcsb.org/about-us](http://dcpcsb.org/about-us). Since PCSB is part of the DC government, this profile includes PCSB policies and state policies.

<sup>vi</sup> DC Law 22-157. Student Fair Access to School Amendment Act of 2018.

<sup>vii</sup> DC Code § 38-1802.03(h)(1) and (2).

<sup>viii</sup> DC Code § 38-1800.02(17).

<sup>ix</sup> DC Law 17-9, Section 106, codified at D.C. Code § 38-175.

<sup>x</sup> “Public schools in existence before June 12, 2007 and authorized by the District of Columbia Board of Education... shall not be required to file a petition with the Public Charter School Board; it shall be considered approved and chartered for the purposes of this chapter and shall be subject to the powers and duties granted to the Public Charter School Board as an eligible chartering authority.” DC Code § 38-1802.01(f).

<sup>xi</sup> DC Code § 38-1802.02.

<sup>xii</sup> The Public Charter School Board, 2021 Charter Application Guidelines, <https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/uWdphFYnVx>

<sup>xiii</sup> DC Code § 38-1802.03(i)(2)(A)(ii).

<sup>xiv</sup> DC Code § 38-1802.03(b).

<sup>xv</sup> DC Code § 38-1802.03(f).

<sup>xvi</sup> DC Code § 38-1802.03(h)(1).

<sup>xvii</sup> DC Code § 38-1802.03(d).

<sup>xviii</sup> The Public Charter School Board, 2021 Charter Application Guidelines, <https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/uWdphFYnVx/>

<sup>xix</sup> DC Code § 38-1802.03(g).

<sup>xx</sup> DC Code § 38-1802.03(j)(2).

<sup>xxi</sup> DC Code § 38-1802.03(h)(2).

<sup>xxii</sup> Id.

<sup>xxiii</sup> The Public Charter School Board, 2021 Charter Application Guidelines, <https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/uWdphFYnVx>

- <sup>xxiv</sup> The Public Charter School Board, Charter School Agreements and Amendments, [dcpcsb.org/charter-agreements-amendments](https://dcpcsb.org/charter-agreements-amendments)
- <sup>xxv</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.03(h)(2).
- <sup>xxvi</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.03(h)(2).
- <sup>xxvii</sup> The Public Charter School Board, Charter School Agreements and Amendments, [dcpcsb.org/charter-agreements-amendments](https://dcpcsb.org/charter-agreements-amendments)
- <sup>xxviii</sup> DC Code § 38-1802.12.
- <sup>xxix</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.12(a)(3).
- <sup>xxx</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.04(b).
- <sup>xxxi</sup> Id.
- <sup>xxxii</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.02(6)(A).
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.04.
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.11(a)(1).
- <sup>xxxv</sup> The Public Charter School Board, Performance Framework, [dcpcsb.org/performance-management-framework-pmf](https://dcpcsb.org/performance-management-framework-pmf). See also Best Practices and Resources Booklet, [dcpcsb.org/sites/default/files/media/file/CCSA%20Best%20Practices%20Booklet\\_FINAL.pdf](https://dcpcsb.org/sites/default/files/media/file/CCSA%20Best%20Practices%20Booklet_FINAL.pdf)
- <sup>xxxvi</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.12(d).
- <sup>xxxvii</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.12(b).
- <sup>xxxviii</sup> Id.
- <sup>xxxix</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.12(d).
- <sup>xl</sup> Id.
- <sup>xli</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.12(d)(6).
- <sup>xlii</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.12(c).
- <sup>xliii</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.03 (h)(2).
- <sup>xliv</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.13a.(e).
- <sup>xliv</sup> Office of the State Superintendent of Education, Charter School Closure Policy, <https://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/Charter%20School%20Closure%20Policy%2010.29.18.pdf>
- <sup>xlvi</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.11 (d).
- <sup>xlvii</sup> Id.
- <sup>xlviii</sup> The Public Charter School Board, Quality Authorizing Leads to Positive Outcomes For DC Charter School Students, [dcpcsb.org/sites/default/files/Transforming\\_Public\\_Education\\_DC-%281%29.pdf](https://dcpcsb.org/sites/default/files/Transforming_Public_Education_DC-%281%29.pdf)
- <sup>xliv</sup> The Public Charter School Board, [dcpcsb.org/about-us/who-we-are?type=181](https://dcpcsb.org/about-us/who-we-are?type=181)
- <sup>1</sup> The Public Charter School Board, [dcpcsb.org/about-us/who-we-are?type=181](https://dcpcsb.org/about-us/who-we-are?type=181)
- <sup>ii</sup> The Public Charter School Board, 2021 Charter Application Guidelines, <https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/uWdphFYnVx>
- <sup>iii</sup> The Public Charter School Board, 2020-21 Planning Year Playbook, <https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/6Qr9cvSLOd/>
- <sup>iiiii</sup> The DC Charter School Alliance, Resources for Schools, [www.dccharters.org/resources-for-schools/](http://www.dccharters.org/resources-for-schools/)
- <sup>liv</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.06(a).
- <sup>lv</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.06(b).

<sup>lvi</sup> The Public Charter School Board, 2021 Charter Application Guidelines, <https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/uWdphFYnVx>

<sup>lvii</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.06(c-1).

<sup>lviii</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.06(c-3). DC law defines at-risk students as those identified as one or more of the following: homeless, in foster care, qualifies for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program; or a high school student that is one year older, or more, than the expected age for the grade in which the student is enrolled. DC Code § 38–2901(2A).

<sup>lix</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.11(b)(2).

<sup>lx</sup> DC Code § 38–1802.14(f).