STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

2016 – 2017 Agency Overview
The First Four Years
Charter Authority: Statutory Base

- **Transfer SBE/NDE Authority and Schools (2011 session)**
- **Purpose (NRS 386.509)**
  - Authorize high-quality charter schools;
  - Provide oversight, ensure schools maintain high standards, preserve autonomy, and protect public interests; and
  - Serve as a model of best practices
    - Required to align policies with national best practice
- **October 2011 office established, January 2012 Seven Member Appointed Board Seated**
  - 2 Gubernatorial appointees
  - 2 Speaker of Assembly appointees
  - 2 Senate Majority Leader appointees
  - 1 Charter School Association of Nevada appointee
- **Deemed a Local Education Agency 2013 (NRS 386.5135)**
  - State-sponsored charters were previously ineligible for federal funds
  - Schools still do not receive allocated special ed monies that go to districts
SPCSA Portfolio is Nevada’s Third Largest Public School System
SPCSA Schools Chartered After Creation of SPCSA in 2011 Outperform Older District & State-Sponsored Schools at 3-5 Star Levels*

* Divides all charter schools statewide into elementary, middle, and high school programs—consistent with NSPF
Student Achievement: Progress

- By Star Level:
  - SPCSA Schools Chartered
  - After Creation of SPCSA in 2011
  - Outperform Older District & State-Sponsored Charter Schools*

* Divides all charter schools statewide into elementary, middle, and high school programs—consistent with NSPF
Growth in 4 & 5 Star Schools vs. State
Decrease in 1 & 2 Star Schools vs. State

* Divides schools into elementary, middle, and high school programs—consistent with NSPF
Statewide Context

- Percentage of students served by schools at each star level has remained relatively flat across all public schools.
Number of students served by 4 & 5 star charter schools statewide grew 147% from 2011-2014.
Growth in Quality Seats: District Charters

- Number of students served by 4 & 5 star district charter schools grew 82% from 2011-2014
Number of students served by 4 & 5 star SPCSA charter schools grew 171% from 2011-2014
Increased Graduation Rates

- SPCSA charter graduation rates have increased 26 points vs. 7 points for district charters* & 8 points statewide

* Preliminary district charter data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPCSA</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Charters</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why The Difference?

- 2011 Legislation made other changes
  - Emphasis begins to shift from technical compliance to quality
  - Aligned many, but not all, elements of application process to best-in-class practices nationally
  - Essential Question: Will this school be an academic, organizational, & financial success?
  - Applicants are evaluated based on their capacity to execute the program they’ve proposed
    - Does the proposed board have the capacity to oversee all three elements?
    - Do proposed staff have the capacity to implement the program?
    - Does the proposed model and any EMO have a strong track record of success in all three areas?
From 1997 to 2013, charter school accountability was based not on the statewide accountability system but on the promises made in the charter application. Less rigorous, compliance oriented process resulted in less accountable schools—the charter contracts were impossible to enforce.

Automatic Closure—begins with Fall 2013-14 school year (NRS 386.5351)


Clear metrics for school performance above and beyond NSPF
Automatic Closure

- Adopted in 2013 via AB205—requires automatic closure in the case of 3 consecutive years of lowest possible rating on statewide system of accountability (Star system)
- Sets a minimum floor for performance statewide
- First year measured: 2013-14

Challenges

- 2014-15 is likely to be a “pause” in statewide accountability due to new testing program
- While some legacy schools have embraced accountability, others struggle to change and need more support (e.g. governance training)
Performance Framework: Elements

- Statute replaced old, less accountable written charter with new charter contract incorporating performance framework for all new and renewal schools
- Answers Essential Questions in Three Domains
  - Academic
    - Is the academic program a success?
  - Financial
    - Is the school financially viable?
  - Organizational
    - Is the organization effective and well-run?

- Builds on NDE sources and publicly available data
- Used to inform replication, expansion, renewal, and closure decisions
- Embedded in all new and renewal contracts since ’13 (currently 11/22 schools)
- Three tiers of intervention: Notices of Concern->Breach->Closure
Performance Framework: Results

- Two schools are currently in breach due to academic performance based on data reported since the end of the 2013 legislative session
  - Schools must take corrective actions and improve performance to avoid Notice of Closure
- Two schools are in breach due to organizational performance based on data reported since the 2013 legislative session
  - Schools must take comply with Authority interventions and investigation, take corrective actions, and improve performance to avoid Notice of Closure
The SPCSA Today
One Agency: Multiple Roles

- Portfolio Manager: Public Education Venture Capital
  - Invest public funds and entrust NV children to education entrepreneurs

- 3rd Largest “District”
  - Provide all NDE/USDOE-mandated support and oversight to schools
Who We Are

- 10 FTE Staff (Estimated Allocation)
  - 4 Special Education, Federal Programs, and Assessment Management Staff & 1 Technology Support Position (90% LEA—Core School Support Functions/10% Authorizing)
  - 1 ASO II (80% Agency--Finance/Purchasing/10% LEA/10% Authorizing)
  - 2 Management Analysts (40% Fiscal/40% LEA/20% Authorizing)
  - 1 Admin Assistant (60% Agency/20% LEA /20% Agency Functions)
  - 1 Director (60% Authorizing/20% LEA/20% Agency Functions)
The Next Four Years
Student Population: Challenge

- Vast Majority of Portfolio & Growth is in Clark County Suburbs
  - Low Income Population 25 Points Less Than State & 29 Less Than Clark
  - Black & Hispanic Population 24 Points Less Than State & 31 Less Than Clark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Am Native</th>
<th>In/AK</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
<td>15.64%</td>
<td>8.58%</td>
<td>62.74%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>14.84%</td>
<td>9.65%</td>
<td>63.65%</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>5.99%</td>
<td>14.72%</td>
<td>9.93%</td>
<td>63.25%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
<td>16.11%</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>61.61%</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 2013-14</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>40.56%</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
<td>35.98%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>5.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Populations</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>Free/Reduced Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>5.12%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 2013-14</td>
<td>51,946</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>67,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunity: Increase Equity & Outcomes

- Overcrowding and Underperformance Are Both Challenges: We Are Addressing Overcrowding But We Are Falling Short on Equity
- Incentivize Best in Class Charter Management Organizations Serving Low Income and High Need Students to Come to Nevada
  - View Recruitment of Top Flight Operators as a Long-Term Economic Development Engine
  - Remove Barriers to Entry and Make Adjustments to Education Ecosystem That Support Excellence
  - Demonstrate the Demographics Are Not Destiny: Proof Points
  - Grow Our Best Local Operators
- Continue Organic Growth of Suburban and Rural Movement While Making Strategic Investments in Urban Core
- Fast-Track Closure of Long-Term Underperformers and Allow Best-in-Class CMOs to Take Over Low-Performers in High Need Areas ➔ Increase Likelihood of Federal Dollars
# How to Meet the Needs of High Quality CMOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Capital</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong teaching and school leadership talent</td>
<td>Drive expansion of Alternate Pathways, teaching/principal residencies, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Parity</td>
<td>Funding sufficient to implement their programs</td>
<td>Access to all state/local dollars (capital and operating) not currently going to charters; funding for high-need populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Equitable and timely access to long-term facilities</td>
<td>Inventory district buildings, revise replacement strategy, lower renovation costs; ASD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup Support</td>
<td>Guaranteed startup capital</td>
<td>State match to rally local and national funders around capital needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Environment</td>
<td>Political cover &amp;stability for multi-site growth &amp; direct operation</td>
<td>Gain political support/cover for entry at multiple scales statewide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflections

- Accomplished a great deal in the past 4 years
- Recognize there is still a great deal of work to do
- We are likely to continue to grow at 30%+ per year
  - Governor’s budget request positions us to grow even faster
- Our infrastructure lags our portfolio & revenue growth
- Tension: dynamic, fast moving portfolio vs. traditional state agency
  - We pride ourselves on flexibility and teamwork
  - Capacity to respond to or proactively address school needs & challenges is a persistent concern
Questions?