

AUTHORITY BOARD SUPPORT DOC TABLE OF CONTENTS

Regular Meeting

1. Approval of July 27 Meeting Minutes (Kathleen Conaboy, Chair) **Page 1 – Page 4**
2. Authority Update (Kathleen Conaboy, Chair) **(Page 5)**
3. Director’s Report (Dr. Steve Canavero, Director, SPCSA) **Page 6**
4. Common Challenges and Promising Practices of Independent Statewide Chartering Boards – presentation of work funded through a grant from the National Governors Association. (Judy Osgood, Senior Policy Analyst Office of Governor Sandoval; Paul O’Neil, Consultant, National Governors Association) **Page 7 – Page 14**
5. Approval of Conversion of the Subsection 7 Charter to Subsection 5 Charter of the Pinecrest Academy (Steve Canavero, SPCSA) **Page 15 – Page 21**
6. Overview of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver as submitted by the Nevada Department of Education and conditionally approved by USED. (Katherine Rohrer, SPCSA) **Page 22 – Page 29**
7. Overview and discussion of the leaver and cohort graduation rate formulas and Authority-sponsored charter school’s graduation rates. (Katherine Rohrer, SPCSA) **Page 30 – Page 34**
8. Discussion of the draft performance frameworks for SPCSA sponsored charter schools. The discussion will center on the Financial framework as well as update the Authority on the Academic and Organizational. (Steve Canavero, SPCSA) **Page 35 – Page 43**
9. Overview of the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) FY14/15 budget. The discussion will include the performance measures as required by the Priorities and Performance Based Budgeting. (Steve Canavero, SPCSA) **Page 44 – Page 45**
10. Update on the successful administration and implementation of federal entitlement programs. (Angela Blair, SPCSA) **Page 46 – Page 48**
11. Report on the letters of intent received by the Authority as of August 24 and discussion related to the application review process and timeline. (Steve Canavero, SPCSA) **Page 49 – Page 50**
12. Discussion and possible action related to the consideration of an independent third party evaluation of the operation of charter schools in Nevada. Discussion may include the purpose of the study and interaction with strategic plan. (Steve Canavero, SPCSA) **Page 51.**
13. Discussion and possible action on the development of a government affairs subcommittee of the Authority empowered to speak on behalf of members at the legislature. (Kathleen Conaboy, Chair) **Page 52**
14. Discussion and possible action identifying future agenda items (Kathleen Conaboy, Chair) **Page 53**
15. Member Comment **Page 54**

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

S U B J E C T: Approval of July 31, 2012

Meeting Minutes

<u> / / </u>	Public Workshop
<u> / / </u>	Public Hearing
<u> / / </u>	Consent Agenda
<u> / / </u>	Regulation Adoption
<u> / / </u>	Approval
<u> / / </u>	Appointments
<u> / x/ </u>	Information
<u> / x/ </u>	Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012

AGENDA ITEM: 2

NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Kathleen Conaboy, SPCSA Chair

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 5 mins

BACKGROUND: President Conaboy will lead the Authority through the approval of July 31, 2012 meeting minutes.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

NEVADA STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

July 31, 2012

Nevada Legislature
Room 2134
401 South Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada

And

Grant Sawyer Building
Room 4412E
555 East Washington Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
(Teleconferenced)

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

Elissa Wahl
Robert McCord

On Conference Call

Melissa Mackedon
Nora Luna

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

Kathleen Conaboy
Michael Van
Marc Abelman

AUTHORITY STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

None

In Carson City:

Dr. Steve Canavero, Director, State Public Charter School Authority
Danny Peltier, Administrative Assistant, State Public Charter School Authority

Also Present:

Tom McCormack, Education Program Professional, State Public Charter School Authority
Angela Blair, Education Program Professional, State Public Charter School Authority
Katherine Rohrer, Education Program Professional, State Public Charter School Authority
Allyson Kellogg, Management Analyst, State Public Charter School Authority

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

None

In Carson City:

None

On Conference Call

Shane Chesney, Senior Deputy Attorney General

Nevada Department of Education Staff Present:

In Las Vegas

None

In Carson City

Donna Wix

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

Carol Mack
Katie Pellegrino
David Calvo
Nicole Martin
Jennifer DiMarzio
Ruth Parker

In Carson City:

J-Lynn Van Pelt

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE; APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Vice President Wahl called the meeting to order at 9:27a.m. with attendance as reflected above.

Agenda Item - Public Comment

None

Agenda Item 2 – Approval of June 29, 2012 Meeting Minutes
Member McCord made a motion for approval of the June 29, 2012 SPCSA meeting minutes. Member Mackedon seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item 3 – Director's Report

Director Canavero began by updating the Authority on the number of Letters of Intent the SPCSA has received so far for the 2013 – 2014 school year. As of the meeting, the SPCSA had received nine Letters of Intent (7 in Clark County, 1 in Washoe County, and 1 in Carson City).

Director Canavero then moved on to the 2013 Legislative agenda. He said that at prior meetings both the Authority and SPCSA staff had worked to put Bill Draft Requests (BDR) before the Legislative Committee on Education (LCE). He said he had spoken with the Governor's office and the Governor was very supportive of

the BDR's, specifically the Performance-Based Charter Contract Bill Draft Request. Director Canavero said that a number of individuals in the state are very supportive of the SPCSA's legislative agenda.

Director Canavero then updated the Authority on the staffing at the SPCSA and the recruitment for two new positions. He said the Administrative Service Officer (ASO) had been recruited and there were four candidates that were going to be interviewed in the upcoming weeks. Director Canavero said that he hopes to have the ASO hired by the next Authority meeting. He then said that recruitment had opened for the Business Process Analyst (BPA), who will primarily be working with the charter schools in Powerschool. He said he is awaiting the approved candidate list from personnel and that interviews will begin in the next few weeks.

Agenda Item 4 – Approval of Conversion of the Subsection 7 Charter to Subsection 5 Charter of the Honors Academy of Literature

Director Canavero began by reiterating the difference between the Subsection 7 and the Subsection 5 charters. He said the Subsection 7 charter had some conditions the Honors Academy had to complete in order for them to be converted into a full Subsection 5 charter. He said they had acquired a facility, received all of the necessary inspections and the building is considered ready for use, clean-up of goals and objectives, the bylaws amendments were satisfied, and the school has demonstrated adequate enrollment. With those conditions met, Director Canavero said that SPCSA staff was recommending to the Authority Conversion of the Subsection 7 Charter to Subsection 5 Charter for Honors Academy of Literature.

Vice President Wahl asked if the Authority would be voting on the Subsection 7 Agreement or the full charter application. Director Canavero said that when the Authority approves the conversion it is approving the written agreement and the application. Vice President Wahl said she had not been able to see the new charter application. Director Canavero clarified that the Authority had voted on the new application when they voted to approve the Subsection 7 Charter for Honors Academy. He also added that the application is generally the same, except for the conditions that were outlined in the Subsection 7 Charter agreement. Discussion continued between the Authority and Director Canavero about specifics in the Subsection 7 and how that translated into a Subsection 5.

Member Mackedon made a motion for Approval of Conversion of the Subsection 7 Charter to Subsection 5 Charter of the Honors Academy of Literature. Member Luna seconded the motion. No discussion was had. The motion carried unanimously.

Director Canavero then detailed the process from this point until Honors Academy begins the 2012 school year. He said that after the SPCSA staff validated the enrollment numbers, those numbers were sent to the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) so NDE could begin processing Honors Academy's August payment.

Agenda Item 5 – Public Comment

None

Agenda Item 6 – Next meeting date

Member McCord asked that SPCSA staff update the Authority on the number of Letters of Intent they receive between this meeting and the next meeting on August 24th, 2012. Director Canavero said he would have a full list of all schools that had submitted Letters of Intent at the next meeting.

Member McCord made a motion for adjournment. Member Luna seconded the motion. No discussion was had. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:51 a.m.

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY
SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Authority Update

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / / Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012

AGENDA ITEM: 3

NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Kathleen Conaboy, SPCSA Authority President

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 10 mins

BACKGROUND: President Conaboy will update the Authority with the latest news and events.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Director's Report

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / / Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012

AGENDA ITEM: 4

NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Steve Canavero PhD, Director, SPCSA

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 10 mins

BACKGROUND: Director Canavero will give the Authority a report on:

- Staffing;
- Strategic Plan;
- NACSA National Conference; and
- Health

SUBMITTED BY: _____

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Common Challenges and Promising Practices of Independent Statewide Chartering Boards – presentation of work funded through a grant from the National Governors Association

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / / Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012

AGENDA ITEM: 5

NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Paul O'Neil, Consultant, National Governors Association

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 30 mins

BACKGROUND: Paul O'Neil will give the Authority a presentation of the Common Challenges and Promising Practices of Independent Statewide Chartering Boards.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

Common Challenges and Promising Practices of Independent Statewide Chartering Boards

Presentation of work funded through a grant from the National Governors Association

BACKGROUND

It is hard to make general statements about charter school authorizers because there is considerable variety among authorizers. Depending on the state, an authorizing office may be a district board of education, a state education department, a college or university, a non-profit organization, a county agency, or a mayor's office. Many states allow for more than one of these to serve as authorizers. Another option that is gaining favor in an increasing number of states is the creation of a statewide chartering board. Unlike other types of authorizers that have responsibilities and functions that go far beyond charter schools, ICBs have a single purpose – they approve and oversee charter schools and hold them accountable for quality. This singular focus may have considerable benefits but also bring with it unique challenges. This analysis will explore the prospects for both.

On a basic level, all charter school authorizers perform the same basic functions, and so best practices for ICBs are in many respects the same as those for authorizers more generally. One national organization has taken the lead in developing and disseminating expertise on authorizer excellence, and that is the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA). NACSA serves as a membership organization comprised of authorizers, but also as a vocal proponent of quality in the sector. Its *Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizers* has, over the last decade, become the benchmark for authorizer best practices. More recently, NACSA has also developed a set of rubrics that it calls *Performance Frameworks*¹ that identify specific metrics for assessing charter programs in terms of academics, financial operations and organizational management. Nevada is one of a handful of pilot sites through which NACSA is refining and piloting these rubrics, and the Nevada ICB can look to them as well as to the *Principles and Standards* as tools.

While neither the *Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizers* nor the *Performance Frameworks* focus specifically on ICBs, NACSA has addressed ICB quality a part of its current policy agenda. Noting that ICBs are frequently created by states seeking to offer an alternative to other existing authorizer options, NACSA has stated that:

- Alternative authorizers can prevent hostile authorizers from blocking good applicants or closing successful schools. They also allow states to close lax authorizers without indirectly harming future charter applicants or strong schools. In the absence of an alternative, state removal of a lax authorizer stops all further authorizing action.

NACSA also recommends that:

- Alternative authorizers would ideally be ICBs and they should be responsible for adopting practices that align with NACSA's Principles and Standards. ICBs have the benefit of an explicit mission to perform as high-quality authorizers. They also have no potential conflicts that would discourage them from approving strong applicants.

¹ The Principles and Standards are still in the pilot phase and not yet available electronically.

When an ICB is not viable for a state or jurisdiction, other types of alternative authorizers would be better than having none.²

As NACSA notes, ICBs can bring strong benefits. Local districts may lack the capacity and/or resources to serve as authorizers or to engage in a substantial amount of authorizing activity. ICBs can be useful in that context. Independent chartering boards can also model best practices for districts, and provide technical assistance to help districts develop strong practices in their own chartering work. This may be particularly valuable where districts lack sufficient funds to devote to developing authorizing expertise. ICBs in states where there are also more traditional chartering options also provide choice for applicants. In a sector where choice is often held out as a hallmark of fairness and equity, as well a springboard for positive competition among providers, this may be an important consideration.

CURRENT STATUS OF STATE ICBs

States that have an independent chartering board are as follows:³

States with ICBs	Mission of ICB	Other Authorizer Options
Arizona	To improve public education in Arizona by sponsoring charter schools that provide quality educational choices.	LEA, SEA
Colorado	The mission of the Charter School Institute shall be to foster high-quality public school choices offered through Institute charter schools that deliver rigorous academic content and high academic performance in a safe environment and on par with the highest performing schools, including particularly schools for at-risk students.	LEA
D.C.	The Board's mission is to provide quality public school options for DC students, families, and communities through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive application review process; • Effective oversight; • Meaningful support; and • Active engagement of its stakeholders. 	No additional authorizer
Hawaii	To authorize high-quality public charter schools throughout the State.	Higher Education Inst., Not for Profit Org., State Agency, County Agency
Idaho	To ensure PCSC-authorized public charter schools' compliance with Idaho statute, protecting student and public interests by balancing high standards of accountability with respect for the autonomy of public	LEA

² National Association of Charter School Authorizers Policy Agenda, 2012.

³ National Association of Charter School Authorizers, 2012.

	charter schools and implementing best authorizing practices to ensure the excellence of public charter school options available to Idaho families.	
Illinois	To evaluate proposals for new charter schools that are denied by local school districts and subsequently appealed to the state.	LEA, SEA
Indiana	The Indiana Charter School Board will authorize and hold accountable a portfolio of high-performing charter schools that provide an education on par with or better than Indiana's best-performing district schools.	LEA, Higher Education Inst., Municipality
Nevada		LEA, Higher Education Inst.
Maine	N/A	No additional authorizer
Missouri	The Commission will operate under the same laws as all other charter school sponsors in the state and will only have authority over the schools under their sponsorship.	LEA, SEA, Higher Education Inst.
South Carolina	To improve student learning and increase learning opportunities in South Carolina through the creation and implementation of innovative, high-quality charter schools.	LEA
Utah	The Utah State Charter School Board is dedicated to facilitating excellence in education through high-performing charter schools.	LEA

Both **Florida** and **Georgia** each briefly had an ICB but those boards were struck down by courts that found them in violation of their respective state constitutions.

PROFILES OF STATEWIDE INDEPENDENT BOARDS

Colorado

In **Colorado**, the statewide chartering board is called the Colorado Charter School Institute (CSI). It was created as an independent state agency within the state Department of Education in 2004 in order to provide an alternative for charter applicants, particularly in districts that have not demonstrated a commitment to substantial and attentive charter authorizing. The law allows school districts that have demonstrated they meet "good authorizer standards" to get exclusive chartering authority and therefore not have CSI charter schools within their geographical boundaries. Districts interested in having exclusive chartering authority must petition the State Board of Education for that right.

In addition to authorizing schools, CSI also develops and disseminates models and practices for use by all authorizers in the state. School districts in **Colorado** can also contract with CSI or a third party to run the charter school application process and then either the district or CSI can authorize after the charter schools are approved.

After receiving start-up funds from foundation grants, CSI is supported through a 3% fee from the schools it oversees. It is governed by a nine-member board of directors; seven members are appointed by the governor, two by the commissioner of education. According to its website, CSI's portfolio currently includes 22 schools serving 10,500 students, and includes several virtual charter schools.

District of Columbia

The District of Columbia Public Charter School Board (PCSB) was created in 1996 by an **amendment to the D. C. School Reform Act of 1995** as a second, independent authorizer of public charter schools. In 2006, the District of Columbia Board of Education (BOE), which had served as the first charter authorizer since 1996, voted to relinquish its authorizing responsibilities. The D.C. city council passed legislation in 2007 to give the Mayor direct authority over the traditional public school system, and to transfer the oversight responsibility for the charter schools previously authorized by the BOE to the PCSB. The PCSB became the sole authorizer of charter schools in the **District of Columbia**.

One of the oldest and most highly regarded ICBs, the PCSB currently oversees 53 charter schools on 98 campuses, serving roughly 31,000 students. Charter schools in **D.C.** must choose whether to serve as independent LEAs or as part of the district LEA for special education services. In instances where charters schools elect to be part of the district LEA, LEA responsibilities fall on the district itself, rather than on the PCSB.

Hawaii

The Hawaii Public Charter School Commission (Commission) was **formed this summer**. The new ICB is the third successive statewide chartering office in the state. **Hawaii** passed its charter schools law in 1999 and at first the State Board of Education served as the exclusive authorizer. Problems with that arrangement (the State Board provided little oversight) led to the creation in 2006 of the State Charter Review Panel (Review Panel), which became an ICB that took over as the only statewide authorizing body. The Review Panel was designed to be more attentive to charter school issues and charter work, but continued frustration with the quality of statewide authorizing and a lack of staffing led this year to a transition from the Review Panel to the new commission. The commission is intended to develop substantial expertise in authorizing. It will be staffed by an Executive Director who is charged with developing a staff to assist with the commission's work. A Transition Implementation Coordinator is in place to facilitate a shift from the Review Panel to the Commission. All nine commissioners of the new ICB are in place.

Hawaii is unique in that the state serves as both SEA and LEA for charter schools. The commission's role with regard to such responsibilities is not yet fully clear. The statewide authorizing function is supported by a two percent fee from overall charter school funding. The legislation in place allows the state board of education to create additional new authorizers.

Illinois

After conducting an analysis of independent chartering options through a special taskforce; (see "resources" section, below, for a link to the task force report), the statewide Charter School Commission in **Illinois** was **established by the state in 2011** at the urging of charter advocates. Their hope in pressing for an independent authorizing board was to provide an alternative to district authorizers which often proved reluctant to approve charter applications and could be inattentive to such work. Another benefit of the ICB is a greater level of autonomy. Schools within its portfolio receive public funds directly from the state rather than passing through the districts, and, if authorized by the ICB, charter schools serve as independent LEA. Charter schools authorized by a district are schools within the district LEA. The ICB is funded by public funds from the schools within its portfolio. Three percent of those funds are withheld by the ICB. The ICB also receives some funds from private sources. To date, the ICB has reviewed several charter applications,

although all of them were either denied or withdrawn. The first full round of application review will take place this fall.

South Carolina

The independent chartering board in **South Carolina** was created in 2007. Called the South Carolina Public Charter School District, it approves charters independently of the South Carolina State Board of Education. In **South Carolina**, however, an applicant must first submit an application to the South Carolina Charter School Advisory Committee, who determines whether the application is in compliance with state law and regulations governing charter schools. If so, the application is forwarded to the authorizer chosen by the school (either the local school district or the South Carolina Public Charter School District), who then determines whether or not to approve the application. The South Carolina ICB currently oversees 13 schools, with more slated to open this year. It serves approximately 10,000 students statewide.

COMMON CHALLENGES

The experiences of ICBs across the country are varied, and depend to a large extent on local factors and the specifics of the powers and structure of each. But many of the challenges they face are similar. Some of the most common and significant are described below.

Autonomy

One threshold issue for ICBs is the question of how autonomous they are or should be. This is initially a policy issue that requires a state to determine if it wants to create a chartering board that is fully independent of the state board of education? Additionally, the state must decide if it should be quasi-independent and serve as an office of the state board or be overseen by the board? Another consideration is whether applicants to the ICB should first be required to apply to their local district. The right to apply to the ICB could be contingent on the local district refusing to approve the initial application.

Unless the laws and regulations addressing these issues are explicit and clear, a more practical problem may arise in the form of challenges to the actions of the ICB. For example, does it have the authority to make the decisions such as: approvals, revocations, and non-renewals.

Local Control

One important aspect of autonomy is the question of local control. Districts may resent approval of charters without their consent or even knowledge. The ability of an ICB to unilaterally approve a charter school application both undercuts district autonomy and impacts district budgets. Push back against ICBs in states like **Colorado, Florida, and Georgia** has been largely based on concerns over local control and a belief that state constitutions in many states provide districts with an exclusive right to create and oversee schools within their borders.

Funding

Funding is another contentious area, both in terms of the source of funds for ICBs and the amount of funds needed to support their work. In **New Jersey** and other states, considerable resistance to the idea of creating an ICB has been rooted in a reluctance to fund the chartering board out of public funds that would otherwise remain with districts. Most commonly, ICBs are funded from a small percentage of the funds attributable to the charter schools they oversee, but this can be unpopular with those charter schools and with the districts where they are located. Without adequate funding, it is not possible for ICBs, or any authorizer, to do high quality work. In fact, one common reason why some district authorizers struggle in their responsibilities is a lack of resources devoted by the district to chartering. Ideally, one of the strengths of an ICB should be that as an organization entirely focused on charter school authorizing, it has the funding and other resources needed to do the job well. In practice, this may or may not be the case.

Staffing

In order for ICBs to be attentive and effective in their work, they require sufficient staff to attend to the application reviews, oversight visits, investigations of various sorts, renewal decision-making, and other functions that characterize this work. Staffing is partly a function of the level of funding available but may relate to the perspective an ICB or other authorizer brings to the work. A more hands-off approach to oversight, for example, will likely require fewer staff to do that work. As with funding, adequate staffing should be a strength of ICBs, as compared to other types of authorizers that may have to stretch personnel between various priorities, including authorizing.

Risk of Overregulation

ICBs and other authorizers committed to fostering high quality charter schools may encounter a tension between respecting the autonomy of the schools they oversee and taking it upon themselves to improve those schools. Especially where staffing is plentiful, they may be tempted to involve themselves in programmatic decisions that are more appropriately the province of the school leaders, or to offer support services designed to improve schools. The ICB's primary role as a gatekeeper, holding schools accountable for their performance, can be compromised by such proactive steps.

Vulnerability to law suits

The discussion of ICB litigation, above, attests to the reality that chartering boards are vulnerable to law suits. The degree of vulnerability of any particular ICB will depend to a great extent on the language of its state constitution. States with an explicit local control clause are most at risk, but the suit in **Colorado** demonstrated that even such clauses can be successfully defended. Whatever a state's constitutional language, care should be taken to draft legislation, regulations and ICB rules that carefully articulate the roles and responsibilities of the ICB in a way that is as respectful as possible of state legal precedents.

QUALITY CONSIDERATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the benefits and challenges described in this memorandum, the following considerations may be worth considering in trying to ensure strong statewide ICBs:

- The singular purpose of ICBs should allow for maximum attentiveness to charter authorizing and for a high level of expertise in that work.
- ICBs have the potential to be more independent and less politically sensitive than district and state education authorities.
- Competence and effectiveness should not be assumed – ICBs that are underfunded, understaffed, and insufficiently attentive to their responsibilities are likely to struggle to be successful.
- ICBs can be shut down for poor performance. While other types of authorizers could lose the ability to approve and oversee charter schools, all of those types – LEAs, SEAs, universities, non-profit groups, etc. – have a larger role beyond authorizing that would continue.
- The presence of a strong ICB as an alternative to other authorizing options can provide an important element of choice for charter applicants and, where other authorizers are weak, can raise the quality level of authorizing within the state.

- Despite the unique aspects of ICBs, their work is in many respects no different from that of other authorizers, and it is essential that they understand and follow best practices for strong authorizing generally. To that end, NACSA's *Principles and Standards for Quality Authorizing* is an essential guiding resource. NACSA's newly developed *Performance Frameworks* that collectively provide a rubric for assessing quality in the academic, financial and organizational management elements of a school's program can be very useful tools for ICBs developing their own approach to school accountability.
- One area in which ICBs and other authorizers commonly struggle is special education. The complex and comprehensive compliance and program requirements imposed on schools, LEAs and SEAs by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and other applicable laws can be daunting and many authorizers are lack the expertise to fully understand how those requirements play out in their work. A new resource has been created by the National Charter Schools Institute called *Charter School Authorizer Rubrics for Special Education*. These rubrics identify all of the important steps an authorizer should take at each phase of the authorizing process – application review, oversight and renewal/closure decisions. These will be made available soon and ICBs should consider using them as a tool.

RESOURCES

Illinois Independent Charter School Authorizer Task Force Report (2010):
http://www.isbe.state.il.us/charter/pdf/final_task_force_report.pdf

Multiple Charter Authorizing Options -- National Association for Charter School Authorizing (2009)
https://www.qualitycharters.org/images/stories/Multiple_Authorizers.pdf

Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing – National Association for Charter School Authorizing (2010) <https://www.qualitycharters.org/policy/principles-and-standards>

The Importance of Multiple Authorizers in Charter School Law – Center for Education Reform (2011)
<http://www.edreform.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/CERPrimerMultipleAuthorizersDec2011.pdf>

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Approval of the conversion from Subsection 7 to full (Subsection 5) charter for Pinecrest Academy

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / x/ Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012
AGENDA ITEM: 6
NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Steve Canavero PhD, Director, SPCSA

RECOMMENDATION: Authority staff recommends conversion of the Subsection 7 charter to full charter (Subsection 5) for the Pinecrest Academy.

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 20 mins

BACKGROUND:

Pinecrest Academy has complied with all required conditions as established in the Subsection 7 Charter Agreement.

A. "The School has not yet obtained a facility." All health and safety requirements are satisfied – Allyson Kellogg.

B. "The School has not yet established a governing body." -The Governing Body was formally established and officers elected – Tom McCormack

C. "The School has not yet demonstrated enrollment that can result in a financially viable charter school." Allyson reviewed our list of students and confirmed 752 (121 in K) students signed-up to attend Pinecrest Academy.

D. "The School's special education plan requires amendment." The proposed amendment language was reviewed and approved by Angela Blair. The Board of Pinecrest formally adopted the amended language on August 9th.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

CHARTER SCHOOL AGREEMENT

Nevada State Public Charter School Authority And Pinecrest Academy of Nevada

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered by and between the Nevada State Public Charter School Authority ("Authority") and the **Pinecrest Academy of Nevada** ("Charter School"), a public charter school.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, in 1997 the Nevada Legislature authorized the formation of charter schools; and

WHEREAS, by decision on **August 24, 2012**, the Authority approved the Charter School application pursuant to NRS 386.527(5); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to NAC 386.050 the Written Charter includes both the application to form a charter school approved by the sponsor and a written agreement signed by the sponsor and the charter school;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing Recitals and the mutual understandings, releases, covenants and payments herein described, the parties agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

1. Compliance with Nevada Law. The statutes and regulations which establish charter schools in Nevada and the Charter School application approved by the Authority are hereby incorporated by reference as a part of this Agreement. The Charter School agrees to comply with all statutes and regulations regarding the creation and operation of charter schools in Nevada, including specifically NRS 386.550.
2. Term. It is the intent of the Authority that the Charter, including this Agreement, is to be effective for a period of six (6) years, to begin on **August 24, 2012**, and to terminate on **August 24, 2018**.
3. Charter School Independence. Pursuant to NRS 386.565, the Authority shall not assign any pupil who is enrolled in a public school or any employee who is employed in a public school to the Charter School, or interfere with the operation and management of the Charter School except as authorized by written charter, NRS 386.490 to 386.610, inclusive, and any other statute or regulation applicable to the Charter School or its officers or employees. The Authority and the Nevada Department of Education, or its designees, may physically inspect the school and its records, including employee and financial records, at any time.
4. Student Achievement. The Charter School agrees to report to the Authority on a regular basis the academic progress of the Charter School in meeting standards of achievement set forth

in the Application, as required by NRS 386.605 and NRS 386.610. In addition to any goals and description of how achievement of those goals will be measured that were approved in the Charter School application, all provisions of NRS 385.3455 through NRS 385.391 (Statewide System of Accountability) apply to the Charter School. Nothing in the application approved by the Authority, this Agreement, or the Written Charter is to be construed as replacing, overriding, or taking precedence over NRS 385.3455 through NRS 385.391.

5. Employment Matters. The Charter School agrees to comply with the provisions of NRS 386.595 regarding employment status. The Charter School will establish and implement its own dispute resolution process for employment matters.

6. Costs of Operations. The Charter School shall be responsible for all costs associated with its school operations, including the cost of contracting for goods and services.

a. The Charter School shall clearly indicate to vendors and other entities and individuals with which or with whom the Charter School enters into an agreement or contract for goods or services that the obligations of the Charter School under such agreement or contract are solely the responsibility of the Charter School and are not the responsibility of the State of Nevada, the Authority, or the Nevada Department of Education. Prior to signing a contract with an Educational Management Organization ("EMO," defined by NRS 386.562), the Charter School shall submit a copy of the proposed contract to the sponsor. The sponsor has the authority to review all or portions of the EMO contract prior to signing. No clause in any contract between the Charter School and an EMO shall require more than a simple majority of the Charter School's Governing Body to terminate the contract. No clause in any contract between the Charter School and an EMO shall require the EMO's agreement before the contract may be terminated by the Charter School.

b. The Charter School agrees that it will not extend the faith and credit of the Authority, the State of Nevada, or the Nevada Department of Education to any third person or entity. The Charter School acknowledges and agrees that it has no authority to enter into a contract that would bind the Authority.

7. Legal Liabilities/Indemnification. As required by NRS 386.550, the Charter School agrees that the Authority is not liable for the acts or omissions of the Charter School, its officers, agents, or employees. Subject to NRS Chapter 41, the Charter School agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold the Authority, its agents and employees harmless from all liability, claims and demands on account of contract, injury, loss or damage, including, without limitation, claims arising from bodily injury, personal injury, sickness, disease, death, property loss or damage or any other losses of any kind whatsoever which arise out of or are in any manner connected with the Charter School's operations.

8. Insurance. The Charter School agrees that it will maintain all appropriate insurance coverages, including coverages for general liability and worker's compensation, as required to protect itself, the Authority and the Nevada Department of Education, and specifically as required by NRS 386.550 and NAC 386.215.

9. Special Education. The Charter School agrees to be responsible for the provision of special education services to students with disabilities who attend the Charter School in accordance with the requirements of state and federal law including Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Individuals with Disabilities Improved Education Act of 2004. The Charter School is responsible, both financially and programmatically, for the response and resolution of any Due Process complaints filed against it.

10. Student Withdrawal. The withdrawal of any student from the Charter School shall be reported to the Nevada Department of Education. Reports shall be submitted on an ongoing basis, and must include each student's name, ID number, and contact information. In the event a student is expelled, the charter school will provide equivalent services to the student. If the expelled student returns to a local school district, the charter school will reimburse the district on a pro rata basis. The Charter School may not require pupils or their parent or guardian to sign "contracts," "commitments," or other documents that can result in the removal, withdrawal, suspension or expulsion of the pupil from the school for reasons other than the reasons for suspension or expulsion stated in NRS 392.466. The Charter School may suspend or expel pupils only for the reasons stated in NRS 392.466. Those reasons are battery on an employee of the school, possession of a firearm or dangerous weapon, sale or distribution of a controlled substance, or status as a habitual disciplinary problem as defined by NRS 392.4655. Removal of a pupil from the Charter School, except for suspension or expulsion pursuant to NRS 392.466, is solely the decision of the parent or guardian of the pupil. Any removal of a pupil from the Charter School against the wishes of the parent or guardian must comply with NRS 392.467.

11. Gifts/Donations/Grants. The Charter School shall inform the Authority of any gifts, donations, grants, etc. received for the school.

12. Miscellaneous Provisions.

a. Entire Agreement. This Agreement contains all terms, conditions and provisions hereof and the entire understandings and all representations of understandings and discussions of the parties relating thereto, and all prior representations, understandings and discussions are merged herein and superseded and canceled by this Agreement.

b. Amendment. This Agreement may only be modified or amended by further written agreement executed by the parties hereto, provided that such amendment will grant the Charter School a greater ability to achieve its educational goals and objectives. An amendment may not authorize an extension of the duration of the term of the written charter.

c. Notice. Any notice required, or permitted, under this Agreement, shall be in writing and shall be effective upon personal delivery (subject to verification of service or acknowledgment of receipt) or three (3) days after mailing when sent by certified mail, postage prepaid, to the office of the Charter School's governing body, in the case of notice being sent to the Charter School, or to the Office of the President of the Authority for notice to the Authority.

d. No Waiver. The parties agree that no assent, express or implied, to any breach by either of them of any one or more of the covenants and agreements expressed herein shall be deemed or be taken to constitute a waiver of any succeeding or other breach.

e. Dispute Resolution. In the event a dispute arises between a charter school sponsored by the State Public Charter School Authority and the Authority or its staff, the charter school shall submit, in writing, a statement outlining its complaint and proposed resolution to the Director of the Authority or his/her designee for review. The Director will respond to the complaint and proposed resolution, in writing, within 30 calendar days outlining whether or not he/she agrees with the complaint and whether he/she accepts the proposed resolution or offers an alternative resolution to the complaint. If the charter school is not satisfied with the response from the Director, it may request, in writing, a review by the President of the Authority. The President of the Authority will respond, in writing, within 15 calendar days stating whether or not he/she agrees with the complaint and if so, whether he/she agrees with the proposed resolution, or proposing an alternative resolution to the charter school. In the event these representatives are unable to resolve the dispute informally, pursuant to this procedure, the complaint and proposed resolution will be submitted to the State Public Charter School Authority at the next available meeting for its consideration. The Authority will decide whether or not it agrees with the complaint or any proposed resolution. Any decision by the Authority is final.

f. Applicable Law. The parties intend that where this Agreement references federal or state law that they be bound by any amendment to such laws, upon the effective date of such amendments.

g. Invalidity. If any provision of this Agreement is determined to be unenforceable or invalid for any reason, the remainder of the Agreement shall remain in effect, unless otherwise terminated by one or both of the parties in accordance with the terms contained herein.

13. Home School Prohibition. Pupils attending the Charter School will be disallowed for Distributive School Account (DSA) apportionment if their names also appear on school district lists of home schooled pupils unless a statement from the parent/guardian has been submitted to the Nevada Department of Education. The statement must clarify that the parent/guardian has withdrawn the pupil from home schooling, and that the parent acknowledges he/she is enrolling the pupil in a public charter school.

14. Adherence to NRS (Nevada Revised Statute) and NAC (Nevada Administrative Code). Nothing in the Written Charter, the application approved by the sponsor, or this Agreement is to be construed as replacing, taking precedence over, or overriding any applicable NRS, NAC, or federal law.

15. If Applicable, Distance Education Program. The distance education program shall operate only as described in the distance education application specifically approved by the Nevada Department of Education. The distance education program is subject to all provisions of NRS 388.820 through NRS 388.874, including the NRS 388.866(1) requirement for weekly communication between the teacher of each course offered through the program and the pupil.

The distance education program is subject to all provisions of NAC 388.800 through NAC 388.860.

16. If Applicable, Distance Education Program. Pursuant to NAC 387.171, the Master Register of Attendance shall include:

- The name of the pupil;
- The gender of the pupil;
- The date of birth of the pupil;
- The school in which the pupil is enrolled;
- The grade or ungraded category of educational service to which the pupil is admitted;
- The dates, if applicable, of enrollment and reenrollment;
- The date of withdrawal, if applicable, and the reason for the withdrawal as described in NAC 387.215;
- The pupils' record of daily attendance;
- If the pupil is enrolled in a program of distance education, the information required by subsection 2 of NAC 387.193; and
- The ethnic group or race to which the pupil belongs.

The Distance Education Class Record Book shall include the following information from the school's software platform:

- Pupil's name;
- Pupil's grade and any applicable special category to which the pupil is assigned;
- Pupil's time on task in his computer for each class per day (daily attendance);
- Grade earned by period and final grade for each class;
- Dates of enrollment, reenrollment, and withdrawal of the pupil from the class; and
- Teacher.

The Pupil's Schedule of Distance Education Classes shall include the following information from the pupil's computer from the school's software platform:

- Name;
- Date; and
- Schedule of classes/with time on task from each class per day.

17. Grades Served: The Charter School shall serve grades **K-8** only, unless the Written Charter is amended by Charter School Governing Body action and Authority action.

18. Compliance with Federal Requirements for Asbestos Management in Schools. The Charter School agrees to pay all costs related to compliance with federal requirements for asbestos management in schools.

19. Facility Lease or Purchase. The Charter School agrees to refrain from entering into any facility purchase agreement without the prior approval of the Authority. Before signing any

facility purchase agreement, the Charter School shall provide a copy of the agreement to the Authority. The Charter School shall not sign the agreement without prior Authority approval.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement.

President, Charter School Governing Body

Please print the President's name: _____

Date: _____

President, Nevada State Public Charter School Authority

Date: _____

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Overview of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver as submitted by the Nevada Department of Education and approved by the U.S.

Department of Education

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / / Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012

AGENDA ITEM: 7

NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Katherine Rohrer, Education Program Professional, SPCSA

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 45 mins

BACKGROUND: Katherine Rohrer will give the Authority an Overview of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility Waiver as submitted by the Nevada Department of Education.

SUBMITTED BY: _____



Protecting Accountability and Autonomy for Charter Schools under ESEA Flexibility

In response to input from NACSA, the U.S Department of Education recently released guidance stating that states implementing waivers under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility process should not use their new plans to undermine charter school accountability and autonomy.

NACSA looks forward to working with states to develop and implement plans that support accountability and autonomy for charters and that do not prevent authorizers from taking necessary action to close failing schools.

Background

The Department is promoting flexibility under ESEA. Under their “ESEA Flexibility Program,” the Department is awarding states with waivers to the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). State plans to alter accountability systems that are proceeding based on these waivers could threaten charter school accountability and autonomy.

Under the waiver plan, new state systems may task failing charter schools with implementing improvement plans when the schools’ authorizers would otherwise have acted to close them. Rather than looking to charter school accountability plans, charter contracts, authorizer practices, and state law and regulations regarding charter school accountability, states may feel bound to simply apply the same remediation practices to all schools, charters and traditional schools alike. This would undercut the autonomy of charter schools and greatly undermine authorizer authority.

What Happened?

NACSA communicated its concern that these new improvement plans and their timelines could undermine the ability of authorizers to close those schools according to the terms of their charter contracts while they implemented new plans. There is also a concern that the implementation of such plans, as well as related teacher evaluation systems, would undermine charter school autonomy. In ongoing consultation with NACSA, Department officials made it clear that they agreed with NACSA and hoped to avoid this harm to the charter movement.

NACSA and the Department believe that all charter schools are accountable for meeting performance expectations under state accountability systems. However, as the Department explained in its guidance, the accountability provisions in each state’s charter school law and each school’s charter contract take precedence over the implementation of less-severe sanctions or slower timelines that states may institute under ESEA Flexibility.

In the new guidance, the Department has clarified that:

1. States are to include charter schools in their new state systems. According to the guidance:

ESEA flexibility affects public charter schools (including public charter school LEAs and public charter schools within a regular LEA) in the same manner as it does all other LEAs and public schools.

2. Regardless of a school's identification and involvement in these other processes, charter authorizers retain the authority to act according to state charter school laws act on a timely basis to close failing schools according to the terms of their charter contracts. The guidance explains:

A charter school that is performing low enough to be considered a priority or a focus school will face revocation of its charter by its authorizer. When a charter school authorizer has indicated that it intends to decline to renew or intends to revoke a charter for a particular charter school based on lack of progress towards improved student academic outcomes or other significant issues cited by the authorizer, the authorizer's decision to do so supersedes any designation from the SEA that such a school is a focus or priority school, as consistent with any applicable State law. In such cases, the charter school would not implement the interventions associated with the SEA's ESEA flexibility request, and would instead proceed towards school closure as designated by the authorizer.

3. Authorizers are free to apply higher standards to charter schools they oversee than are applied in state systems. According to the guidance:

...we encourage charter school authorizers and SEAs to work together so that charter school academic performance requirements are at least as rigorous as those used to define priority and focus schools. The Department encourages SEAs to clarify the role they will play in reviewing and supporting or closing persistently low-performing charter schools when authorizers fail to close them.

--and--

Nothing in ESEA flexibility prohibits the continuation of existing charter contracts or the development of future contracts that exceed the minimum requirements of an SEA's system under ESEA flexibility. If a charter school's contract with its authorizer imposes more immediate or rigorous consequences than an SEA's differentiated accountability system would impose, the authorizer should take appropriate steps to ensure that the charter school abides by the charter contract as specified in the State's charter school law.

4. In states with adequate charter school accountability, teacher evaluation systems implemented under these waivers need not apply to charters and charter schools in these states should have the flexibility to implement alternatives. According to the guidance:

...if the SEA can demonstrate to the Department that all charter schools in its State are held to a high standard of accountability through a strong charter school authorizer system... the SEA may allow its charter schools to develop and implement evaluation and support systems that meet all of the elements of

Principle 3, but that do not necessarily adhere specifically to the SEA's guidelines.

What's Next?

The important work going forward will take place in states. For states that already have waivers, state departments of education are going to be working out the details of how they will act on their waivers. Other states are likely to draft and submit additional waivers. In both circumstances, states should clarify how they will act to safeguard accountability and autonomy among their charter schools.

Charter school authorizers, charter school operators, charter support organizations, and other stakeholders should work with their state agencies to ensure that each state's plan addresses these concerns.

Additional Resources

The Department's Guidance is available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/esea-flexibility-faqs-addendum4.doc>

For more information on this issue, see NACSA's materials at:

<http://www.qualitycharters.org/ESEA-flexibility>

Consideration for Charter Schools and Sponsors

In 1997 Nevada passed law allowing for the formation of charter schools. As of today, 31 charter schools educate roughly 17,000 or 3.8% of Nevada students. According to the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, for the 2011-2012 school year, Nevada's charter school law was ranked 20th from the best (of 42 states ranked), earning 111 of a possible 208 points – a significant improvement from the prior year. The Nevada Legislature's creation of the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) as a State-wide sponsor of charter schools is credited by the Alliance as a major contributing factor to Nevada's improvement in the ranking over prior years. Nevada statute allows Higher Education Institutions, Local Education Agencies (School Districts), and the State Public Charter School Authority to sponsor charter schools.

Nevada is committed to the proposed ESEA Flexibility and will classify all schools and identify Priority and Focus schools without regard to their charter/non-charter status. Nevada is committed to the development and application of a system of differential recognition, accountability, and support. Nevada also recognizes that the charter school concept is built upon a fundamental quid pro quo – autonomy from certain statute/regulation in exchange for accountability for student learning. Therefore, nothing in this plan or its implementation shall interfere with the autonomy and accountability of charter schools in the State as defined by Nevada charter school law and regulations. Specifically, this plan shall be implemented in a manner that protects the authority of charter school sponsors to close low-performing charter schools under the timeframes and according to the performance expectations in their charter agreements and under current Nevada law. The identification of a charter school as falling within the category of Priority or Focus schools under the provisions of this flexibility application, and the subsequent improvement planning and implementation of any improvement plan by such a school, shall not be used as evidence to delay or avoid closure if the school is failing to meet the terms of its charter agreement.

Equitable Distribution of Teachers (EDT)

The NDE will continue to provide technical assistance to districts where there is inequitable distribution of "experienced" teachers. These districts will continue to analyze, revise, and submit their EDT plans to the NDE to ensure the strategies that are designed and implemented actually result in increasing equitable distribution of teachers and closing the achievement gap.

District Engagement in Needs Assessment, Improvement Planning, and Implementation

Stakeholders in Nevada have agreed that schools are the primary unit of change for increasing outcomes in student achievement. The role of the school district is critical in supporting the school to improve. The framework described at the top of this section demonstrates various ways in which district leaders will engage in negotiated processes with school leaders along the continuum of autonomy and managed performance. In addition, there may be instances in which an analysis of school district policies, procedures, and practices is needed in order to determine LEA capacity to support school improvement. Such a need might be evidenced by a disproportionately higher number of schools that are classified as 3-Star schools or lower rather than just a percentage of an LEA's schools classified as such. Numbers and percentages are difficult to determine with finality due to the variability of district size with regard to numbers of schools. In Clark County, there are more than 300 schools whereas in some of our very small districts, there are four or fewer schools. To demonstrate how this might play out, consider this example: an LEA with a total of six schools might have two of those schools identified as 3-Star or lower, while a similarly-sized LEA might only have one such school classified as Level or below. The proportions for these two LEAs would

NSPF Indicators within a Point-Based System

School Level	Growth	Status	Gap	Graduation	College/Career Readiness	Other	Total
Elementary Middle Schools	40	30	20			10	100
High Schools	Growth proxy in Status & Gap	30	10	30	16	14	100

Charter School Assurances

- NSPF will classify and identify Priority and Focus schools without regard to their charter/non-charter status.
- However, nothing in the NSPF shall interfere with the autonomy and accountability of charter schools as defined by NV charter law and regulations.
- NSPF will be implemented in a way that will protect the authority of charter sponsors to close low-performing charter schools under their timeframes and according to the performance expectations in their charter agreements.

Key changes concerning the adoption of NSPF

- Multiple weighted measures
- Eliminates “all or nothing” outcomes
- Emphasizes both growth to a standard (AGP), normative growth (SGP), status, and the over-arching importance of preparing all students for college-and career readiness
- Allows for a mission specific measure to be placed in the “other” indicator category
- Aligned to Common Core Standards
- Move to Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium—complete on-line testing by 2014-2015
- N-count threshold lowered to 10 students—creation of “supergroups” when a school does not have at least 10 students within each “subgroup”
- Identified “subgroups” reported will be FRL, IEP, and ELL
- Participation rates lower than 95% will result in 1 star classification regardless of NSPF index value
- Graduation rate less than 60% will result in priority designation regardless of NSPF index value

New star classification system based on Percentile Ranking

- 5 star 90th percentile and above
- 4 star 89th percentile to 75th percentile
- 3star 74th percentile to 25th percentile
- 2 star 24th percentile to 5th percentile
- 1 star below the 5th percentile

New Designations

- Reward (Highest Performing, High Progress, Exemplary)
- Focus (low “subgroup” performance)
- Priority (low “all students” performance)

Elementary/Middle School Index (100 points)			
Growth—40 points		Math	Reading
		10	10
		10	10
School Median Growth Percentile (MGP)			
Overall % of Students meeting adequate growth percentiles (AGP)		15	15
Status—30 points			
Gap—20 points		10	10
Other—10points			
Other Indicator—Average Daily Attendance or Mission Specific			

High School Index (100 pts)			
Status/Growth—30 points		Math	Reading
		5	5
		5	5
		5	5
Overall % of 10 th grade meeting Proficiency			
Cumulative % of 11 th grade meeting Proficiency			
Median growth percentile for 10 th grade			
Gap—10 points		5	5
Cumulative % of 11 th grade IEP, ELL, FRL proficiency			
Graduation—30 points			15
			15
Overall graduation rate			
Graduation rate gap for IEP, ELL, FRL			4
College and Career Readiness—16 points			
			4
% of students in NV colleges needing remediation			
% of students earning an Advanced Diploma			
Advanced Placement Participation/Proficiency			
ACT/SAT Participation/Proficiency			
Other—14 points			10
			4
Other Indicator—Average Daily Attendance or mission specific			
% of 9 th graders credit deficient			

Nevada's Managed Performance Empowerment (MPE) Continuum

5-Star Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autonomy in school improvement planning, creating a 5-Star Performance Plan • Flexible use of allocations within parameters of school board policies • Site based decision making on use of core instructional materials • Pay for performance/financial incentives • Public recognition
4-Star Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autonomy in school improvement planning with school district review, creating a 4-Star Performance Plan • Negotiated flexibility between school district and school in use of allocations • Site based decision making on use of core instructional materials • Pay for performance/financial incentives • Public recognition
3-Star Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in statewide Student Achievement Gap Elimination (SAGE) school improvement planning process, creating a 3-Star Improvement Plan • Negotiated flexibility in use of allocations • Negotiated flexibility between school district and school with core instructional materials • Optional visits to model sites • Public recognition, when appropriate
2-Star Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in statewide SAGE school improvement planning process, creating a 2-Star Improvement Plan • Required engagement of district leaders to support school in uniform school improvement planning and monitoring of implementation through the NDE's established eNOTE system (i.e., WestEd Tracker platform) • Prescribed use of core instructional materials • Prescribed scheduling • Collaboration with districts and local educational associations to negotiate collective bargaining agreements and engage national resources for school turnaround • Required visits to model sites and provision of embedded professional development that aligns with strategies, including coaching and mentoring if determined necessary through data analysis • Differentiated supports negotiated by the NDE and the LEA, with a focus on capacity building of school and LEA educational leaders
1-Star Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in statewide SAGE school improvement planning process, creating a 1-Star Improvement Plan • Required engagement of district leaders to support school in uniform school improvement planning and monitoring of implementation through the NDE's established eNOTE system (i.e., WestED Tracker platform) • Prescribed use of core instructional materials • Prescribed scheduling • Collaboration with districts and local educational associations to negotiate collective bargaining agreements and engage national resources for school turnaround • Required visits to model sites and provision of embedded professional development that aligns with strategies, including coaching and mentoring if determined necessary through data analysis • Differentiated supports negotiated by the NDE and the LEA, with a focus on capacity building of school and LEA educational leaders, including engagement in University of Virginia school turnaround leadership program • Personnel changes including teaching faculty and/or leadership as recommended by LEA and approved by the NDE • Imposed turnaround principles • Reopening of schools using different delivery models • School closure based on chronic failure

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Overview and discussion of the leaver and cohort graduation rate formulas and Authority-sponsored charter school's graduation rates

<u> / / </u>	Public Workshop
<u> / / </u>	Public Hearing
<u> / / </u>	Consent Agenda
<u> / / </u>	Regulation Adoption
<u> / / </u>	Approval
<u> / / </u>	Appointments
<u> / x/ </u>	Information
<u> / / </u>	Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012

AGENDA ITEM: 8

NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Katherine Rohrer, Education Program Professional, SPCSA

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 45 mins

BACKGROUND: Katherine Rohrer will give the Authority an overview of the graduation rates in SPCSA-sponsored schools.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

A graduate is considered a student who graduates in four years or less with a standard, advanced, or adult diploma. A student who leaves school after four years with a certificate of attendance, adjusted diploma or high school equivalency diploma is not considered a graduate and cannot be included in the numerator. ACGR is pulled from school student information systems and requires clean data in order to achieve accuracy.

$$\frac{\text{Number of cohort members who earn a regular high school diploma through summer of year } x}{\text{Number of first-time 9}^{\text{th}} \text{ graders in year } x \text{ plus students who transfer in, minus students who transfer out}}$$

Example:

- 100 first-time 9th graders at the start of school year 2010/2011
- They are assigned a cohort graduation date of 2014
- Over the course of four years of high school—
 - ten students transfer to other schools,
 - five students drop-out,
 - two students fail to pass the NV proficiency exams,
 - four students transfer in

# in cohort (denominator)	Transfer out	Transfer in	Drop-out	Other non-grad	Total Grads in 2014 (numerator)
(100+4)-10=94	10	4	5	2	(94-5)-2=87

$$\frac{87}{94} = 92.55\%$$

2011 Graduation Rate for State Public Charter Schools

$$\frac{238}{855} = 27.84\%$$

46+301+325+129+248+357 = 1406 minus (transfer outs = 551) = 855 (denominator)

855 minus (drop outs, missing status, other non-grads, completers, other transfers = 617)
855-617 = 238 (numerator)

Leaver rate

The leaver rate is the percentage of students leaving high school with a standard, advanced or adult diploma compared to the total # of students leaving with a certificate of attendance or other completion credential, or who have dropped out. The leaver rate is self reported and does not take into consideration the number of years a student has taken to graduate.

Example:

Total number of graduates	# Standard Diplomas	# Advanced Diplomas	# of Adult Diplomas	# Adjusted Diplomas	# Certificates of Attendance	Drop outs
64	42	10	0	5	2	5

$$\frac{\text{\# of graduates with standard, advanced, and adult diplomas}}{\text{\# of standard diplomas + \# of advanced diplomas + \# of adult diplomas + \# of adjusted diplomas + \# of certificates of attendance + drop outs}}$$

From Example:

$$\frac{42+10+0}{64} = 81.25\%$$

2010-2011 Graduation Rates

School	# in Cohort	Graduates	Completer	Other Non-graduate	Other Transfer	Drop out	Missing Status	Transfer Out	Grad Rate Percentage
Alpine	46 (30)	15	0	2	0	10	3 (15)	16	50%
Beacon	301 (235)	38	5	23	10	130	29 (197)	66	16.2%
Connections	325 (200)	53	0	13	1	133	0 (147)	125	26.5%
NV State	129 (84)	84	0	0	0	0	0 (0)	45	100%
Virtual	248 (77)	25	0	16	0	36	0 (52)	171	32.5%
Silver State	357 (229)	23	10	0	0	178	18 (206)	128	10%

- Graduate = Standard, advanced, and adult diploma
- Completer = Certificate of attendance, adjusted diploma, high school equivalency
- Other non grad = Did not meet requirements to obtain any of the above
- Other transfer = Withdraw code of W1(a) or other transfer code not recognized as a Transfer Out
- Drop out = Withdraw code in list specified by state
- Missing status = student has missing or unrecognized completion type or withdrawal code
- Transfer out = Withdraw code in list specified by state

Contact: Dr. James Guthrie, Superintendent
700 E. Fifth Street Carson City, NV. 89701
Phone 775-687-9217 Fax 775 687 9202

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Press Release

CARSON CITY, NV. FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE, AUGUST 9, 2012 –

2010-2011 Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate for Nevada

For the first time today, the Nevada Department of Education released Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates in accordance with new U.S. Department of Education requirements for all states. All states must report graduation data for students who entered 9th grade in the 2007-2008 school year using the same specified calculation under the new four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR). In the past, states reported using a variety of self-selected methodologies, resulting in reports that could not be fairly compared nationwide.

The new ACGR tracks the movement of all students entering high school in a given year and determines how many graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years, adjusting for the students who transfer in and out. Because it can track individual students, the ACGR provides an accurate measure of the percentage of students who graduate in four years or less.

The new methodology represents a significant departure from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) formula previously used in Nevada and some other states. The NCES measured the percent of students leaving high school with a regular or advanced high school diploma, compared to a total number of students leaving with a diploma or other completion credential, or who have dropped out.

The new calculation is expected to reflect a slightly lower graduation rate nationwide as states will be tracking multiple-year student level data in their respective databases. Nevada tracks their ACGR through the state longitudinal data system entitled the System of Accountability Information for Nevada (SAIN). Therefore, since Nevada has the capacity to track students over many years, it will provide us with a more accurate measure of students who graduate in four years or less.

Since the U.S. Department of Education also allows states to calculate an extended-year graduation rate, Nevada chose to calculate a five-year ACGR in order to include students who take five years to

For Immediate Release, August 2, 2012

graduate. These five year rates will be published next year (2012-2013) and will include students who remain in school and who graduate within five years.

Besides providing a more accurate and consistent report of graduation data, the ACGR will permit a more equitable comparison of states' progress in improving graduation rate and reducing dropout rates.

2010-2011 Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates by State and District	
	Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate
State	61.98
Churchill	77.68
Clark	59.37
Douglas	82.77
Elko	74.61
Eureka	88.24
Humboldt	64.26
Lander	69.75
Lincoln	86.44
Lyon	72.71
Mineral	67.27
Nye	64.87
Carson	80.99
Pershing	72.55
Storey	87.50
Washoe	70.04
White Pine	75.61
State-Sponsored Charter Schools	27.84

- END -

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

S U B J E C T: Discussion and possible action related to the draft Performance Frameworks for SPCSA-sponsored charter schools. This discussion will center on Financial framework as well as update the Authority on the Academic and Organizational

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / x/ Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012

AGENDA ITEM: 9

NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Steve Canavero PhD, Director, SPCSA

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 30 mins

BACKGROUND: Director Canavero will discuss the draft Performance Frameworks for SPCSA-sponsored charter schools. This discussion will center on Financial framework as well as update the Authority on the Academic and Organizational.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

Analysis of Example I School

Source: Independent Audit
Source Data: Below

	2010	2009	2008
Cash	3,108,676	3,370,184	2,749,563
Current Assets	3,309,800	3,570,327	2,923,750
Non Current Assets	473,224	273,645	439,069
Total Assets	3,783,024	3,843,972	3,362,819
Current Liabilities	1,050,005	1,159,938	1,113,399
Net Assets	2,733,019	2,684,034	2,249,420
Revenue	9,898,119	9,790,797	9,642,401
Expense	9,849,134	9,356,183	9,608,464
Change in Net Assets	48,985	434,614	33,937
Current Ratio	3.15	3.08	2.63
Days Cash	115.20	131.48	104.45
Debt to Asset Ratio	0.28	0.30	0.33
Profit Margin	0.00	0.04	0.00
Cash Flow	(261,508.00)	620,621.00	

1. NEAR TERM INDICATORS

1.a. Current Ratio (Working Capital Ratio): Current Assets divided by Current Liabilities

Meets Standard:

Current Ratio is greater than 1.1

or

Current Ratio is between 1.0 and 1.1 and one-year trend is positive (current year ratio is higher than last year's)

Note: For schools in their first or second year of operation, the current ratio must be greater than 1.1.

Does Not Meet Standard:

Current Ratio is between 0.9 and 1.1

Or

Current Ratio is between 1.0 and 1.1 and one-year trend is negative

Falls Far Below Standard:

Current ratio is less than 0.9

1.b. Unrestricted Days Cash: Unrestricted Cash divided by (Total Expenses/365)

Meets Standard:

60 Days Cash

or

Between 30 and 60 Days Cash and one-year trend is positive

Note: For schools in their first or second year of operation, they must have a minimum of 30 Days Cash.

Does Not Meet Standard:

Days Cash is between 15 and 30 days

Or

Days Cash is between 30 and 60 days and one-year trend is negative

Falls Far Below Standard:

Less than 15 Days Cash

1.c. Enrollment Variance: Actual Enrollment divided by Enrollment Projection in Board-Approved Budget

Meets Standard:

Enrollment Variance equals or exceeds 95% in the most recent year and equals or exceeds 95% over each of the last three years

Note: For schools in their first or second year of operation, Enrollment Variance must be equal to or exceed 95% for each year of operation.

Does Not Meet Standard:

Enrollment Variance is between 85% and 95% in the most recent year

or

Enrollment Variance is 95% or greater in the most recent year but does not equal or exceed 95% greater each of the last three years

Falls Far Below Standard:

Enrollment Variance is less than 85% in the most recent year

No data

1.d. Default

Meets Standard:
 School is not in default of loan covenant(s) and/or is not delinquent with debt service payments

Does Not Meet Standard:
 Blank

Falls Far Below Standard:
 School is in default of loan covenant(s) and/or is delinquent with debt service payments

2. SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS

2.a. Total Margin: Net Income divided by Total Revenue and Aggregated Total Margin: Total 3 Year Net Income divided by Total 3 Year Revenues

Meets Standard:
 Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is positive and the most recent year Total Margin is positive
 or
 Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is greater than -1.5%, the trend is positive for the last two years, and the most recent year Total Margin is positive

Note: For schools in their first or second year of operation, the annual Total Margin must be positive.

Does Not Meet Standard:
 Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is greater than -1.5%, but trend do not meet standard

Falls Far Below Standard:
 Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is less than -1.5%
 or
 Current year Total Margin is less than -10%

2.b. Debt to Asset Ratio: Total Liabilities divided by Total Assets

Meets Standard:
 Debt to Asset Ratio is less than 0.90

Does Not Meet Standard:
 Debt to Asset Ratio is between 0.90 and 1.0

Falls Far Below Standard:
 Debt to Asset Ratio is greater than 1.0

2.c. Cash Flow

Meets Standard (in one of two ways):
 Three-year cumulative cash flow is positive and cash flow is positive each year
 or
 Three-year cumulative cash flow is positive, cash flow is positive in two of three years, and cash flow in the most recent year is positive

Note: For schools in their first or second year of operation, they must have positive cash flow.

~~Does Not Meet Standard:~~

Three-year cumulative cash flow is positive, but trend does not meet standard

Falls Far Below Standard:

Three year cumulative cash flow is negative

2.d. Debt Service Coverage Ratio: $(\text{Net Income} + \text{Depreciation} + \text{Interest Expense}) / (\text{Principal and Interest Payments})$

Meets Standard:

Debt Service Coverage Ratio is equal to or exceeds 1.10

Does Not Meet Standard:

Debt Service Coverage Ratio is less than 1.10

Falls Far Below Standard:

Blank

N/A

Analysis of Example II School

Source: Independent Audit
Source Data: Below

	2011	2010	2009	2008	
Cash	471,785	455,688	397,616	417,352	
Current Assets	523,047	512,461	433,756	431,484	
Non Current Assets	192,318	445,280	690,375	945,331	
Total Assets	715,365	957,741	1,124,131	1,376,815	
Current Liabilities	114,542	125,042	143,368	233,234	
Total Liabilities	289,320	299,820	318,146	408,012	
Net Assets	426,045	657,921	805,985	968,803	
Revenue	1,600,051	1,764,066	1,839,553	1,907,653	
Expense	1,831,927	1,912,130	2,002,371	1,738,976	
Change in Net Assets	(231,876)	(148,064)	(162,818)	168,677	
	2011	2010	2009	2008	3 YR
Current Ratio	4.57	4.10	3.03	1.85	
Days Cash	94.00	86.98	72.48	87.60	
Debt to Asset Ratio	0.40	0.31	0.28	0.30	
Profit Margin	(0.14)	(0.08)	(0.09)	0.09	
Cash Flow	16,097.00	58,072.00	(19,736.00)		

1. NEAR TERM INDICATORS

1.a. Current Ratio (Working Capital Ratio): Current Assets divided by Current Liabilities

Meets Standard:

Current Ratio is greater than 1.1

or

Current Ratio is between 1.0 and 1.1 and one-year trend is positive (current year ratio is higher than last year's)

Note: For schools in their first or second year of operation, the current ratio must be greater than 1.1.

Does Not Meet Standard:

Current Ratio is between 0.9 and 1.1

Or

Current Ratio is between 1.0 and 1.1 and one-year trend is negative

Falls Far Below Standard:

Current ratio is less than 0.9

1.b. Unrestricted Days Cash: Unrestricted Cash divided by (Total Expenses/365)

Meets Standard:

60 Days Cash

or

Between 30 and 60 Days Cash and one-year trend is positive

Note: For schools in their first or second year of operation, they must have a minimum of 30 Days Cash.

Does Not Meet Standard:

Days Cash is between 15 and 30 days

Or

Days Cash is between 30 and 60 days and one-year trend is negative

Falls Far Below Standard:

Less than 15 Days Cash

1.c. Enrollment Variance: Actual Enrollment divided by Enrollment Projection in Board-Approved Budget

Meets Standard:

Enrollment Variance equals or exceeds 95% in the most recent year and equals or exceeds 95% over each of the last three years

Note: For schools in their first or second year of operation, Enrollment Variance must be equal to or exceed 95% for each year of operation.

Does Not Meet Standard:

Enrollment Variance is between 85% and 95% in the most recent year

or

Enrollment Variance is 95% or greater in the most recent year but does not equal or exceed 95% greater each of the last three years

Falls Far Below Standard:

Enrollment Variance is less than 85% in the most recent year

No data

1.d. Default

~~Meets Standard:~~

School is not in default of loan covenant(s) and/or is not delinquent with debt service payments

Does Not Meet Standard:

Blank

Falls Far Below Standard:

School is in default of loan covenant(s) and/or is delinquent with debt service payments

2. SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS

2.a. Total Margin: Net Income divided by Total Revenue and Aggregated Total Margin: Total 3 Year Net Income divided by Total 3 Year Revenues

~~Meets Standard:~~

Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is positive *and* the most recent year Total Margin is positive

or

Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is greater than -1.5%, the trend is positive for the last two years, *and* the most recent year Total Margin is positive

Note: For schools in their first or second year of operation, the annual Total Margin must be positive.

Does Not Meet Standard:

Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is greater than -1.5%, but trend do not meet standard

~~Falls Far Below Standard:~~

Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is less than -1.5%

or

Current year Total Margin is less than -10%

2.b. Debt to Asset Ratio: Total Liabilities divided by Total Assets

~~Meets Standard:~~

Debt to Asset Ratio is less than 0.90

Does Not Meet Standard:

Debt to Asset Ratio is between 0.90 and 1.0

Falls Far Below Standard:

Debt to Asset Ratio is greater than 1.0

2.c. Cash Flow

~~Meets Standard (in one of two ways):~~

Three-year cumulative cash flow is positive *and* cash flow is positive each year

or

Three-year cumulative cash flow is positive, cash flow is positive in two of three years, *and* cash flow in the most recent year is positive

Note: For schools in their first or second year of operation, they must have positive cash flow.

Does Not Meet Standard:

Three-year cumulative cash flow is positive, but trend does not meet standard

Falls Far Below Standard:

Three year cumulative cash flow is negative

2.d. Debt Service Coverage Ratio: $(\text{Net Income} + \text{Depreciation} + \text{Interest Expense}) / (\text{Principal and Interest Payments})$

Meets Standard:

Debt Service Coverage Ratio is equal to or exceeds 1.10

Does Not Meet Standard:

Debt Service Coverage Ratio is less than 1.10

Falls Far Below Standard:

Blank

N/A

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Discussion and possible action related to the SPCSA FY14/15 budget. The discussion will include the performance measures as required by the Priorities and Performance Based Budgeting

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / / Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012

AGENDA ITEM: 10

NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Steve Canavero PhD, Director, SPCSA

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 30 mins

BACKGROUND: Director Canavero will discuss the SPCSA FY14/15 budget. The discussion will include the performance measures as required by the Priorities and Performance Based Budgeting.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

Priorities and Performance Based Budgeting SPCSA FY14/15 Budget

- **Quality Charter School Authorizing**
 - Percent of schools meeting academic performance
 - Percent of 3rd graders meeting reading proficiency
 - Percent of Essential Practices adopted
- **Technical Assistance and Support**
 - Dollars saved through shared services
 - Percent of schools meeting data quality standards
 - Percent of schools meeting compliance expectations
- **Pass Through**
 - N/A

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Update on the successful administration and implementation of federal entitlement programs.

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / / Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012

AGENDA ITEM: 11

NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Angela Blair, Education Program Professional, SPCSA

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 30 mins

BACKGROUND: Angela Blair will update on the successful administration and implementation of federal entitlement programs.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

1. Update on the successful administration and implementation of federal entitlement programs.
 - a. **Special Education Part B**
Amount of money per school will be based on Special Education Child Count as of Oct. 1 the previous school year. New schools will be able to access their Part B funds in the Spring. All schools must submit a detailed narrative and spending plan through the e-Page system of DOE.
 - b. **Title I**
The SPCSA, acting as the LEA for Title I, collectively qualified for \$971,800.00 based on 1929 as our poverty count for 2011-12 school year.

The 7 schools chosen to receive Title I monetary assistance for this coming school year had higher FRL percentages than SPCSA's total FRL average. The dispersement of funds will be \$347.43 per FRL qualified student. The breakdown per school is as follows:

<u>School</u>	<u>Total FRL Students</u>	<u>School Allocation</u>
(1.) NV Connections	576	\$200,119.84
(2.) Imagine MTN View	50	\$ 17,371.51
(3.) Alpine Academy	37	\$ 12,854.92
(4.) Nevada State HS	73	\$ 25,362.41
(5.) Discovery	54	\$ 18,761.23
(6.) Quest Academy	166	\$ 57,673.43
(7.) Nevada Virtual Academy	973	\$338,049.66
(8.) SPCSA, Mandatory Set Asides		\$301,607.00

(Note: The amount not spent in "set asides" will be able to be rolled over into the next fiscal year and funneled back to our schools.)

We are currently developing the District Improvement Plan (DIP) in conjunction with these 7 schools' School Improvement Plans (SIP). Our plans must be Targeted Assistance focused which means that our schools can target the students who need the extra support and instruction to progress in their education. We will be meeting on Sept. 10th to finalize our DIP and have invited DOE's Title I Director, Janie Lowe, and another Title I Consultant, Kathy Robson, to join us so that we can get any questions, issues, and/or concerns answered in person with the key administrators all together. Once the DIP is complete, I will enter our plan into the DOE e-Page system. It then goes through a 5 level approval system. Because this is a new budget, the Internal Finance Committee (IFC) must approve our new budget which should take place in October. Once this has been approved, our schools can then request funds to be reimbursed.

- c. **Title II a**
Our Title II a funds this year are \$238,537.00.

These funds must be targeted to schools who:

- (1.) Have the lowest proportion of highly qualified teachers
- (2.) Have the largest average class size, or
- (3.) Are identified for school improvement under Section 1116(b) of Title 1-A [Section 2122 (b)(3)]

We are gathering data now to consider whether to target funds, to help meet Title I responsibilities:

- (1.) By working in consultation with schools as they develop and implement their plan or activities under Section 1119 [Section 1112 (c)(I)(H)],

- (2.) by complying with the requirements of Section 1119 regarding the qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals and professional development {Section 1112 (c) (I)(H), and/or]
- (3.) by ensuring, through incentives for professional development, recruitment programs etc. that low-income students and minority students are not taught at high rates than other students by unqualified, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers.

d. **Title III, English Language Learners**

Our schools only identified 66 students who qualify for ELL services. We needed around 87-90 students to qualify for the minimum amount of \$10,000.00 to be awarded to the SPCSA as the LEA. I attribute this to most of our schools not having a home language survey in their enrollment packet to identify students; a late start in the year at trying to identify and screen students; and the changing of personnel at a charter school this past school year without communicating the need to follow through with the process.

All schools currently have a home language survey in their enrollment packet and all have identified representatives so that I can communicate pertinent information to the schools.

We were awarded **\$5,200.00 for the Migrant** numbers of students that were identified towards the end of the last school year. This money will be targeted for Professional Development such as sheltered instruction for our schools personnel who could benefit from this training.

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Report on the letters of intent received by the Authority as of August 24 and discussion related to the application review process and timeline.

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / / Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012
AGENDA ITEM: 12
NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Steve Canavero PhD, Director, SPCSA

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 15 mins

BACKGROUND: Director Canavero will report on the letters of intent received by the Authority as of August 24 and discussion related to the application review process and timeline.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

Letters of Intent Received as of August 21, 2012

1. **Sterling Charter High School**
 - a. Lyon
 - b. At-risk

2. **Promise Academy**
 - a. Clark
 - b. At-risk
 - c. ELL

3. **American Preparatory Academy**
 - a. Clark
 - b. At-risk

4. **Legacy International**
 - a. Clark
 - b. Distance Education

5. **Doral Academy**
 - a. Clark

6. **Nevada Performance Academy**
 - a. Carson City

7. **Imagine Centennial**
 - a. Clark

8. **Silver State Virtual Academy**
 - a. Clark
 - b. Distance Education

9. **Ben Gamla**
 - a. Clark

10. **Northern Nevada High School**
 - a. Washoe

11. **Leadership Academy of Nevada**
 - a. Clark
 - b. Distance Education

12. **Las Vegas Preparatory Academy**
 - a. Clark

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Discussion and possible action related to the consideration of an independent third party evaluation of the operation of charter schools in Nevada. Discussion may include the purpose of the study and interaction with strategic plan.

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / x/ Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012

AGENDA ITEM: 13

NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Steve Canavero PhD, Director, SPCSA

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 30 mins

BACKGROUND: Director Canavero will report on the consideration of an independent third party evaluation of the operation of charter schools in Nevada. Discussion may include the purpose of the study and interaction with strategic plan.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Discussion and possible action on the development of a subcommittee of the Authority empowered to speak on behalf of members at the legislature.

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / x/ Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012
AGENDA ITEM: 14
NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Kathleen Conaboy, Chair, SPCSA

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 30 mins

BACKGROUND: Chair Conaboy will lead discussion and possible action on the development of a subcommittee of the Authority empowered to speak on behalf of members at the legislature.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Discussion and possible action identifying future agenda items.

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / x/ Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012
AGENDA ITEM: 15
NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Kathleen Conaboy, Chair, SPCSA

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 15 mins

BACKGROUND: Chair Conaboy will lead discussion and possible action identifying future agenda items.

SUBMITTED BY: _____

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

SUBJECT: Member Comment.

- / / Public Workshop
- / / Public Hearing
- / / Consent Agenda
- / / Regulation Adoption
- / / Approval
- / / Appointments
- / x/ Information
- / / Action

MEETING DATE: August 24, 2012

AGENDA ITEM: 16

NUMBER OF ENCLOSURE(S):

PRESENTER(S): Kathleen Conaboy, Chair, SPCSA

RECOMMENDATION:

FISCAL IMPACT:

BUDGET ACCOUNT (FOR PRINTING CHARGES ONLY):

LENGTH OF TIME EXPECTED FOR PRESENTATION (IN MINUTES): 10 mins

BACKGROUND:

SUBMITTED BY: _____