

Cross-Sector Collaboration Case Studies Preliminary Research Findings

This document provides EducationCounsel's preliminary research on district-charter collaboration efforts in other U.S. cities. It is intended to serve as a pre-read for the March 21 DC Cross-Sector Collaboration Task Force (Task Force) meeting. We hope that it can support the Task Force's work by providing case studies of successful collaboration efforts and obstacles to collaboration on topics related to Task Force goals. After embedding feedback from the Task Force and conducting any follow up research, we plan to release the full brief.

During our research process, we reviewed 18 cities in total, examining them for the strength of collaboration and some alignment with DC's own context. The ten case studies here (including DC) have at least some readily available evidence of cross-sector collaboration in a policy or practice area related to the Task Force's goals. Most research is based on publicly available written sources, though we are working to round out our findings through interviews with leaders in several case study cities.¹

Each city is described in more detail below, starting with a box that summarizes key contextual factors and a summary of our preliminary findings. (All enrollment information is based on the most recently available data.) Each case study then highlights efforts related to:

- **Collaboration structure:** What agreement or body structures efforts to collaborate in the city? What are the city's major accomplishments and challenges related to collaboration?
- **Accountability/Data Reporting:** Given federal and state requirements common to all public schools, do students and parents have access to data and information common to both traditional and charter public schools? Is there a common ratings system or other public reporting tool?
- **Facilities:** Are traditional and charter public schools co-located? If so, are there policies that define those relationships? Does the district use collaboration and common standards to make decisions about school openings and closings?

In a few cases, additional information is provided about particularly promising practices in **other areas** (e.g., special education in Denver; common expulsion policies in New Orleans). Please note that we have not focused on collaboration efforts in areas not currently identified within the Task Force's goals; joint professional development programs, for example, are common collaborative efforts elsewhere.

Though each city has approached collaboration in its own way, there are some common themes:

- **Common goals for collaboration.** Most cities aim to create common enrollment systems and tools to provide students and parents with common data and information for all schools.
- **Conditions that tend to promote collaboration.** The cities with more robust collaboration efforts appear to share a commitment to finding solutions to common challenges that can make a difference for schools, students, and families. They also have a representative decision making

¹ Many of our findings relate to [District-Charter Collaboration Compacts](#) established in most cities studied. For the last five years, the Gates Foundation has supported the initiation and implementation of these compacts in 21 U.S. cities. Each compact is different, but common themes include joint professional development for educators, Common Core implementation, personalized learning experiences for students, universal enrollment systems, and common metrics to help families evaluate all schools more consistently. We also benefitted from the research within the National Charter School Resource Center's [District-Charter Collaboration: A User's Guide](#) (2015).

body to shepherd collaborative efforts, start small with initiatives that are later scaled, engage with students and parents, promote collaboration among leaders and educators alike, and have relative stability in budget and school population. Philanthropic support can also promote collaboration, though has not always led to successful collaboration absent these other factors.

- **Conditions that tend to hinder collaboration.** Collaboration has been met with challenges in all the cities we reviewed. Common hurdles include: challenging local and state politics, a history of mistrust between sectors, a lack of a decision making body charged with overseeing collaborative efforts, an absence of collaboration among educators and in schools, and an agenda shaped by external advocates rather than the community's own priorities and needs.

The chart below summarizes our preliminary findings for the eleven cities.

City	Students served by charter schools	Authorizer Structure	Summary of Preliminary Findings
Washington, DC	45% charter	Independent board authorizes charters	Collaboration efforts in DC are expanding. In addition to the Task force, initiatives like My School DC and the School Equity Reports are evidence that partnership is possible and can have a positive impact on students and families.
Chicago, IL	14% charter	District authorizes charters	Collaboration in Chicago has led to some successes (e.g., new facilities funds for charters and a cross-sector committee that created common accountability tools), but tense local politics have often been a challenge.
Denver, CO	17% charter	District authorizes charters	Denver has significant collaboration efforts that have led to co-location of charter and district schools as well as an expansion of inclusive centers for students with significant disabilities.
Hartford, CT	6.2% charter	State DOE authorizes charters; state legislature then decides to fund	Collaboration in Hartford has been plagued by charter school scandal and difficult state politics, though it has had some successes (e.g., a common enrollment system and joint professional development).
Los Angeles, CA	23% charter	District and state board authorize charters	Collaboration efforts in Los Angeles have achieved common accountability tools and standardized policies for co-location, despite tensions between the district school board and charter school operators.
Nashville, TN	10% charter	District, state, and state-led district authorize charters	In Nashville, many charter and district schools use a common report card, the Academic Performance Framework, to share information about school performance.
New Orleans, LA	93% charter	District and state-led district authorize charters	Collaboration in New Orleans led to the development and implementation of a unified set of expulsion policies.
NYC, NY	8% charter	State, state university, and	Collaboration in New York City is facilitated by the NYC Collaborates initiative, which highlights and fosters

		district authorize charters	positive cross-sector interactions despite ongoing local political tensions.
Philadelphia, PA	33% charter	District authorizes charters	A history of loose charter authorizing and severe district fiscal challenges have hampered collaboration in Philadelphia, though it has had some success through the Renaissance Schools Program, where the district invites charter operators to run low-performing schools.
Spring Branch, TX	4% charter	State DOE and district authorize charters	Collaboration in Spring Branch has produced several successes, including common accountability tools, shared locations and resources, and a cross-sector steering committee. But its success also shows that true collaboration is not easy to achieve.
Tulsa, OK	3.4% charter	District and local university authorize charters	Though cross-sector collaboration in Tulsa is a relatively recent development, district and charter leaders have committed to sharing facilities and developing a common school performance framework.

Washington, DC

Background: In SY2015-16, charter schools served 45% of all DC public school students; there are 111 district public schools, 114 public charter schools, and 63 Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in Washington, DC.

Governance: The Mayor oversees District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS). There is one authorizer – the DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB). PCSB is independent and reports to a Board of Directors. The Mayor appoints members of the board. Individual charter schools are accountable to their own particular board of directors and to the PCSB through their charter agreement.

Collaboration Structure

- Created in 2015-16, the DC Cross-Sector Collaboration Task Force has been charged with developing a report for the Mayor with clear and fair recommendations on how to improve the coherence of public education in DC for parents and increase the collaboration across and among public schools; this initiative aims to improve effectiveness, efficiency, and student outcomes. The Task Force will focus its efforts on identifying key aspects of education that would benefit from cross-sector efforts between DCPS and public charter schools.
- DCPS and PCSB generally operate independently of one another and each entity makes its own decisions about schools under its authority, without input or discussion from the other.
- District and charter leaders have occasionally come together to identify and address mutual challenges that impact families. Two such examples of cross-sector collaboration are found in the My School DC common lottery system and School Equity Reports initiative.
- There are some valuable lessons to be learned from the collaboration that resulted in the [My School DC](#) and School Equity Reports initiatives, such as the importance of district and charter leaders having equal voice in the decision-making process and also an equal willingness to identify and address gaps within the quality of service offered to DC students and families.

Accountability/Data Reporting

- Currently, there are three systems of accountability. The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) uses one framework, based on federal requirements related to ESEA and IDEA, to hold all LEAs accountable (DCPS and charter). Then, each sector has its own accountability framework. PCSB holds charter schools accountable with its Performance Management Framework (PMF) and DCPS uses a combination of tools to hold schools accountable.
- Although DC's accountability systems are not fully aligned and do not share all of the same performance indicators, the district and charter sectors have some history of collaboration under the Race to the Top Initiative where LEAs collaborated on a variety of initiatives, including data sharing, professional development and teacher evaluation.
- With the implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), district leaders are hopeful that both sectors will work collaboratively to develop an inclusive accountability system that respects the differences and uniqueness of both sectors.

Facilities

- Charter schools receive a facilities per-pupil allotment as part of the per-pupil funding formula, but are not part of the District's capital budget.
- Current law requires that public charter schools be given right of first offer to make use of surplus and vacant district public school buildings.

- The city currently has few co-located school buildings, but does not have clear co-location policies or process in place. This makes it difficult to increase the number of co-located schools.
- Charter schools, which are often authorized before facilities have been secured, struggle to find suitable facilities – both in vacant school buildings and other real estate options.
- Facility needs in the charter community are greater than the available District buildings. A comprehensive plan is needed to address this.

Chicago, IL

Background: In 2014-15, charter schools served 57,519 (14%) of all Chicago public school students; 150 of 650 public schools are charters. Charter-district relations in Chicago have some bright spots, though local politics have cast a long shadow over the success of efforts to collaborate.

Governance: Currently, Chicago Public Schools (CPS) authorizes charter proposals in the city. CPS receives about 20 charter applicants annually; between 2012 and 2015, 31 approved charter campuses opened. For the 2014 and 2015 charter application review cycle, CPS created [Neighborhood Advisory Councils](#) that provided feedback from families and communities on charter applications to open schools in their area and made recommendations to the district and board of education. (In 2015, the Councils were led by independent facilitators to eliminate concerns that the district was overly influencing the process.) Proposals rejected by CPS may be appealed to the Illinois State Charter School Commission, which has authority to overrule local school boards' chartering decisions.

Collaboration Structure

- Chicago has a [district-charter collaboration compact](#) that was signed in 2011 and aimed to create a streamlined application process for all schools and common performance measures for district and charter schools primarily aimed at helping families compare schools in their neighborhoods. It is one of the more detailed, bold district-charter compacts to date.
- A [2015 progress report](#) applauded the city for "substantial wins for both sides," including increased funding for all schools (after joint lobbying efforts), new facilities dollars for charters, and a cross-sector committee that created common accountability tools (described below).
- The Compact's Leadership Collaborative continues to bring district and charter leaders together for joint professional development.
- Still, the progress report deemed the current status of collaboration as "marginal" due to significant political challenges in the city, primarily due to tensions between Mayor Emmanuel and the teachers' union. A plan to create a common enrollment system, for example, stalled in the midst of the 2012 CPS CEO turnover and the 2013 teacher strike and school closures, though interest remains in revisiting the idea.

Accountability/Data Reporting

- The [School Quality Rating Policy](#) (SQRP) was designed by a cross-sector committee and implemented in the 2013-14 school year. Its purpose is to:
 - Communicate to parents and community members about the academic success of individual schools and the district as a whole;
 - Recognize high achieving and high growth schools and identifying best practices;
 - Provide a framework for goal-setting for schools;
 - Identify schools in need of targeted or intensive support; and
 - Guide the Board's decision-making processes around school actions and turnarounds.
- The five-tiered system provides parents with annual ratings of all public and public charter schools across multiple metrics, including student test score performance, student academic growth, closing of achievement gaps, school culture and climate, attendance, graduation, and preparation for post-graduation success.
- SQRP ratings are currently available to the public on the CPS website as an Excel spreadsheet, but the Illinois Network of Charter Schools is working to make the data more accessible to the

public. CPS also has an SQRP calculator to help schools identify the targets needed to achieve a particular level.

- Schools may receive a Quality Rating of 1+, 1, 2+, 2, or 3. (For CPS schools, a rating of 2 or 3 leads to district-led interventions.
- According to the 2015 progress report, an ongoing challenge has involved school discipline because CPS's current data definitions do not allow for the measurement of charter schools' unique disciplinary practices.

Facilities

- CPS established [student-based budgeting](#) that, according to the progress report, "provides equity for both district and charter schools and helps tie spending decisions to the classroom in both systems."
- Currently, about [23 charter schools are co-located within CPS schools or other charters](#) and co-location has been a major theme in public discussions about new charters opening.
- All co-location arrangements must abide by the [CPS Shared Facility Policy](#) (adopted in 2005 as part of an effort to create more small schools), which describes:
 - How to identify potential shared facility opportunities based on building underutilization;
 - Comprehensive space analyses to determine space allocation based on each school's programmatic needs; and
 - The submission of an MOU by all schools sharing the CPS facility, agreeing to overarching principles shared by all schools, governance of the facility by a CPS-designated Campus Manager, regular communication between schools, and common areas within the building.
- According to the progress report, with one exception, the challenging political environment has prevented charter schools from opening at sites of 50 recently closed CPS schools (despite the potential cost savings and blight prevention that the move could provide).

Denver, CO

Background: In 2014-15, charter schools served 14,760 (17%) of all Denver public school students; in 2015-16, 52 of 199 public schools are charters.

Governance: Throughout Colorado, charters may be authorized either by the local school district or the Colorado Charter School Institute, an independent agency housed within the Colorado Department of Education, however, in Denver, all currently existing charter schools are authorized by Denver Public Schools (DPS). DPS a public document called the "[Call for New Quality Schools](#)" to articulate projected needs for new schools and to describe the process for "inviting proposals to meet the needs, facilitating a quality review of these proposals, engaging community, and supporting DPS Board decision-making."

Collaboration Structure

- Denver has a [district-charter collaboration compact](#) that was signed by the Superintendent, Office of School Reform and Innovation (OSRI), and all DPS charter schools in 2010. It is guided by [commitments](#) to "the three equities of responsibility, access, and accountability; the value of sharing best practices and collaborating among multiple school types; and sustaining charter school autonomy."
- Denver is considered the leading national model Compact.
- The [District-Charter Collaborative Council](#) serves to discuss and develop policy recommendations and is the primary mechanism for collaboration between the two sectors. The council is a nine member body comprised of leaders from the district and charter communities. Policy recommendations developed by the Council are presented to the Superintendent and then to the Board of Education, as appropriate.
- A [2016 progress report](#) applauded the city for instituting a common enrollment system and developing a unified accountability system. The report deemed the status of the collaboration as mature, but noted that the city should be wary of losing momentum as their large Compact grant is set to expire and key administrators are stepping down.

Accountability/Data Reporting

- Denver's [School Performance Framework](#) (SPF) incorporates measures such as growth, proficiency, engagement, and college and career readiness to calculate ratings for all public schools. Results from the SPF are used to guide district decisions around charter school contracts, interventions, and resource allocation. The results also allow parents to compare schools and influence employees' compensation.

Facilities

- DPS allows high performing charter schools to utilize district facilities with underused space, establishing [Shared Campuses](#). Nearly half of DPS charter schools are co-located with other schools in district facilities. This can help defray costs of underutilized space, avoid additional construction and maintenance costs, promote choices for families, and allow for creation of new schools at lower price.
- In each Shared Campus arrangement, the District prepares a binding [Memorandum of Understanding](#) (MOU) to be signed by schools sharing the campus which specifies how the schools will operate on the Shared Campus. The MOU and accompanying Annual Sharing Agreement must be signed by all schools on the campus each year. These detail the operating

principles and dispute resolution process, as well as spaces to be shared or utilized by only one school.

- [Lessons learned](#) from shared campuses include: school leaders need frequent communication; campuses must include all schools in communications; each principal needs equal say in building use; intentional events for all campus staff to interact are essential to create collegial relationships; and creating shared behavior expectations and values for the campus helps establish clear expectations for staffs and students campus wide.

Other: Special Education

- DPS currently has 132 centers (special self-contained classrooms for students with uncommon or severe special needs) in district and charter schools serving ~1,300 students. In SY14-15 9 charters enrolled 58 students in K-12 center programs. It is projected that, by SY19-20, 40 charter school centers will enroll 300 students, mirroring their share of overall student enrollment.
 - These services are not available at every school, so students are generally assigned to the closest program that meets their needs.
- The goals of placing centers in charter schools is to ensure that program exists where there is geographic need and to ensure that students with disabilities have access to high-quality charter schools.
- Denver district officials have been opening special centers for students with significant disabilities (severe or uncommon) inside high-performing charters across the city since 2010.
- DPS is involved in the setup and rollout of the center programs (developing strong plan, answering legal questions) and then takes a backseat to the school in the day-to-day operation of the program.

Hartford, CT

Background: In 2012-13, charter schools served 1,413 (6.2%) of all Hartford public school students. The city has only two charter operators (Achievement First and Jumoke Academy), which operate eight total schools. Charter-district collaboration in Hartford has survived a resistant teachers' union and a federal investigation into Jumoke Academy's Charter Management Organization (CMO).

Governance: The Connecticut Department of Education approves charter schools in Hartford; the state legislature then decides whether or not to fund the schools. Driven by Jumoke Academy's financial mismanagement and the discovery of its CEO's criminal history, the Connecticut legislature implemented more robust charter school regulations to ensure accountability and transparency in the authorization process.

Collaboration Structure

- Hartford signed a [district-charter collaboration compact](#) in 2010 that aimed to increase accountability for low-performing schools by bringing charter schools into a portfolio management strategy with the district and help charters access more funding to expand successful schools.
- A [2015 progress report](#) applauded the city for its common enrollment system and efforts to create a pipeline for more effective district and charter principals through Achievement First's Residency program for School Leadership.
- While the progress report cites Hartford's collaboration progress as "mature," cross-sector collaboration in the city has been plagued by the local teachers union's unwillingness to participate in joint training and scandal around Jumoke Academy's mismanagement.

Accountability/Data Reporting

- The Hartford Public School District (HPS) operates under a [portfolio management strategy](#) that coordinates district and charter school closings, redesigns, or expansion according to an accountability matrix that ranks school performance and grants high-performers greater autonomy and budgetary authority.
- The district's [school performance targets](#) include data from both district and charter schools.

Facilities

- District and charter schools do not co-locate.
- HPS provides district buildings and school services like student transportation to charter schools.

Los Angeles, CA

Background: In 2014-15, charter schools served 151,310 (23%) of all Los Angeles public school students; 274 of over 900 public schools are charters. LAUSD has one of the largest charter sectors in the country; approximately 20 new charter schools are opened in Los Angeles each year. L.A.'s collaboration efforts have improved district-charter relations in some areas, but tensions between the district school board and charter school operators make greater collaboration difficult.

Governance: The Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) reviews charter school proposals and submits recommendations to the district board of education, which authorizes charter schools along with the Los Angeles County Office of Education and the California State Board of Education. L.A.'s charter sector is made up of two types of schools: fully independent or district-affiliated. District-affiliated charters go through a charter conversion process and are semi-autonomous from the district.

Collaboration Structure

- LAUSD has a [district-charter compact](#) that was signed in 2010 and aimed to set common performance standards for schools across sectors, ensure that all students have access to high-quality schools, streamline district enrollment options for parents, and improve charter access to special education funds.
- A [2015 progress report](#) applauded the city for its reorganization of special education services for charter schools, its recent co-location conference to share best practices in facilities sharing, and the creation of a School Performance Framework.
- But compact goals have not been fully realized, even in the most promising areas. District-charter leaders continue to disagree over the best way for charters to provide special education services to students. Also, there are tensions between the sectors because new charter schools are not sited in the most high-need areas.
- LAUSD staff and the L.A. Board of Education are [increasingly in disagreement](#) about whether to approve charter school proposals. Some charter school leaders believe the district is unfairly recommending the rejection of applications in an effort to slow the opening of new charter schools.

Accountability/Data Reporting

- LAUSD schools and charter schools jointly set minimum academic performance expectations and accountability metrics - the [School Performance Framework](#) - for all district and charter schools.
 - The SPF identifies academic performance standards that include both status and growth metrics and sets minimum performance expectations across all district schools and both types of charter school (district-affiliated and independent).
 - Status performance is defined by a student's absolute performance on a specific assessment.
 - Since the release of LAUSD's 2015 Smarter Balanced Assessment results, district and charter schools can look to common standardized testing data and compare status metrics across sectors.
- Under the SPF, each school receives a performance classification on a scale composed of five tiers: excelling, achieving, service and support, watch, or focus.

Facilities

- California's [Proposition 39](#) calls for charter school facilities that are "reasonably equivalent" to other district school buildings. As a result of this requirement, about 50 district and charter schools co-locate in LAUSD.
- According to the district's [Policy on Co-locations for District School Facilities](#), most interaction between co-located schools is limited to logistical concerns such as:
 - Facilities utilization;
 - Site access and availability;
 - School services;
 - Student meals; and
 - Classroom usage.
- To improve co-location relationships, LAUSD and the California Charter Schools Association (with the support of Loyola Marymount University) jointly held a [2014 Co-Location Conference](#) to offer co-located principals an opportunity to share and discuss best practices.

Nashville, TN

Background: In 2014-15, charter schools served 8,392 (~10%) of all Nashville public school students in 28 charter schools. Though Metro Nashville Public Schools (MNPS) has authorized many new charters over the last few years, there are [significant tensions](#) between members of the local school board on a variety of topics, including charters, which have precluded substantive efforts at cross-sector collaboration.

Governance: MNPS is a member of the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) and authorizes charters in the city. The Achievement School District (ASD), a district created to improve the bottom 5% of schools across the state, functions as both an operator and authorizer of public schools. The ASD only operates and authorizes charter operation in priority schools (lowest performing 5% of schools statewide). The TN State Board of Education may also authorize charters on appeal. In Nashville, all but two of the charter schools are authorized by MNPS.

Collaboration Structure

- MNPS' Office of Innovation, which houses the Division of Charter Schools, manages the districts' portfolio of charter schools and reviews charter applications. It does not appear that there are formal committees in place designed to facilitate collaboration between district and charter schools in the city.
- Nashville signed a [district-charter collaboration compact](#) in 2010 that primarily aimed to support joint professional development and the sharing of best practices. It is not clear that the compact has led to any actual collaboration.

Accountability/Data Reporting

- MNPS schools (district and charter operated) in Nashville utilize a [common report card](#) called the Academic Performance Framework (APF), which was developed with extensive feedback from community members. However, charters authorized by the ASD or State Board of Education are not required to use the APF.
- The APF requires that schools authorized or operated by MNPS be rated annually on a balanced index of multiple measures (achievement, growth, college readiness, gap closure, school culture). The results are reported on a 5-category scale (Excelling, Achieving, Satisfactory, Review, Target).

Facilities

- MNPS seeks to open new schools in communities that are experiencing overcrowding with wide-ranging educational needs, community assets, and student populations.
- In the [application for new schools](#), potential charter operators are incentivized to provide detailed and thoughtful explanations of how their proposed school will meet the unique needs of that particular community and student population. The instructions indicate that "successful applications for growth and demand will include details about how the new school will:
 - Assist in serving students currently attending schools that are overcrowded or likely to become overcrowded;
 - Offer opportunities to serve students at schools with enrollments that are rapidly declining or below a reasonable threshold;
 - Expand district capacity to respond to population growth consistent with its goals for academic excellence and diversity;

- Recruit, retain, locate and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; and
- Expand opportunities for families who are unable to access similar options at present."

New Orleans, LA

Background: In 2014-15, charter schools served 42,860 (93%) of all New Orleans public school students. New Orleans is served by two school districts: Orleans Parish Public Schools, which houses traditional and charter public schools, and the New Orleans Recovery School District (RSD), which has operated 100% charter schools since September 2014. Prior to Hurricane Katrina in 2005, New Orleans public schools were controlled entirely by the Orleans Parish School Board (OPSB). Following the storm, OPSB asserted that the school system would remain closed indefinitely, which prompted the birth of the RSD and the state-takeover of many of the city's schools, made possible by legislation that redefined what constituted a failing school and allowed the state to take over entire school districts.

Governance: Both RSD and the OPSB act as charter authorizers and portfolio managers as they close low-performing schools and allow for new schools or the expansion of existing schools.

Collaboration Structure

- The 2014 Cooperative Endeavor Agreement (CEA) defines the relationship between RSD and OPSB in three areas: educational programs and services; facility improvement; and the equitable use of funding and shared financial resources. Within the CEA, RSD and OPSB agree to, among other things:
 - Create an exceptional needs fund to serve students with the highest needs;
 - Jointly plan the number and types of schools needed citywide;
 - Utilize the Student Hearing Office and common student expulsion policies; and
 - Maintain the operation of the OneApp unified enrollment system under RSD control, and maintain the participation of OPSB direct-run schools and new charter schools to in the OneApp.
- RSD signed a [district-charter collaboration compact](#) in 2012 that primarily aimed to provide universal enrollment, improve special education services, and improve the district facilities assignment process.

Accountability/Data Reporting

- All charter schools authorized by the state participate in the [Charter School Performance Compact](#) (CSPC), which contains an intervention ladder for charter schools that fall out of compliance with legal or contractual obligations, and can be used to initiate revocation proceedings.
- All schools receive a [letter grade and annual report](#) from the state Department of Education.

Facilities

- The Orleans Parish School Board (OPSB) and the Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) passed resolutions in December 2008 and January 2009, respectively, to create the [Master Plan Oversight Committee](#) (MPOC). The MPOC's oversight responsibilities include:
 - Reviewing progress and implementation of the school facilities master plan (SFMP), and
 - Reviewing demographic changes and compare them to projections in the SFMP and recommend adjustments accordingly.
- The MPOC is composed of five members, with BESE and OPSB co-chairs.
- The MPOC has received [some criticism](#) for failing to meet regularly or engage community members. Also, a high school alumni association [filed suit](#) against the MPOC for an alleged violation of Louisiana Open Meetings Law.

Other: Common Student Expulsion Policies

- In SY12-13, RSD and OPSB came together to develop and implement a [unified expulsion policy](#) and process for their schools.
- State regulations mandated participation in the unified expulsion process for all charter schools in Orleans Parish in SY14-15. A few schools, such as virtual charter schools, are excepted.
- The unified system requires all schools to route expulsions through a central hearing office and use the same set of expellable offenses when seeking to expel a student.
- The unified system does not require schools to use same disciplinary policy for offenses other than expulsion or prevent schools from implementing their own discipline system

New York City, NY

Though we have found some promising sources, it is not fully clear to what degree collaboration has occurred or impacted systems or students in New York. We are in the process of following up with individuals who have experience in New York.

Background: At the start of the [2015-16](#) academic year, charter schools served nearly 12% of all public school students in New York City; 205 of over 1,800 public schools are charters. Compact leaders continue attempts to foster trust and build relationships between district and charter leaders and communities, but political tensions make progress difficult.

Governance: The New York State Education Department, the State University of New York, and the NYC Department of Education (NYCDOE) all authorize charter schools in New York City. While NYC's charter school sector is growing every year, a charter school cap and city Mayor de Blasio's move away from the previous closure and school replacement strategy for low-performing schools have slowed growth.

Collaboration Structure

- New York has a [district-charter collaboration compact](#) that was signed in 2010 and aimed to increase co-location and charter use of district facilities, close or reconstitute consistently low-performing schools, and improve district access to charter school student data and demographics information.
- According to a [2013 progress report](#), despite ongoing tension between sectors, compact leaders have developed [NYC Collaborates](#), "an initiative to directly advance the compact work, and organize district and charter principals and teachers to visit high-performing schools." NYC Collaborates has developed several opportunities for schools of both sectors to learn from each other, including:
 - School Study Tours highlight best practices at schools around the city.
 - The Collaboration Council brings together district and charter leaders to discuss challenges facing the city's public schools.
 - Education Policy Dialogues assemble educators, the public, and education thought leaders to discuss elevating excellence in public schools.
 - Education Leadership Collaborative is yearlong, part-time program for New York City public school educators with at least three years' experience who want to become stronger leaders and more effectively drive change in their schools. The program emphasizes peer-to-peer learning, collaboration across schools, and the exchange of ideas to improve student achievement and community service.

Accountability/Data Reporting

- As a result of the compact, NYC Charter School Center released their first ["State of the Sector"](#) report in 2012 to "provide transparent data on charter schools' student performance and demographics."
- In 2014, NYCDOE announced two [School Quality Reports](#) to be produced annually: the School Quality Snapshot and School Quality Guide are accountability tools that provide a picture of district and charter school quality based on multiple measures, including information gathered from formal school visits and evaluations; feedback from parents, students, and teachers from the NYC School Survey; and a variety of student achievement and progress measures.

- The School Quality Snapshot is a family-facing report that provides information in a format easily understood by the public.
- The School Quality Guide provides a robust set of information about each school, including several years of data so that schools' progress can be tracked easily over time.

Facilities

- Under former Mayor Bloomberg, NYCDOE pursued accountability for all schools in the city by working to close or reconstitute consistently low-performing schools and replacing them with smaller district or charter schools.
- Under current Mayor de Blasio, NYCDOE identifies low-performing schools as "Community Schools" as part of its [School Renewal Program](#). These schools are not slated for immediate closure and are instead given the resources to provide holistic supports to students and a period of three years to improve outcome measures.
- Some NYC charter schools are co-located with underutilized district schools.
- In 2014, district and charter education leaders and experts in NYC formed [The School Space Working Group](#) and released recommendations about the principles that should guide district-charter co-location in the city. These recommendations encourage the Department to:
 - Take extra steps to support space requirements of students with special needs;
 - Increase transparency and community engagement;
 - Monitor "high-risk co-locations and appoint an arbiter when school leadership teams are unable to resolve disputes themselves; and
 - Give schools that share space additional resources to coordinate schedules.

Philadelphia, PA

Interviews with Lars Beck (Task Force member) and Paul Kihn (former SDP Deputy Superintendent) were conducted to confirm and ground information contained in the summary.

Background: In 2014-15, charter schools served 64,090 students (33%) in the School District of Philadelphia (SDP); currently, there are approximately 90 charter schools in Philadelphia. In part due to financial mismanagement of many of the city's charter schools that led to a federal investigation in 2008, there is a history of mistrust of charters in Philadelphia. Also, the SDP has been in dire financial straits for several years, resulting in the district floating significant debt to maintain operations and [closing schools](#) in an effort to operate more efficiently.

Governance: SDP is the charter authorizer in Philadelphia.

Collaboration Structure

- The [Great Philadelphia Schools Compact](#) was signed in 2011 with the stated goal of replacing the poorest performing schools with high quality options by "expanding the enrollment of high performing schools; transforming, turning around, or closing low performing schools; forming new charter schools; and helping families to identify and choose high performing schools."

Accountability/Data Reporting

- A common performance framework developed by the SDP, the School Performance Report, is used across all district schools and the majority of charter schools.

Facilities

- As part of the [Renaissance Schools Initiative](#), the SDP may attempt to transform low-performing schools by establishing Innovation, Contract, or Charter schools. Contract schools are SDP schools that are managed and staffed by an external organization. Charter schools function as independent local education agencies authorized by the district. Renaissance Charter agreements include provisions for student enrollment, requiring the schools to serve the same catchment area so that they remain neighborhood schools. Since 2010, SDP has converted over 20 district schools to Renaissance Charters.
- The SDP may close, expand, or reallocate resources to schools for, among other criteria, experiencing significant growth or decline in enrollment or failing to reach and maintain adequate yearly progress. In 2009, the SDP adopted the [Facilities Rightsizing Policy](#) which clarified the criteria for combining, expanding, and closing facilities.
- In 2011, the school board voted to close four low-performing charter schools and eight schools that were under-enrolled.
- In 2013, the SDP [closed 24 of its ~240 schools](#) in an effort to better utilize its space and balance its budget.

Other: Universal Enrollment

- Though there were some efforts at developing and implementing a universal enrollment system, in the end the effort failed. A [controversial city council presentation](#) made in 2013 by the Philadelphia Schools Partnership (PSP) proposed for a private entity to match students to schools with the PhillySchoolApp. The proposal was met with severe opposition that halted any progress toward establishing a universal enrollment system.

Spring Branch, TX

Background: In 2011-12, charter schools served 1,358 (4.0%) of all public school students in Spring Branch; 6 of 41 public schools are charters. The Spring Branch partnership appears to have avoided much of the sense of competition that can define district-charter relations in other cities. Some leaders attribute this harmony to both sectors getting something of value from the partnership while also maintaining their unique identities.

Governance: The Texas Education Agency and the Spring Branch Independent School District (SBISD) both are both charter authorizers for Spring Branch.

Collaboration Structure

- The Spring Branch [district-charter compact](#) was signed in December 2011 and aimed to improve community outreach efforts, share underutilized district facilities with charters, and develop an equitable funding formula for district and charter schools.
- According to a [2015 progress report](#), "the Compact commits district leaders to provide equitable per-pupil funding for YES Prep and KIPP charter school students."
- SBISD, KIPP, and YES Prep (SKY) joined together to form the SKY Partnership Steering Committee in May 2011, months before their district-charter compact was signed.
- The SKY Partnership has achieved many of the goals it set out to accomplish: parents are more aware of their options thanks to choice fairs and common one-page descriptions for all schools and district and charter schools share everything from co-located facilities to food, transportation, and technology services.
- Collaboration in Spring Branch is not without its challenges. The district is still refining its co-location strategies to improve student performance results and decrease principal turnover.
- The Spring Branch compact established the SKY Partnership Steering Committee, composed of leaders from each partner organization. The Committee has worked to:
 - Define areas of improvement for each participating organization;
 - Update a shared online resource with all communications and documentation;
 - Create a sustainable structure and process to ensure the partnership lives beyond any personnel changes in either of the three partnership organizations; and
 - Document the collaboration's work for future partnerships and to share best practices with others.
- The SKY Partnership Steering Committee structure includes several working groups that include personnel responsible for the management of student transportation, special education, finance, and human resources.

Accountability/Data Reporting

- While SBISD uses the state's school performance framework and includes YES Prep and KIPP academic results in their score reports, the district also used the compact as the foundation to develop an [internal district accountability system](#) to further encourage the charter school integration with district schools.
- SBISD's T-2-4 initiative is a five year plan to double the number of students completing a technical certificate, military training, two-year, or four-year degree by 2017. T-2-4 measures a single metric for all students: the percentage of graduates who complete some form of higher education.

- Spring Branch, KIPP, and YES Prep (SKY) schools administer the same student surveys as part of their teacher feedback and development system.

Facilities

- As part of the SKY Partnership, one KIPP school and two YES Prep schools co-locate within three struggling and under-enrolled SBISD schools. The co-located schools in the Spring Branch District maintain their individuality in some areas, but have agreed to meld and present a united front to students in many others.
 - For example: KIPP and YES prep have maintained a longer school day and academic year than the traditional schools with which they share facilities. But the co-located schools share a mascot, similarly train college advisors, and allow all students to participate in electives and extracurricular programming together.

Tulsa, OK

Background: In 2012-13, charter schools served 1,440 (3.4%) of all Tulsa public school students; 6 of 88 public schools are charters. Despite tensions between the district and charter sectors, all district-authorized charter schools are located in district facilities, charter school enrollment of special education students has increased, and Compact leaders are working to reach agreement on a Common School Performance Framework.

Governance: The Tulsa Public Schools (TPS) and Langston University, a local HBCU, both authorize charter schools in Tulsa, though the district-charter compact only includes district-authorized charters. District and charter leaders established the Tulsa Collaboration Compact Steering Committee.

Collaboration Structure

- The Tulsa [district-charter compact](#) was signed in 2014 and aimed to create a common School Performance Framework, build a common enrollment system, and improve access to special education services at charter schools
- A [2015 progress report](#) noted that, though Tulsa has not had much time to realize all of its goals, collaboration efforts are set up for success thanks to the creation of The Tulsa Compact Steering Committee made up of district and charter leaders and principals. The Compact Steering Committee meets on a monthly basis to:
 - Plan one or more co-located schools;
 - Articulate a shared understanding of desired Compact outcomes; and
 - Define areas of improvement for all Compact schools.

Accountability/Data Reporting

- TPS and district-authorized charters provide each other with transparent and complete accountability and performance data. District and charter schools also participate in system-wide value added reporting.
- District and charter schools define and report outcomes based on common accountability standards and timelines.
- TPS and charter schools are exploring the possibility of developing a School Performance Framework that will identify common and comparable performance milestones for all schools, both district and charter.

Facilities

- Currently, district and charter schools do not co-locate in Tulsa.
- All district-authorized charter schools are located in district facilities that were once vacant or underutilized.
- As new charter schools open and existing charter schools expand, available district space may be limited. District and charter leaders are exploring the possibility of co-location, but charter schools have expressed concerns over losing autonomy.