PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING

March 1, 2018
650 W. State Street, Boise, ID 83702
Len B. Jordan Building, 3rd Floor, Clearwaters Conference Room

AGENDA

Thursday, March 1, 2018 – 650 W. State Street – 9:00 a.m.

A. Charter Renewal Consideration

1. Falcon Ridge Public Charter School
2. Heritage Community Charter School
3. Idaho Virtual Academy
4. INSPIRE Academics, Inc.
5. Idaho Science and Technology Charter School
6. Legacy Charter School
7. Monticello Montessori Charter School
8. North Idaho STEM Charter School
9. North Star Charter School
10. North Valley Academy
11. Palouse Prairie Charter School
12. Rolling Hills Public Charter School
13. The Village Charter School

B. Proposed PCSC Policy Amendments – First Reading

C. PCSC 2017 Annual Report

If auxiliary aids or services are needed for individuals with disabilities, or if you wish to speak during the regarding an agenda item, please contact the PCSC office at (208) 332-1561 or PCSC staff before the meeting opens. While the PCSC attempts to address items in the listed order, some items may be addressed by the PCSC prior to or after the order listed.
SUBJECT
Charter Renewal Consideration

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
§33-5209B
§33-5209C(7)

BACKGROUND
Idaho statute requires that authorized chartering entities periodically evaluate schools for charter renewal. In 2018, thirteen schools are scheduled for charter renewal consideration. The PCSC must make these renewal decisions by March 15, 2018. With regard to each school under renewal consideration, the PCSC may:

- Renew the school’s charter for a five-year term;
- Non-renew the school’s charter; or
- Renew the school’s charter for a five-year term, subject to specific, written conditions for necessary improvements that state the date by which the conditions must be met.

DISCUSSION
All thirteen schools under renewal consideration in 2018 were recommended for either renewal or conditional renewal. Each school was given the option of either signing an agreement (Notice and Acknowledgement of Commission’s Recommendations for Renewal of Charter) or exercising its right to a public hearing. All thirteen schools elected to forgo public hearings, instead agreeing to the recommendation for renewal or conditional renewal.

IMPACT
Any school whose charter is renewed will sign a new performance certificate for five years, effective July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2023. These certificates will incorporate the performance framework adopted by the PCSC in May 2017.

Schools whose charters are conditionally renewed will receive annual status updates regarding their outcomes relative to the conditions. If the schools fail to meet the conditions by the dates specified, the PCSC could, but would not be required to, proceed with revocation of the charter.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends that the PCSC approve the thirteen renewals and conditional renewals as agreed to by the thirteen schools.
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COMMISSION ACTION FOR FALCON RIDGE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL - Case # 18-01


Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No ______

COMMISSION ACTION FOR HERITAGE COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL-Case # 18-02


Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No 

COMMISSION ACTION FOR IDAHO VIRTUAL ACADEMY-Case # 18-03

A motion to approve Idaho Virtual Academy’s January 22, 2018 Notice and Acknowledgment of Commission’s Recommendation for Renewal of Charter and to renew its charter for a 5-year term, starting July 1, 2018. Idaho Virtual Academy must comply with the agreed upon condition set forth in the Notice and Acknowledgment of Commission’s Recommendation for Renewal of Charter.

Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No 

COMMISSION ACTION FOR INSPIRE ACADEMICS, INC.-Case # 18-04

A motion to approve Inspire Academics, Inc.’s January 22, 2018 Notice and Acknowledgment of Commission’s Recommendation for Renewal of Charter and to renew its charter for a 5-year term, starting July 1, 2018. Inspire Academics, Inc. must comply with the agreed upon conditions set forth in the Notice and Acknowledgment of Commission’s Recommendation for Renewal of Charter.

Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No 
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COMMISSION ACTION FOR IDAHO SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY CHARTER SCHOOL-Case # 18-05


Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No ______

COMMISSION ACTION FOR LEGACY PUBLIC CHARter SCHOOL-Case # 18-06

A motion to approve Legacy Public Charter School’s January 22, 2018 Notice and Acknowledgment of Commission’s Recommendation for Renewal of Charter and to renew its charter for a 5-year term, starting July 1, 2018.

Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No ______

COMMISSION ACTION FOR MONTICELLO MONTESSORI CHARTER SCHOOL-Case # 18-07

A motion to approve Monticello Montessori Charter School’s January 22, 2018 Notice and Acknowledgment of Commission’s Recommendation for Renewal of Charter and to renew its charter for a 5-year term, starting July 1, 2018.

Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No ______

COMMISSION ACTION FOR NORTH IDAHO STEM CHARTER ACADEMY, INC.-Case # 18-08

A motion to approve North Idaho Stem Charter Academy, Inc.’s January 16, 2018 Notice and Acknowledgment of Commission’s Recommendation for Renewal of Charter and to renew its charter for a 5-year term, starting July 1, 2018.

Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No ______
COMMISSION ACTION FOR NORTH STAR CHARTER SCHOOL, INC.-Case # 18-09


Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No ______

COMMISSION ACTION FOR NORTH VALLEY ACADEMY-Case # 18-10

A motion to approve North Valley Academy’s February 12, 2018 Notice and Acknowledgment of Commission’s Recommendation for Renewal of Charter and to renew its charter for a 5-year term, starting July 1, 2018. North Valley Academy must comply with the agreed upon conditions set forth in the Notice and Acknowledgment of Commission’s Recommendation for Renewal of Charter.

Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No ______

COMMISSION ACTION FOR PALOUSE PRAIRIE CHARTER SCHOOL-Case # 18-11


Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No ______

COMMISSION ACTION FOR ROLLING HILLS PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL-Case # 18-12


Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No ______
A motion to approve The Village Charter School’s January 18, 2018 Notice and Acknowledgment of Commission’s Recommendation for Renewal of Charter and to renew The Village Charter School’s charter for a 5-year term, starting July 1, 2018. The Village Charter School must comply with the agreed upon conditions set forth in the Notice and Acknowledgment of Commission’s Recommendation for Renewal of Charter.

Moved by _______ Seconded by _______ Carried Yes ______ No _______
SUBJECT
Proposed PCSC Policy Amendments (First Reading)

APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
I.C. §33-5213(2)

BACKGROUND
The PCSC adopted its current policies and procedures in 2015. Changes to statute and administrative rule made since that time require that these policies and procedures be updated.

DISCUSSION
The proposed new and amended PCSC policies included with these materials reflect discussions held previously held by the PCSC and its petition and renewal committees. They are intended to reflect current statute, administrative rule, and procedures.

IMPACT
Once adopted, the new and amended PCSC policies will take effect immediately. The PCSC may wish to consider the proposed policy and procedure amendments at a second reading during an upcoming public meeting.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends that the PCSC consider the proposed policy and procedure amendments during a second reading at its next meeting.

COMMISSION ACTION
Any action would be at the discretion of the PCSC.
IDAHO PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL COMMISSION

POLICIES & PROCEDURES

As Amended June 11, 2015
Section I: General

A. Submission of Meeting Materials

i. Regular Meeting Materials Deadline: Materials to be considered at a regular meeting of the Public Charter School Commission (PCSC) must be received by the PCSC office no later than 5:00 p.m. Mountain Time thirty (30) calendar days prior to the meeting date. Additional or revised materials will be received after this deadline only upon the specific direction of PCSC staff.

ii. Special Meeting Materials Deadline: Materials to be considered at a special meeting of the PCSC must be received by the PCSC office no later than 8:00 a.m. Mountain Time three (3) days prior to the meeting date. Additional or revised materials will be received after this deadline only upon the specific direction of PCSC staff.

iii. Meeting Materials Format: Meeting materials must be submitted electronically via electronic mail, web-based file-sharing services, or portable data storage device, or secure server provided by the PCSC office. Documents must be combined into the smallest possible number of files and be submitted in Microsoft Word, Excel, or Adobe PDF. Completed budget templates must be submitted in Excel. Materials submitted in or as more than five (5) separate electronic files will not be accepted, except in rare cases as specifically directed, in advance, by PCSC staff.

iv. Additional Materials and Handouts: No additional materials or handouts will be accepted at PCSC meetings. Rare exceptions will be made only as specifically directed by the chairman.

Section II: New and Transfer Charter School Petitions

A. Petition Consideration Timeline

i. The PCSC shall consider new and transfer charter school petitions on a timeline in compliance with Section 33-5205, Idaho Code.

ii. New and transfer charter petitions shall be considered only at regularly scheduled PCSC meetings.

iii. The PCSC shall hold an initial hearing to consider the merits of the petition within 75 days after a petition is “considered received” as defined in IDAPA 08.03.01.300.04.

iv. Pursuant to Section 33-5205(2), Idaho Code, the initial hearing on a petition may be delayed for a specified period of time by mutual, written agreement of both parties. The initial hearing for any petition may be delayed only once.

B. Standards for Petition Approval
i. In order to be eligible for approval, a charter petition must score at least a 2 on every indicator on the Petition Evaluation Rubric (PER). The PER shall be available to charter petitioners in advance of petition submission.

ii. Consideration shall be given to indicators receiving a score of 3 and thereby influencing the total points earned to demonstrate the overall strength of the petition, but such indicators shall not overrule Section II.B.1 of this policy.

iii. Petitions shall be scored against the PER by PCSC staff in advance of the PCSC’s consideration of the petition. The PCSC may, at its discretion and by formal motion, modify the PER ratings recommended by PCSC staff.

iv. The PCSC may approve a new or transfer charter petition contingent upon specific revisions that the petitioners are directed to make to PCSC staff’s satisfaction. The PCSC’s written notice of approval shall not be issued until the revisions are approved by PCSC staff. If not finalized by written notice, the PCSC’s contingent approval shall expire effective at 8:00 a.m. Mountain Time on the date of the PCSC’s next regularly scheduled meeting.

A. Petition Evaluation Process

i. New and transfer charter petitions shall be considered only at regularly scheduled PCSC meetings.

ii. Petitions shall be submitted electronically via electronic mail, web-based file-sharing services, or portable data storage device. Documents must be combined into no more than two (2) PDF documents, one comprising the body of the petition and the other the combined appendices.

iii. Petitions shall be submitted in the following format:

a. One Adobe PDF document comprising the body of the petition and all appendices, including the completed budget template; and

b. One Excel document comprising the completed budget template.

iv. Upon initial submission to the PCSC office, petitions shall be evaluated using the PER by PCSC staff. Results A written review shall be provided to the petitioning group within thirty (30) days.

v. One (1) petition revision revised petition shall be accepted by PCSC staff prior to the initial PCSC hearing, provided it is received no later than the meeting materials submission deadline described in Section I.A.i of this policy.

vi. Revised petitions shall show in legislative format all changes from the most recent version reviewed by the PCSC office staff (see The Idaho Rule Writer’s Manual, Section II.4), with the exception of changes to budget spreadsheets and PCSC templates. The “track changes” or “show markup” feature in Microsoft Word shall not be considered an acceptable substitute for legislative format.
vii. Revised petitions shall clearly show the submission date of the most recent revision on the title page.

viii. Revised petitions shall be submitted in accordance with Section II.A.ii of this policy. The entire petition, including appendices, must be submitted with each the revision in the format required by Section II.A.iii of this policy.

ix. Revised petitions shall be submitted in accordance with Section II.A.ii of this policy. The entire petition, including appendices, must be submitted with each the revision in the format required by Section II.A.iii of this policy.

x. Revised petitions that are not submitted in compliance with this section may be returned to the petitioners without further review.

xi. Revised petitions that are returned without review in accordance with Section II.A.ix of this policy may be resubmitted, with relevant corrections made, within the initial meeting materials submission deadlines imposed by described in Section I.A.i of this policy.

xii. The most recent, complete version of the petition revision in the possession of PCSC staff by 5:00 p.m. Mountain Time on the meeting materials submission deadline will be the version provided to the PCSC.

xiii. The version of the petition revision provided to the PCSC shall be accompanied by a PER written review updated to reflecting the merits of that revision version. The petitioning group shall also be provided with the updated PER results written review.

xiv. Additional revisions or supplementary documents submitted separately from the petition and/or after the materials submission deadline shall not be considered, except in rare cases and only by advance permission of PCSC staff, unless an exception is made in accordance with Section I.A.iv of this policy. Public comment on the petition is excluded from this provision.

xv. If, at the initial hearing, a decision regarding a petition is delayed pursuant to Section 33-5205(2), Idaho Code, one (1) revision will be accepted by the PCSC office within thirty (30) days.

Section III: Charter and Performance Certificate Amendments

A. Proposed Charter or Performance Certificate Amendment Consideration Timeline Process

The PCSC will consider proposed amendments to a school’s charter or performance certificate on a timeline in compliance with IDAPA 08.02.04.302.03.

Proposed amendments, other than those deemed appropriate for administrative approval in accordance with Section III.A.iv of this policy, must be submitted according to the meeting materials deadlines described in Section I.A.i.

Except as provided in Section III.A.iv of this policy, proposed charter amendments will be considered at regular meetings only.
In accordance with IDAPA 08.02.04.302.08, the PCSC delegates to the Public Charter School Commission Director authority to approve minor revisions to a school’s charter or performance certificate.

Pursuant to Section 33-5206(8), Idaho Code, proposals to increase enrollment by 10% or more of the public charter school’s approved enrollment cap shall be considered by the PCSC during a public hearing.

Proposed Charter or Performance Certificate Amendment Process

Proposed charter or performance certificate amendments shall be submitted electronically via electronic mail, web-based file-sharing service, or portable data storage device.

Proposed charter or performance certificate amendments shall be accompanied by a cover letter explaining the nature of and rationale for the proposed amendment. Supporting documentation, including budgets, shall be provided when relevant.

Documents associated with a proposed charter or performance certificate amendment must be combined into no more than two (2) files, one comprising the sections(s) of the charter or performance certificate to be amended and the other comprising the cover letter and documentation described in Section III.B.ii of this policy.

Proposed charter or performance certificate amendments must show all proposed changes in legislative format. Use of Microsoft Word’s “track changes” or “show markup” feature shall not be considered an acceptable substitute for legislative format.

One (1) revision of the proposed charter or performance certificate amendments will be accepted by PCSC staff prior to the PCSC hearing, provided it is received within the deadline established in writing by PCSC staff.

The most recent, complete version of the proposed amendment in the possession of PCSC staff by 5:00 p.m. Mountain Time on the deadline established in writing by PCSC staff shall be provided to the PCSC.

The version provided to the PCSC will be accompanied by a PER or alternate evaluation document updated to reflect the merits of the proposal. The charter holder will also be provided with the evaluation document.

Additional revisions or supplementary documents submitted separately from the proposed charter or performance certificate amendment and/or after the deadline established in writing by PCSC staff shall not be considered, except in rare cases and by advance permission of PCSC staff. Public comment on the proposed charter amendment is excluded from this provision.

The PCSC shall approve or deny a proposed charter or performance certificate amendment at the time of consideration.
The PCSC may approve a proposed amendment contingent upon specific revisions that the charter holders are directed to make to PCSC staff’s satisfaction. The PCSC’s written notice of approval shall not be issued until the revisions are approved by PCSC staff. If not finalized by written notice, the PCSC’s contingent approval shall expire effective at 8:00 a.m. Mountain Time on the date of the PCSC’s next regularly scheduled meeting.

Student-level data may be considered by the PCSC, in a manner consistent with federal and state law, for the purpose of decision-making with regard to proposed charter amendments.

i. Except as provided in Section III.A.xii of this policy, proposed charter or performance certificate amendments shall be considered only at regularly scheduled PCSC meetings.

ii. Proposed charter or performance certificate amendments shall be submitted electronically via electronic mail, web-based file-sharing service, portable data storage device, or secure server provided by the PCSC office.

iii. Proposed charter or performance certificate amendments, other than those deemed appropriate for administrative approval in accordance with Section III.A.xii of this policy, must be submitted according to the meeting materials submission deadline described in Section I.A.i.

iv. Proposed charter or performance certificate amendments shall be submitted in the following format:

a. A cover letter explaining the nature of and rationale for the proposed amendments;

b. One Adobe PDF document comprising the section(s) of the charter or performance certificate to be amended; and

c. One Adobe PDF document comprising any supporting documentation, including budgets, if applicable.

v. Upon initial submission to the PCSC office, proposed charter or performance certificate amendments shall be reviewed by PCSC staff. A written review shall be provided to the charter holder within thirty (30) days.

vi. One (1) revision of the proposed charter or performance certificate amendments will be accepted by PCSC staff prior to the PCSC hearing, provided it is received no later than the meeting materials submission deadline described in Section I.A.i of this policy.

vii. The most recent, complete version of the proposed charter or performance certificate amendments in the possession of PCSC staff by 5:00 p.m. Mountain Time on the meeting materials submission deadline shall be the version provided to the PCSC.

viii. Additional revisions or supplementary documents submitted separately from the proposed charter or performance certificate amendments or after the meeting materials submission deadline shall not be considered, except in rare cases and by advance
permission of PCSC staff. Public comment on the proposed charter or performance certificate amendments is excluded from this provision.

ix. A school’s current accountability designation and student-level data may be considered by the PCSC, in a manner consistent with federal and state law, for the purpose of decision-making with regard to proposed charter or performance certificate amendments.

x. The PCSC shall approve or deny proposed charter or performance certificate amendments at the time of the hearing at which they are considered.

xi. The PCSC may approve proposed charter or performance certificate amendments contingent upon specific revisions that the charter holders are directed to make to PCSC staff’s satisfaction. The PCSC’s written notice of approval shall not be issued until the revisions are approved by PCSC staff. If not finalized by written notice, the PCSC’s contingent approval shall expire effective at 8:00 a.m. Mountain Time on the date of the PCSC’s next regularly scheduled meeting.

xii. In accordance with IDAPA 08.02.04.302.02, the PCSC delegates to the Public Charter School Commission Director authority to approve minor amendments to a school's charter or performance certificate.

B. Standards for Charter Amendment Approval

Application of Petition Evaluation Rubric

When proposed charter amendments are closely aligned to a section of the Petition Evaluation Rubric (PER), PCSC staff will use the PER to evaluate the proposed charter amendment and make recommendations to the PCSC.

Proposed charter amendments that score at least a 2 on every relevant indicator on the Petition Evaluation Rubric (PER) are most likely to be recommended for approval. The PER will be available to charter holders in advance of amendment submission.

i. School Enrollment Expansion Eligibility

a. Enrollment expansion proposals include proposals to broaden the range of grades served or to add additional students in grades already served by a public charter school.

b. Enrollment expansion proposals for schools whose current academic accountability designation is honor or good standing shall be considered by the PCSC. A school’s current accountability designation is the designation reflected in the school’s most recent midterm annual report or renewal year performance report.

c. Enrollment expansion proposals for schools whose current academic accountability designation is remediation or critical shall not be approved for enrollment expansion are unlikely to succeed. Exception to this provision may be made on the basis of contextual factors impacting a school’s accountability designation.
d. Enrollment expansion proposals for schools whose current academic accountability designation is critical shall not be considered for approval.

e. Enrollment expansion proposals shall include documentation of the school’s capacity to serve additional students without compromising the quality of the existing program and evidence of community interest in expansion.

ii. Amendments During Non-Renewal or Revocation Proceedings

a. During non-renewal or revocation proceedings, schools may not propose the PCSC shall not consider approval of amendments to sections of the charter or performance certificate that are relevant to the reasons for possible non-renewal or revocation.

b. A school shall be considered to be in non-renewal proceedings from the time it receives written notice from PCSC staff stating that the school will be recommended for non-renewal of the charter. The school shall remain in non-renewal proceedings until such time as the PCSC moves to renew the charter.

c. A school shall be considered to be in revocation proceedings from the time the PCSC moves to issue a notice of intent to revoke the charter. The school shall remain in revocation proceedings until such time as the PCSC takes action to allow the school to continue operations, or until the State Board of Education overturns the PCSC’s revocation decision upon appeal.

Section IV: Charter School Oversight

A. Performance Certificates

i. Performance certificates for new, or transfer, or renewed non-alternative public charter schools shall include the standard current performance certificate and performance framework adopted by the PCSC in August 2013, as amended.

Performance certificates for new or transfer, alternative public charter schools shall include the standard performance certificate adopted by the PCSC in August 2013, as amended, and the alternative framework adopted by the PCSC in May 2014, as amended.

Performance frameworks for transfer petitions received after January 1, 2015, shall include mission-specific measures.

ii. In cases of proposed transfer from another authorizer to the PCSC, the draft performance certificate, including the performance framework, must be adopted executed by the PCSC and charter school board holder at the time of transfer approval.

iii. Prior to PCSC consideration, PCSC staff and charter school board members holders shall collaborate to draft those sections of the performance certificate and performance framework that are intended for individualization, including any
mission-specific performance measures that may be requested by the school or required by conditions of petition approval or charter renewal.

iv. Whenever possible, PCSC staff and the charter school board holders shall reach agreement regarding the individualized contents of the draft performance certificate and appendices, including the performance framework, prior to its submission of the draft to the PCSC for consideration.

v. If agreement regarding the individualized contents of the draft performance certificate and appendices, including the performance framework, cannot be reached in time to meet relevant timelines in statute and PCSC policy, a subcommittee of three commissioners may be formed to advise or mediate the collaborative drafting process.

B. Annual Public Charter School Performance Reports

i. An annual Public Charter School Performance Report (annual report) shall be issued by the PCSC to each school it authorizes.

ii. Annual performance reports shall be issued by November 15 to schools whose charters will expire at the end of the current school year (renewal-year schools) and by January 31 to schools whose charters will not expire at the end of the current school year (midterm schools).

iii. Annual performance reports shall provide information about schools’ statuses with regard to all applicable measures contained in the performance framework, and will provide the schools with academic, operational, and financial accountability designations based on points earned within the framework.

iv. Annual performance reports shall provide information about schools’ statuses with regard to all any conditions contained in Appendix A of petition approval or charter renewal incorporated into the performance certificate.

v. Midterm schools shall not be sanctioned on the basis of their accountability designations, except as otherwise provided in law, administrative rule, or PCSC policy, including Section III.C. The primary purpose of annual performance reports to midterm schools is to provide those schools with ample warning of any concerns that may impact renewal decision-making at the end of the performance certificate term. Midterm results annual performance reports will also provide information about a school’s changing performance over time, which will be considered in the renewal year.

vi. Midterm schools may submit corrections and clarifications to their PCSC’s annual performance reports within thirty (30) days of issuance of the performance reports. Corrections and clarifications shall be submitted to the PCSC office in writing and shall include, at minimum, a completed Annual Report Response Form clearly identifying each correction/clarification and documentation supporting each correction/clarification.

Midterm schools shall have twenty-one (21) days in which to provide, in writing and with relevant documentation, any corrections or clarifications to the annual report.
Annual reports may be amended by PCSC staff pursuant to corrections or clarifications provided by schools. When such amendments are not made, for reasons including but not limited to inadequate documentation of the correction or clarification, a notation may be included summarizing the school’s requested correction or clarification and the reason for its exclusion.

vii. Annual performance reports shall be published on the PCSC’s website no later than January 31.

C. Required Reports

i. Dashboard Reports School Leadership Updates: Each PCSC-authorized school shall submit a completed annual dashboard report School Leadership Update Form to the PCSC office no later than July 30 of each year. Dashboard reports shall be submitted using the dashboard reporting form provided by the PCSC.

ii. Budget Financial Reports: Each PCSC-authorized school shall submit the following financial reports:

   a. All budget worksheets submitted to the State Department of Education at the beginning of the fiscal year, including the Support Unit Calculation form, which is due to the PCSC office no later than July 30;

   b. Revised budgets, if applicable; and

   c. Quarterly balance sheets and income statements. Schools achieving honor status on the financial section of their most recent current annual performance reports shall be exempt from first and third quarter reporting.

iii. Independent Fiscal Audits: Each PCSC-authorized school shall submit an independent fiscal audit approved by its governing board to the PCSC office no later than October 15/November 1 of each year.

iv. Mission-Specific Performance Measure Results: Each PCSC-authorized school with a performance framework that includes mission-specific performance measures shall submit relevant results data and supporting documentation for the previous school year no later than October/August 1, or by the alternate deadline specified in the performance certificate, if applicable.

   a. Supporting documentation must demonstrate the accuracy of the results data.

   b. Schools submitting data that is inaccurate, unverifiable, or otherwise inadequate for determining a score on the framework may receive a score of zero (0) on the affected measure(s).

v. Other Reports as Requested: The PCSC or its staff may request additional reports on an as-needed basis in order to understand and monitor the school’s financial, operational, and academic status.
D. Courtesy Letters

i. Upon becoming aware of a concern regarding a school’s finances, operations, legal compliance, or academic status, PCSC staff may issue to the charter school board holder a courtesy letter advising the board charter holder of such concern. Courtesy letters will typically be issued with regard to concerns of sufficient significance as to be noted in the school’s annual performance report.

ii. Courtesy letters shall be for the purpose of ensuring that the public charter school board holder is aware of the concern and has maximum opportunity to seek resolution in advance of the next annual performance report or renewal consideration. Courtesy letters should not contain, nor be viewed as, sanctions against the charter school. Because they do not represent sanctions, courtesy letters will not be “removed” or “lifted” by the PCSC or its staff.

iii. Charter school boards holders in receipt of courtesy letters are strongly encouraged to provide PCSC staff with additional information to provide clarity or document resolution of the concern.

iv. Regardless of whether or not a courtesy letter is issued and or the charter school board holder responds, the charter school board holder remains responsible for the charter school’s operations and outcomes.

E. Notice to Entities Responsible for Legal Enforcement

i. Pursuant to Section 33-5210(4) 33-5209(4), Idaho Code, PCSC staff shall notify the entity responsible for administering a law it has reason to believe that a public charter school has violated. Such notice shall be in writing, and a copy shall be provided to the public charter school holder.

ii. In some cases of non-compliance, an entity responsible for enforcing the relevant provision of statute or administrative rule cannot be identified. In such instances, PCSC staff shall issue to the charter school’s board holder a courtesy letter ensuring the board is aware of the issue.

iii. Any sanctions against the public charter school resulting from the issuance of notice to entities responsible for legal enforcement shall be considered imposed by the entity responsible, rather than by the PCSC.

iv. Charter school boards holders are strongly encouraged to provide PCSC staff with documentation of resolution of the concern as soon as possible in order to ensure accurate reflection of the situation in the school’s annual performance report.

v. Regardless of whether or not a notice to entities responsible for enforcement is issued and or the charter school board holder responds, the charter school board holder remains responsible for the charter school’s operations and outcomes.
F. Letters Written Notification of Fiscal Concern

i. Pursuant to Section 33-5210(3) 33-5209C(3), Idaho Code, if the PCSC has reason to believe that a public charter school may not remain fiscally stable for the remainder of its performance certificate term, the PCSC shall issue to the State Department of Education a letter written notification of concern.

ii. For purposes of this section, fiscal stability shall be defined as the ability to maintain positive cash flow and positive year-end balances while servicing all obligations, without relying on revenues intended for use in future fiscal years to cover current-year operating expenditures. For purposes of determining fiscal stability:

a. Budgets shall be completed on an accrual basis, with year-end balances including encumbrance. That is, revenue intended for use in one fiscal year may not be used to demonstrate fiscal stability by covering expenditures that should have been paid using revenue from the previous fiscal year. (For example, teacher contracts for the 2015-16 school year must be paid entirely out of FY16 funds; payroll over the summer of 2016 should not be met using FY17 revenue.)

b. Cash flow projections shall be completed on a cash basis, showing actual cash amounts and projections with funds moving out at the appropriate, anticipated time.

iii. Fiscal letters written notifications of concern shall be reevaluated for continuation or removal only at the PCSC’s June regular meeting. Schools wishing to have letters written notifications of concern considered for removal shall provide updated fiscal status details and supporting documentation in accordance with Section I.A of this policy.

Section V: Renewal and Non-Renewal

A. Standards for Renewal Decision-Making

i. The PCSC shall make renewal decisions based on documented outcomes regarding a school’s academic, mission-specific (if applicable), operational, and fiscal financial performance. Such performance shall be evaluated using the provisions, conditions, and measures contained in the performance certificate and its appendices, including the performance framework.

ii. Calculation of the percentage of eligible points earned on the academic and mission-specific sections of the performance framework for each school shall determine that school’s academic accountability designation: honor, good standing, remediation, or critical. The academic accountability designation shall guide the PCSC’s renewal or non-renewal decision-making. Renewal or non-renewal decision-making shall also be influenced by results on the mission-specific, operational, and financial sections of the framework.

a. Schools achieving an academic accountability designation of honor or good standing shall be recommended for renewal. Schools that fall into the point-percentage range
for Honor but whose financial and/or operational outcomes are poor shall not be eligible for an Honor designation.

Schools achieving an academic accountability designation of good standing shall be recommended for renewal; however, conditional renewal may be recommended if financial and/or operational outcomes in other sections of the performance framework are poor.

b. Schools achieving an academic accountability designation of remediation may be recommended for non-renewal or conditional renewal, particularly if financial and/or operational outcomes in other sections of the performance framework are poor.

c. Schools achieving an academic accountability designation of critical are likely to be recommended for non-renewal, particularly if financial and/or operational outcomes in other sections of the performance framework are poor.

d. Financial or Mission-specific, operational, or financial outcomes shall be considered poor if points achieved on the corresponding section of the performance certificate framework place the school in remediation or critical status for that section.

Measures for which a school lacks data due to factors such as grade configuration or small size shall not contribute to that school’s accountability designation.

e. Student-level data may be considered by the PCSC, in a manner consistent with federal and state law, for the purposes of renewal or non-renewal decision-making.

iii. The PCSC shall consider contextual factors affecting a school’s accountability designations when making renewal or non-renewal decisions. However, renewal decisions shall be based on past outcomes, not on promises of future improvement.

iv. The PCSC shall consider trends documented in a school’s annual performance reports for the years leading up to renewal throughout the performance certificate term. Statistically significant, positive growth trends will make renewal of schools’ with remediation accountability designations more likely, while stagnant or negative growth trends will make renewal of such schools less likely. Trends may also contribute to recommendations for conditional renewal.

v. If a school fails to meet any conditions of charter approval or specific, written conditions for necessary improvement within the specified timeframes included in Appendix A of the performance certificate, non-renewal may result regardless of the school’s accountability designation.

vi. Conditional renewals shall be for periods of five years, but shall include in Appendix A of the performance certificate specific, written conditions for necessary improvement pursuant to Section 33-5209B(1), Idaho Code.
B. Renewal / Non-Renewal Process

i. No later than July 15 of their pre-renewal calendar year, schools may submit to the PCSC office optional, auxiliary performance data for consideration during the renewal process.

ii. During the spring or fall prior to a school’s renewal consideration, PCSC staff and/or contracted individuals may perform a pre-renewal site visit for the primary purpose of gathering contextual information to inform the PCSC’s interpretation of the academic, operational, and financial outcomes described in the schools’ annual performance reports and renewal applications.
   a. Schools shall have an opportunity to respond in writing to pre-renewal site visit evaluation reports.
   b. Schools achieving an honor accountability designation in all sections of their performance frameworks, as of the annual performance reports provided by January 31 of the pre-renewal year, shall be exempt from pre-renewal site visits.

iii. No later than November 15, the PCSC shall issue to all renewal-year schools an annual performance report and renewal guidance and application guidance that meets the requirements of Section 33-5209B, Idaho Code. The annual performance report shall include notification of the prospect of non-renewal, if applicable.

   Renewal-year schools may submit corrections and clarifications to their PCSC’s performance report with thirty (30) days of issuance of the performance report.
   
   Corrections and clarifications shall be submitted to the PCSC office in writing and shall include, at minimum: A completed Annual Report Response form clearly identifying each correction/clarification; and documentation supporting each correction/clarification.

iv. Except as provided in Section V.B.iv.c of this policy, renewal-year schools shall submit a completed renewal application to the PCSC no later than December 15. Renewal applications shall be submitted in accordance with the renewal guidance and application guidance provided by the PCSC and represent the charter holders’ opportunity to submit documents challenging any rationale for non-renewal and supporting the continuation of the school.
   a. Renewal applications shall be submitted to the PCSC office electronically via email, online file-sharing service, portable data storage device, or secure server provided by the PCSC office.
   b. Renewal applications shall be comprised of no more than two (2) documents: the completed application form and an Adobe PDF document providing any supporting documentation. Supporting documentation shall include a table of contents and make use of Adobe’s “bookmark” feature for ease of navigation. Additional documents in or other formats may be accepted, on a case-by-case basis, with the prior approval of PCSC staff.
Schools that fail to submit their completed renewal applications, in a format consistent with this policy, by the statutory deadline may be recommended for non-renewal.

c. Schools achieving an honor accountability designation in all sections of their performance frameworks, as of the annual performance reports provided on November 15 of the renewal year, shall be eligible for automatic renewal, and shall be exempt from the required submission of a renewal application.

v. No later than January 15, PCSC staff will advise any renewal-year schools regarding whether they will be recommended for renewal or non-renewal. The purpose of this notice is to permit schools that may be recommended for non-renewal time to prepare a response in advance of the PCSC’s regular February meeting.

vi. During its February regular meeting, No later than March 15, the PCSC will consider evidence regarding all renewal-year schools.

a. Written evidence provided by schools as part of their optional auxiliary data submission and renewal applications shall be provided to the PCSC by PCSC staff. Additional written evidence shall not be accepted from schools after the meeting materials deadline.

b. Written evidence provided by schools and PCSC staff shall be published on the PCSC’s website at least seven (7) days in advance of the meeting.

c. Both schools and the PCSC may be represented by counsel.

d. Schools may call witnesses and give testimony.

e. The PCSC may call witnesses and give testimony.

f. The PCSC may delegate the hearing of evidence to a hearing officer, or may hear evidence itself.

Schools may submit written closing arguments to the PCSC office within seven (7) days of the February regular PCSC meeting.

vii. No later than March 15, the PCSC will hold a special meeting for the purpose of making final renewal or non-renewal determinations regarding all renewal-year schools.
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APPLICABLE STATUTE, RULE, OR POLICY
N/A

BACKGROUND
The PCSC’s 2017 annual report provides information about the PCSC’s activities and focus, as well as performance data and contextual information regarding the schools in its portfolio.

DISCUSSION
PCSC staff will present the 2017 annual report, including aggregated results from PCSC schools’ individual performance reports and additional data. Individual, annual performance reports for all PCSC portfolio schools are available on the PCSC’s website.

IMPACT
Information item only.

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff has no comments or recommendations.

COMMISSION ACTION
Any action would be at the discretion of the PCSC.
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A Year in Review

Thank you for your interest in Idaho’s public charter schools. The Public Charter School Commission (PCSC) is Idaho’s largest authorizer, with a portfolio comprising 73% of Idaho’s 56 charters. Our mission is to protect student and public interests by balancing high standards of accountability with respect for the autonomy of public charter schools. We endeavor to implement best authorizing practices and fulfill the requirements of Idaho statute in order to ensure the excellence of public charter school options for Idaho families.

During 2017, the PCSC broadened the services it provides to public charter schools in its portfolio. By identifying and filling gaps in the support structures already available through other entities, the PCSC developed resources that enhance the ability of new and operating public charter schools to maximize their own effectiveness. The new tools and guidance opportunities are designed to assist schools without infringing on their autonomy.

With extensive input from stakeholders, the PCSC adopted a new performance framework. The updated framework dovetails with the state’s new accountability system where possible, but can accommodate future policy shifts with minimal disruption. It evaluates schools’ proficiency rates in light of meaningful comparison groups and recognizes individual student growth. The framework provides meaningful data regarding schools of all sizes, demographics, and missions.

Our portfolio has expanded to include four new schools: Future Public School (Garden City), Peace Valley Charter School (Boise), Project Impact STEM Academy (Kuna), and Gem Prep: Meridian (Meridian).

The PCSC is engaged in conversations regarding opportunities for increased autonomy for Idaho’s high-performing charter schools. We look forward to supporting fulfillment of the vision on which Idaho’s charter movement was founded twenty years ago.

We invite you to join us in supporting a high-quality charter school sector in Idaho.

Sincerely,
Alan Reed, Chairman
Tamara L. Baysinger, Director

January 2018
Portfolio Overview

The PCSC’s portfolio comprises 41 public charter schools. These schools are located all across the state, in both rural and urban communities, and served approximately 16,800 students during the 2016-17 school year. Their time in operation ranges from one to nineteen years. They offer an array of educational choices: Core Knowledge, Expeditionary Learning, Montessori, Waldorf, International Baccalaureate, and more. Several are alternative schools, and others focus on underserved or at-risk populations while welcoming all students who wish to attend. Eight are categorized as virtual schools, which together enroll about 4,900 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCSC PORTFOLIO SCHOOL</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>GRADES</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alturas International Academy</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Idaho Falls</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Heritage Charter School</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Idaho Falls</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Core Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Choice Virtual School</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Treasure Valley</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Virtual, Special Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham Academy</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Blackfoot</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>STEM, Postsecondary Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfoot Community Charter Learning Center</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Blackfoot</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Brain-Based, Multi-Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Tahgee Elementary Academy</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Fort Hall</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>Native Language &amp; Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d’Alene Charter Academy</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass Public Charter School</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Compass Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conner Academy</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Pocatello</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falcon Ridge Public Charter School</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Public School</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem Prep: Meridian</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Blended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem Prep: Pocatello</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Pocatello</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>Blended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Academy</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Schoolwide Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Community Charter School</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Classical, Dual-Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Technical Career Academy</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>Virtual, Career Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Connects Online</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Science and Technology Charter School</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Blackfoot</td>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Virtual Academy</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPIRE Connections Academy</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iSucceed Virtual High School</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenai Bridge Academy</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>Virtual, Credit Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Charter School</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Charter School</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello Montessori Charter School</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Ammon</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>Montessori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Idaho STEM Charter Academy</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Rathdrum</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Star Charter School</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Valley Academy</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Gooding</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Core Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palouse Prairie Charter School</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Expeditionary Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Valley Charter School</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Waldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Impact STEM Academy</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Blended STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard McKenna Charter School</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Montessori K-8, Virtual Alt. HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills Public Charter School</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage International School of Boise</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syringa Mountain School</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Ketchum</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>Waldorf Inspired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor’s Crossing Public Charter School</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Idaho Falls</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village Charter School</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>7 Habits &amp; Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory Charter School</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Charter School</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pine Charter School</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Idaho Falls</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Core Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier Charter School</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Classical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who We Are

The PCSC's seven members hail from all around the state. Commissioners are appointed by the Governor (3 members), Senate Pro Tempore (2 members), or Speaker of the House (2 members). They serve four-year terms, and officers are elected every two years in the spring.

Our mission is 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 charter schools and implementing best authorizing practices to ensure the excellence of public charter school options available to Idaho families.

Each commissioner adds to a broad scope of collective experience in public education, business, and governance. All bring to the table a strong desire to contribute to quality school choice for Idaho families.

The PCSC’s FY 2018 budget is $665,600, representing an increase of 34% from FY 2017. The legislature approved this increase in order to facilitate the engagement of independent experts in the charter renewal process. The PCSC’s revenue comprises a combination of authorizer fees and state funds appropriated as part of the Office of the State Board of Education’s budget.

The PCSC office is staffed by the Office of the State Board of Education and includes four FTE. In 2017, PCSC staff reorganized itself to increase its capacity to develop services for public charter schools. These services include extensive pre-opening support for newly approved schools, as well as new resources for charter school leaders and governing boards.

Additionally, the PCSC and its staff worked with stakeholders to refine the charter renewal process. These efforts streamlined the process, making it easier for schools to navigate while retaining the best practices that enable the PCSC to make informed, outcome-based decisions. Further development of the process will be undertaken in response to identified need.

The PCSC also engaged stakeholders in the development of an updated performance framework. Adopted in May 2017, the new framework is designed to provide meaningful data regarding the performance outcomes of schools within the context of their student demographics, size, and educational models.

The following pages of this report represent the initial data set gathered using the new framework. They offer new opportunities to consider how charter school outcomes compare to those of their surrounding communities and impact students across the state.

---

OUR COMMISSIONERS

Chairman Alan Reed
Idaho Falls
Term: 2014 - 2018

Vice-Chairman Brian Scigliano
Boise
Term: 2016 - 2020

Commissioner Kelly Murphey
Castleford
Term: 2014 - 2018

Commissioner Wanda Quinn
Coeur d’Alene
Term: 2016 - 2020

Commissioner Sherrilynn Bair
Firth
Term: 2016 - 2020

Commissioner Nils Peterson
Moscow
Term: 2017 - 2019

Commissioner Kitty Kunz
Boise
Term: 2017 - 2019

We also thank former Commissioner Evan Frasure for his service.
What We Do

As an authorized chartering entity, the PCSC’s role is to protect students and taxpayers by overseeing the quality of the charter schools it authorizes. We also endeavor to protect the autonomy of charter school boards, focusing on performance outcomes while giving schools as much freedom to direct their own inputs as the law allows.

Authorizing work can be divided into three phases: petition review, ongoing oversight, and charter renewal. Each of these phases demands a different focus, but our goals are always to encourage innovation and ensure quality.

The petition review phase focuses on evaluating new charter petitions with the following question in mind:

Is it likely that this proposal will result in a successful, high-quality school that fills a need in its community?

Petition reviews consider:

- Quality of the educational program,
- Adequacy of financial resources, and
- Capacity of the founding board.

Upon approval of a new charter petition, the PCSC and school sign a performance certificate and framework detailing the academic and operational performance expectations and measures against which the school will be evaluated.

The ongoing oversight phase focuses on keeping schools and stakeholders apprised of schools’ performance outcomes relative to the standards contained in the performance certificate and framework.

The PCSC provides its portfolio schools with annual performance reports reflecting their academic, operational, and financial statuses. Schools are encouraged to use this information for strategic planning and to ensure that any identified weaknesses are addressed in advance of renewal consideration.

The PCSC endeavors to limit the reporting burden on its portfolio schools. Data contained in annual performance reports is gathered primarily through ISEE and independent fiscal audits. Most PCSC portfolio schools need to submit only a few, additional reports to the PCSC:

- Semi-annual financial updates,
- An annual board membership update, and
- Mission-specific performance data (optional).

Charter renewal is an important process for both authorizers and schools. At the end of a school’s performance certificate term, authorizers must evaluate performance outcomes in the light of contextual factors and determine whether or not the school should continue to be entrusted with students’ time and taxpayers’ resources for another five-year term. Schools are invited to make their cases for renewal, demonstrating either strong performance outcomes or clear evidence that their outcomes, despite room for improvement, still reflect success. This thoughtfully-applied bedrock of accountability is at the heart of the charter school concept.
Services We Provide

During 2017, the PCSC broadened its provision of services to public charter schools. Portfolio schools were surveyed to gather feedback on their greatest needs and preferred methods of resource delivery. We also coordinated with other state agencies, the Idaho School Boards Association, and the Idaho Charter School Network to identify gaps in the supports already available. Based on this information, we developed resources designed to support our schools without infringing on the decision-making authority of their governing boards:

New Charter Petitioner Guidance Although statute and administrative rule provide information regarding the required contents of a charter petition, petitioners often request additional guidance regarding the scope and nature of information their charters should include. This friendly guide walks petitioners through the development of a high quality charter petition in order to maximize their chances of approval.

Pre-Opening Guidance The months between petition approval and opening day are busy and stressful for the leaders of a new public charter school. The PCSC’s pre-opening guidance includes interactive project management tools, resources and advice on topics ranging from employee recruitment to governance training, and a series of one-on-one meetings to exchange information and receive support from PCSC staff.

New School Leader Orientation Many public charter schools hire administrators who have not previously worked in the charter sector. They face new challenges as they adjust to leading not only a school, but a charter LEA. The PCSC now offers written and in-person orientation materials to introduce new administrators to the role of the authorizer, charter-specific requirements, and resources available to support their work. The orientation materials have also proven helpful to incoming charter school board members.

Charter Renewal Guidance The PCSC provides ongoing guidance to schools whose charters will be considered for renewal in the upcoming year. From a one-on-one orientation meeting a year in advance, through optional auxiliary data submission opportunities and an onsite visit by independent experts, the process is designed to ensure that schools have the opportunity to share their perspectives regarding the success of their schools. A written Charter Renewal Guidance and Application document walks schools through the process, providing examples and detail regarding the types of information that will help them present strong renewal applications.

The PCSC looks forward to developing further resources in response to schools’ requests. These will include an interactive, monthly Board Governance Guidebook and a series of webinars and self-guided exercises on topics such as branding, recruitment, and retention.

Needs Schools Identify

Throughout the course of its authorizing work, the PCSC seeks to enhance the operational autonomy that charter schools experience in exchange for the increased accountability represented by periodic renewals and the performance framework. During 2017, our conversations with schools have emphasized the following needs:

Reduced Reporting Burden Like many Idaho schools and districts, charter school leaders express a desire for a reduction in the volume of paperwork due to state agencies each year.

Increased Funding Flexibility Also like other schools and districts, charters often struggle with the confines of funding silos, expressing that they could better serve their students if they were free to allocate funds as needed.

Increased Startup Funding Charter petitioners frequently encounter difficulty securing the startup funds necessary to ensure the stable opening of a new school. The absence of such funds can result in reliance on expensive leases or high-interest loans, delayed opening, or even a petition denial recommendation.

Other Funding Needs Operating schools need increased funding for facilities, teachers, and classified staff.
Summary of 2017 Performance Outcomes

The following chart summarizes each PCSC portfolio school’s performance outcomes in the areas of academics, operations, and finance. Results are color-coded by schools’ accountability designations as detailed in their individual annual performance reports. The four accountability designations are Honor (blue), Good Standing (green), Remediation (yellow), and Critical (red). Gray indicates not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCSC PORTFOLIO SCHOOL</th>
<th>ACADEMIC</th>
<th>OPERATIONAL</th>
<th>FINANCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d’Alene Charter Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falcon Ridge Public Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Star Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass Public Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Idaho STEM Charter Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palouse Prairie Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor’s Crossing Public Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Heritage Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage International Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alturas International Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pine Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills Public Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello Montessori Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenai Bridge Academy (alternative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard McKenna Charter School (alternative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Virtual Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Science and Technology Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem Prep: Pocatello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Virtual Academy (alternative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard McKenna Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPIRE Connections Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Technical Career Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Valley Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Community Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Connects Online (alternative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfoot Charter Community Learning Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Connects Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iSucceed Virtual High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syringa Mountain School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Choice Virtual School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Taghee Elementary Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Outcomes

In 2017, 54% of PCSC portfolio schools met or exceeded the academic standard established in the performance framework. All 20 of these schools presently qualify for automatic or guaranteed renewal.

Accountability designations of Honor, Good Standing, Remediation, or Critical are based on the percentage of the total available academic points that each school earns. Points are awarded for measures designed to reflect:

- ISAT proficiency by comparison to the state;
- ISAT proficiency by comparison to the surrounding district;
- Student-level growth toward proficiency (K-8);
- Student-level growth by comparison to academic peers (high school); &
- Graduation rate.

Certain measures are modified or eliminated for alternative schools, virtual schools, and schools serving limited grade sets.

While summary data can give us a sense of the overall performance of PCSC portfolio schools, each school’s story is different. It is important to reserve judgement until one has visited the school, spoken to its educators and the families they serve, and viewed the data in the context of the school’s mission and student population.

Individual schools’ 2017 annual reports, which include comparative demographic data and other contextual information, may be found on the PCSC’s website.

In 2017, the percentage of academic points earned by schools ranged from 15% to 94%, with a median of 61%.
Proficiency

A school’s proficiency rate is the percentage of its students that achieved a rating of “proficient” or “advanced” on the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT). One way to evaluate the effectiveness of the PCSC’s portfolio schools is by comparing their proficiency rates to the state average.

The following charts compare each PCSC portfolio school’s 2017 ISAT proficiency rates to the statewide average for students in the same grade set served by the public charter school.

In math, 53% of PCSC portfolio schools exceeded the state average proficiency rate for the relevant grade set.

Two-thirds of these schools exceeded the state average by 15 or more percentage points.

Among the remaining 47% of schools whose math proficiency rates fell below the state average for the relevant grade set, more than half fell short by 15 or more percentage points.

The extent to which virtual schools’ populations differ from those of most other types of schools is unknown. However, it is generally recognized that their student bodies tend to include somewhat higher percentages of mobile, at-risk, and academically struggling students than the state as a whole. When only brick-and-mortar charter schools are compared to their traditional counterparts statewide, the statewide comparative data shifts.

Among brick-and-mortar schools, 66% exceeded the state average in math.
In English Language Arts, 64% of PCSC portfolio schools exceeded the state average proficiency rate for the relevant grade set. More than half of these schools exceeded the state average by 15 or more percentage points. Among the remaining 36% of schools whose ELA proficiency rates fell below the state average for the relevant grade set, about one-third fell short by 15 or more percentage points.

Communities across Idaho vary widely, and comparisons to state averages can’t tell the whole story of a charter school’s success. The PCSC also considers how its portfolio schools’ outcomes compare with those of their surrounding districts. This allows each school to be evaluated in the context of a community whose demographics - from ethnicity to mobility to socioeconomic factors - are typically more similar than those of the entire state.

As in the state comparisons above, PCSC portfolio schools are compared to the surrounding district average for the same grade sets they serve. Because virtual schools serve students across multiple districts or statewide, they are excluded from the district comparison charts that follow.

76% of brick-and-mortar schools exceeded the state average in ELA.
75% of PCSC portfolio brick-and-mortar schools had math proficiency rates that exceeded those of their surrounding districts.

80% had ELA proficiency rates that exceeded those of their surrounding districts.
Virtual schools typically serve student bodies whose demographics are more similar to one another than to individual districts or the state. While most of Idaho’s virtual charter schools are authorized by the PCSC, these charts include one, district-authorized virtual school (indicated by the gray bars).

Virtual charter schools’ proficiency rates in math ranged from 22 percentage points above the virtual school average to 22 percentage points below the average.

Virtual schools’ ELA proficiency rates ranged from 18 percentage points above average to 26 percentage points below average.

The PCSC continues to engage in conversation and data collection to better understand to what extent factors such as student mobility and off-cohort enrollment impact virtual school populations.

In the meantime, stakeholders are invited to view individual virtual schools’ annual reports, available on the PCSC’s website, to learn more about their missions, student demographics, and academic outcomes.

Alternative schools also serve significantly different demographics than the state as a whole.

In 2017, the four alternative schools in the PCSC’s portfolio, all of which are virtual, had proficiency rates that trended above those of the statewide averages for alternative schools.

All four alternative schools showed above average student-level growth in ELA. Two exceeded the standard in math growth, while two did not meet the standard.
Student-Level Growth

The PCSC also assesses its portfolio schools on the basis of individual student growth. A criterion-referenced growth measure looks at the percentage of students in grades K-8 who are growing at a rate sufficient to reach proficiency within three years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first. Schools with at least 70% of students showing adequate growth receive a “meets standard” or higher rating on the performance framework.

In 2017, 50% of brick-and-mortar schools in the PCSC’s portfolio met or exceeded the standard in math.

Another 20% came within ten percentage points of meeting the standard.

Eight brick-and-mortar schools, in addition to the four virtual schools serving grades K-8, fell far below the standard in math. In these cases, fewer than 50% of students were making adequate growth.

Two-thirds of brick-and-mortar schools in the PCSC’s portfolio met or exceeded the standard in ELA.

Another 20% of brick-and-mortar schools, plus two virtual schools, came within ten percentage points of meeting the standard.

Three brick-and-mortar schools and one virtual school fell far below the standard in ELA.
High schools in the PCSC’s portfolio are evaluated using a norm-referenced growth measure. This measure compares the growth of individual students to that of their academic peers. It examines growth from grade 8 to grade 10. For example, charter school tenth graders who scored “below basic” in 8th grade are compared to other students statewide who also scored “below basic” in 8th grade, while students who scored “proficient” are compared to other students who scored “proficient.” The charts below reflect median student growth percentiles.

Among brick-and-mortar high schools in the PCSC’s portfolio, 77% met or exceeded the standard in math and 84% met or exceeded the standard in ELA, with median SGPs above the 43rd percentile. Virtual schools’ median SGPs generally fell between the 30th and 42nd percentile, though two virtual schools did meet the standard in ELA.
Graduation Rates

Graduation rates at Idaho’s public schools are calculated using a four-year-plus-summer Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR).

40% of high schools in the PCSC’s portfolio had graduation rates that exceeded the state average by 15 percentage points or more.

Both alternative and non-alternative PCSC-authorized virtual charter schools had low four-year ACGRs, ranging from 21% to 49%. (Idaho offers one other virtual charter school, whose ACGR was 67%.) The state average ACGR was 80%.

Virtual school leaders indicate that many students who enroll at virtual schools are already behind their cohorts. Some of their students are able to graduate in five or six years, rather than the traditional four.

Additional research and conversation are underway to examine how many students are credit deficient when they enroll at virtual schools, how far behind cohort they are, and the rate at which they recover credits after enrollment.

2015 cohort data indicates that non-alternative virtual schools graduated an additional 0% to 16% of students between a four-year and six-year cohort.

Alternative virtuals graduated an additional 4% to 11% of students.
SAT Results and Go-On Rates

SAT results offer additional perspective regarding schools’ academic outcomes. The following charts compare SAT results for PCSC portfolio schools to those of the state. The data reflects all 11th and 12th grade students who took the SAT during the 2016-17 school year; participation was not required. It is important to note that the State category reflects a much larger sample than the PCSC Portfolio category. The left axis refers to median score, while the right axis refers to the percentage of students whose scores indicate college readiness.

The state’s 2016 cohort Go-On rate was 49%. The rate for PCSC portfolio schools was 47%.
Operational & Financial Outcomes

The PCSC assesses its portfolio schools on a range of management and compliance outcomes. We also review schools’ near-term financial health and long-term viability, bearing in mind that Idaho’s public charter schools received $118,965,210 in state funding during FY 2017. $90,176,645 was disbursed to PCSC portfolio schools.

As in prior years, most PCSC portfolio schools demonstrated operational and fiscal strength. When weak areas did appear, they tended to be in the areas of late reporting and independent financial audit findings. A small minority of schools evidenced fiscal distress. In these cases, the PCSC has taken steps to protect taxpayer resources while allowing the schools every opportunity to regain stability.

Student Demographics

Though all students are welcome to attend Idaho’s public charter schools, these schools do tend to be less demographically diverse than the state’s traditional public schools.

Despite notable exceptions, most PCSC portfolio schools enroll smaller percentages of non-white students, students with limited English proficiency (LEP) or special needs, and free & reduced lunch (FRL) qualifying students than do their traditional counterparts.

Virtual schools, though also less diverse than the state, tend to show a smaller discrepancy than many of the brick-and-mortar charter schools do by comparison to their surrounding districts.

Most PCSC portfolio schools actively encourage diverse students to enroll, but Idaho statute does not permit them to offer priority enrollment to these groups. An increasing number of new charter petitioners intend to specifically target diverse students through their educational programs. Many existing charter schools focus on serving low-income, special needs, LEP, at-risk, and other challenging populations.

---

Building public awareness of enrollment opportunities for all is a responsibility shared by the entire charter sector.

---
In 2017, PCSC portfolio schools’ collective proficiency rates for non-white, FRL, and special needs subgroups exceeded state averages in both math and ELA. LEP subgroup outcomes were comparable.

Individual schools’ 2017 annual performance reports, available on the PCSC’s website, contain additional demographic comparison data. This information provides important context for understanding each school’s academic outcomes and is considered by the PCSC when making renewal decisions.
Charter Renewals

In 2017, the PCSC completed its initial cycle with the renewal of twelve charters. Seven of the twelve were renewed with conditions for necessary improvement. The PCSC took great care to ensure that such conditions would be both reasonable and effective in promoting improved outcomes for Idaho students.

Upon publication of this report, the 2018 renewal cycle remains underway. Two out of the thirteen schools under consideration qualified for automatic renewal; five more were recommended for unconditional renewal. The remaining six were recommended for renewal with conditions.

Ten of the twelve schools looking ahead to renewal in 2019 qualify for automatic or guaranteed renewal. As the PCSC continues to converse with stakeholders and stay abreast of national best practices, we bear in mind that success does not look the same at every school, nor does every school succeed. Meaningful renewal requirements are crucial to the long-term health of the charter school sector, and the PCSC does not take lightly the impact of its decisions on students, families, and communities.

While school quality is of utmost importance for Idaho students, the PCSC also places high value on school choice. It is our sincere hope that Idahoans can work together to promote the development of more, high-quality new and replication public charter schools so that while a few may come and go, plentiful choice will remain.

We must be willing both to give promising ideas a chance, and to let go of them when reality falls short of expectations.
Looking Back, Looking Ahead

Twenty years ago, Idaho’s charter school movement formed around a central concept: the exchange of increased autonomy for increased accountability. Time has witnessed a struggle to find an appropriate balance between these factors. Changing legislation, authorizer policies, and stakeholder experience have often tipped the scales in one direction or another, leaving half of the so-called “charter bargain” underrepresented.

In 2013, new legislation established a clear charter accountability structure based on national best practice. It also promoted school autonomy by removing the requirements that once forced authorizers to micromanage school inputs and charter petitioners’ proposals.

As a result, the PCSC has been able to eliminate nearly all of its reporting requirements, as well as take risks on exciting proposals for new public charter schools. Implemented with fidelity, the structure centered around outcome-based standards and periodic renewals is both fair and effective.

Meanwhile, however, Idaho’s public charter schools have seen their autonomy diminished by an increasing volume of other requirements. Public charter schools are responsible for essentially all of the same reporting obligations as are their traditional counterparts.

In addition to being time-consuming, the majority of these reports are linked to funding silos that further limit charter schools’ ability to adapt to their students’ needs.

Generally speaking, the purposes of funding silos and required reports are:

1) to ensure appropriate use of taxpayer dollars and
2) to encourage improved student academic achievement.

Put another way, the silos and reports are inputs intended to improve outcomes.

Public charter schools are already held to rigorous, outcome-based standards established in the performance framework. Chronic failure to meet these standards can result in a charter school’s closure.

This high-stakes, outcome-based accountability structure serves to protect students and taxpayers. Conversation is underway regarding whether it should also earn public charter schools autonomy from state-mandated inputs that are directed toward the same goal.

We appreciate the increasing interest of our legislature and state agencies in seeking additional means of enhancing autonomy for all public schools. Public charter schools are particularly well suited to lead the way.

Idaho’s public charter schools were intended to provide opportunities for innovation, safeguarded by a commitment to quality results. To this end, autonomy and accountability are not opposing forces, but different sides of the same coin. With twenty years behind us and a bright future ahead, the Public Charter School Commission stands ready to support the charter sector in finding the balance that allows it to thrive.