

ED 401 370

UD 031 368

AUTHOR Greenawalt, Charles E.  
 TITLE Charter Schools: A National Innovation for Pennsylvania.  
 INSTITUTION Commonwealth Foundation for Public Policy Alternatives, Harrisburg, PA.  
 PUB DATE Apr 95  
 NOTE 19p.  
 PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS \*Accountability; \*Charter Schools; Educational Change; \*Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; \*Institutional Autonomy; Nontraditional Education; \*School Restructuring; Self Determination; State Legislation; State Programs; \*Teacher Role

IDENTIFIERS \*Pennsylvania

## ABSTRACT

A charter school is an autonomous educational entity operating under a contract negotiated between the organizers who manage the school (teachers, parents, or others from the public or private sector) and the sponsors who oversee the provisions of the charter (local school boards, state education boards, or some other public authority). The premise that underlies the charter school idea is that this innovation will free schools from the uniformity and confines of top-down regulations and mandates. Eleven states have charter school legislation, but only 6 of those charter laws are considered to be "alive." The possibilities for charter schools in Pennsylvania appear quite bright. In states where charter schools have been adopted, a number of challenges have developed, four of which are prominent. The first is the necessity for new relationships to be developed between school boards and schools. The second is that charter schools must use true site-based decision making. A third challenge is that charter schools must, and will, provide new roles for teachers, and the final challenge is that charter school legislation will also generate fear among educators that it will be a back door for private school vouchers. In Pennsylvania, as in other states, the charter school innovation must not be seen as an instant panacea. Nevertheless, charter schools offer an avenue to bring together some of the most promising educational reform ideas to create highly autonomous and accountable learning environments. (Contains one table comparing charter school legislative approaches.) (SLD)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

# THE COMMONWEALTH FOUNDATION

*for Public Policy Alternatives*

## CHARTER SCHOOLS: A NATIONAL INNOVATION FOR PENNSYLVANIA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL  
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Clifford Frick  
Commonwealth Found.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

600 North Second Street  
Suite 300  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1032  
(717) 231-4850

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

Charles E. Greenawalt, Ph.D.  
Senior Policy Associate

April 1995

UD031368

## INTRODUCTION

During his first Budget Address to the General Assembly, Governor Tom Ridge, the newly elected chief executive of Pennsylvania, acknowledged the need for fundamental reform of the state's educational system by declaring, "We must do things differently." Throughout his gubernatorial campaign, Ridge maintained that the Commonwealth's educational system was in need of repair. As a candidate, Ridge advocated instituting some type of educational choice plan along with the establishment of charter schools.

In his Budget Address, Governor Ridge seized upon these themes as initiatives that his Administration will be developing. The charter school concept, as one educational analyst observed, "is an educational innovation that is developing with lightning speed."<sup>1</sup> In fact, the cover of *Time* magazine on October 31, 1994, declared charter schools as a "New Hope for Public Schools."

## CURRENT STATUS

The appearance of a *Time* cover story on this educational concept was a recognition that it had entered the "mainstream" of educational reform ideas. Minnesota's state government adopted the nation's first charter school law in 1991. Since that time, ten other states have followed Minnesota's example, and at this writing, at least 18 state legislatures are considering charter school legislation that has been introduced. Support for charter school legislation has come from both major political parties.

California passed charter school legislation in 1992 and became the second state in the country with charter school legislation. Six states approved this educational reform idea in 1993--Colorado, Georgia, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Mexico, and Wisconsin. Another three states followed suit in 1994--Arizona, Hawaii, and Kansas.

Even though 11 states have charter school legislation, only six of these charter laws are considered to be "alive." These six states have seen considerable activity occur under the auspices of its legislation. In these states proposals appear, charters are granted, schools open, students enroll, and districts begin to respond with their own improvements. These six states include Arizona, California, Colorado, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Minnesota.

The remaining five states with charter school legislation--Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, New Mexico, and Wisconsin--have witnessed little charter activity. Wisconsin's statute, however, is being reviewed, and may be revised in order to spur charter activity in the state.

Presently, 18 states are considering the charter school idea. These states include the following: Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, and Washington. Although sites in the Great Lakes area have been the center of charter school activity, the idea is now receiving its first serious consideration on a widespread basis in the South. The November 1994 elections have also produced a new climate for the charter school debate. More than 20 state legislative chambers have seen a switch in partisan control. These election results have broken up old power structures and have brought new state leaders and ideas into the spotlight.

Ted Kolderie of the Center For Policy Studies in St. Paul, Minnesota believes that these election results will trigger more immediate interest in the educational voucher idea; a mechanism that provides additional public financing to private education. The concept of charter schools appeals to Kolderie, however, because it represents a new form of public education. He believes it represents the "middle way" between the status quo and vouchers.<sup>2</sup> Of course, it may also be used as a measure to improve education that supplements educational vouchers and the reform activity catalyzed by them.

## **DEFINITION**

Charter schools are a new form of public education. Indeed, these facilities are publicly funded schools that are more or less self-governing.

A charter school is an autonomous educational entity operating under a contract negotiated between the organizers who manage the school (teachers, parents, or others from the public or private sectors) and the sponsors who oversee the provisions of the charter (local school boards, state education boards, or some other public authority).

The premise that underlies the charter school idea is that this innovation will free schools from the uniformity and confines of top-down regulations and mandates. Except for basic state and federal health, safety, and non-discrimination laws, charter schools operate unencumbered by bureaucracy. Therefore, charter schools possess the ability to redesign all the elements of a school--budget, curriculum, personnel, and schedule. Charter schools are chosen by parents, rather than enrolled by involuntary student assignment.

## **THE CHALLENGE**

Charter schools force educators to question the wisdom of conventional educational practices and procedures. This process may create new dynamics that will foster change within an entire school system. This potential frequently exists because charter schools normally integrate various reform ideas that have not been able to produce systematic change by themselves.

Charter schools can also assist state educational systems with six problem areas:

- The resolution of the school autonomy struggle in a way that traditional site-based decisionmaking has not done.
- The creation of "real" choices within the public school arena for students, parents, and teachers.
- The development of new professional opportunities for teachers.
- The empowerment of local school boards to overcome micro-management tendencies and to become true policy boards.
- The elimination of real and perceived barriers to innovation through blanket

waivers of most state laws and policies.

- The improvement of educational planning by focusing on outcomes, not inputs.

Charter laws reflect a dramatic shift in education policy and a radical departure from the way public schools have typically been governed. For a generation, administrators, legislators, and reformers have attempted to improve school performance by mandating curricula, shrinking class sizes, paying teachers more, and setting hour requirements for continuing professional development. Across the country, billions of dollars have poured into such reforms with few improvements in student achievement. Rather than being regulated by state mandates, charter schools are regulated by their performance in achieving mutually determined goals.

The performance goals for students must be specified by charter school applicants, and a charter school's existence hinges on meeting these goals. Charters are normally granted for an initial period of three to five years. If the schools fail to meet their specified goals in a given period of time, the school's charter is rescinded.

In addition to closing due to poor performance, charter schools may also be closed for lack of student enrollment. If a charter school fails to attract a sufficient number of students, it will close just like any private business.

The focus of charter schools is not to create a few "models" that can later be replicated in the public school system. Charter schools instead hope to foster competition and supply-side forces in the educational marketplace. By allowing new "suppliers" into public education, encouraging them to differentiate themselves to attract students, and holding them accountable for results, charter schools create a level of competition in the public sector that might lure even more entrants into the marketplace. Competition for students will force schools to examine their operations and results in an effort to improve.

The charter school innovation, therefore, is not just another education reform model; it is a new conception of how a public enterprise is structured. Charter schools seek to redefine public education by who is being served rather than who provides the service. Consequently, this movement is like many privatization efforts that attempt to "contract out" services in order to provide higher levels of efficiency and effectiveness.

## **COMMON CHARACTERISTICS**

Although charter schools vary among states and localities, certain elements that they have in common improve learning environments and positively influence the educational system. These desired characteristics are set forth below:

- 1) At least one other public authority besides a local school board is able to sponsor the school.
- 2) The state allows a variety of public or private individuals/groups the opportunity to organize, seek sponsorship, and operate a charter school.

- 3) The charter school is a discrete legal entity.
- 4) The charter school embraces the ideals of the common school--nonsectarian in programs and operations, tuition-free, nonselective in admissions, nondiscriminatory in practices, and accountable to a public body.
- 5) Each charter school is accountable to parents and its sponsoring public authority for the performance of its students.
- 6) Every charter school is exempted from all state and local laws and regulations except those tied to health, safety, and nondiscrimination.
- 7) A charter school is a school of choice for students, parents, and teachers; no one is forced to be there.
- 8) Each charter school receives the full operating funds associated with its student enrollment from its state government.
- 9) Teachers may be employees of the charter school, but they may also be owners or subcontractors.<sup>3</sup>

As of July 1994, none of the 11 state charter school laws incorporated all of these nine elements. This situation has developed due to the necessity of forging political compromises while adopting these statutes; compromises were frequently needed due to the revolutionary nature of the concept. In the course of state lawmaking, four broad areas have attracted the most attention: 1) sponsorship options, 2) legal autonomy questions, 3) funding formulas, and 4) protection given to teachers.<sup>4</sup>

## HISTORY

Many charter school activists and educational observers credit Ray Budde for being the first to coin the term "charter schools" in his 1988 book, *Education By Charter*. All the kudos for developing this concept, however, should not be given to Budde. The idea of creating public schools with more independent governance structures had been in circulation much longer. The charter schools movement finds its roots in the "restructuring movement." This movement traces its origins to the aims of being more responsive to the students and the teachers, and to making management more "site-based."

Notably, the British possess a similar educational practice--the "grant maintained" schools. British "grant maintained" schools opt out of the government-run system and are funded by a lump-sum payment from London.

During the 1970s in the United States, two phenomena were making the public ripe for the type of educational reform embodied in the charter school concept. First, the country was in the grips of a nationwide recession that forced state lawmakers to examine their budgets more

carefully. Second, business leaders began to question the effectiveness of American education when compared to the educational systems of other countries. Doubts and concerns over American education crystallized in 1983 with the publication of *A Nation At Risk*. While the theorists had their say about the shortcomings of American education in this work, "real-world" managers at such corporations as Motorola were also increasingly concerned with the quality of the nation's workforce. These concerns inevitably led to Motorola's massive worker-retraining program.

## THE FUTURE OF CHARTER SCHOOLS

In states where charter school legislation has been adopted, a number of challenges have developed that need to be dealt with by educational professionals. Four challenges are prominent and should be examined.

The first challenge is the necessity for new relationships to be developed between school boards and the schools. When a charter school statute becomes operational, local school boards and the central administrative offices of school districts are apt to discover that their roles and responsibilities have been greatly altered.

Some states, for example, limit school board authority over charter schools to contract oversight, while other states terminate school board authority if the school's sponsor is not the local school board. Nonetheless, some school board authorities see future opportunities for school boards under state charter legislation. The executive director of the Colorado Association of School Boards, Randy Quinn, argues that charter schools represent:

. . . a dramatic, very fundamental difference, one that forces the school board to reexamine its role. Rather than serving as provider, the board has an opportunity to become the *purchaser* of education services on behalf of the citizens of a community served by the board.<sup>5</sup>

Second, charter schools must utilize true site-based decisionmaking. This item is a challenge because each school district has to determine whether its personnel and adequately prepared to manage what is really a small business.

Even though a great deal of lip service is paid to site-based decisionmaking practices in many school districts, most current school-based decisions focus on curriculum and involve only a small amount of discretionary funding. This situation arises in many districts from the fact that school boards remain legally responsible for decisions.

In the ideal circumstance, charter schools are legally and financially autonomous. Thus, charter school personnel gain greater control over their professional lives and the education they offer to their students. This increased responsibility focuses attention on whether school personnel are prepared for these responsibilities. Currently, most principals focus their energies on instructional activities, not financial or management issues; most teachers are reluctant to make budgetary or personnel decisions for which they have no training and that take time away from the classroom. There is no easy solution to this concern. Without additional appropriate training and outside technical support, principals and teachers will find it difficult to visualize

and execute roles that differ significantly from the status quo.

This second challenge to educators leads directly to the third challenge--charter schools will provide new roles for teachers. In many instances, teachers will have the chance to be involved in all phases of school management; in some cases, the teachers might own and operate the school. Some of these roles may exceed what many teachers wish to do in their professional lives. Furthermore, many of these changes accompanied by a alteration in roles and responsibilities will surely be perceived as a threat by many teachers unions.

Finally, charter school legislation will also generate a fear among many educators that it will serve as a "back door" for private school vouchers. Minnesota provides one such example. The Minnesota Federation of Teachers lobbied against that state's charter school legislation because it permitted private, nonsectarian schools to become public charter schools.

## **CHARTER SCHOOLS IN PENNSYLVANIA**

The possibilities for charter schools in Pennsylvania appears quite bright. As previously mentioned, Governor Ridge proposed funding for the development of this concept in the Commonwealth to fulfill a pledge he made during his gubernatorial campaign. In addition, Senator Harold Mowery introduced Senate Bill 377 on February 1, 1995, that would provide for the establishment of charter schools. Cosponsors for this bill include Senators Salvatore, Jubelirer, Schwartz, Heckler, and Peterson. Their proposal was referred to the Senate Education Committee on the day of its introduction. Although no further action has been taken on Senate Bill 377 at this time, one can speculate that Senator Mowery and his cosponsors are in dialogue with the new Administration to fashion a measure agreeable to both branches.

Senate Bill 377 would authorize the establishment of no more than 35 charter schools in public school districts. A maximum of two charter schools could be founded in any one school district. After 35 charter schools have been established, the bill mandates that the State Board of Education would inform the General Assembly in addition to potential sponsors of other charter schools. This provision ensures the presence of a trigger mechanism so that the General Assembly will be able to review the efficacy and efficiency of these schools and determine whether to continue and enlarge the demonstration project.

## **CONCLUSION**

Although charter schools possess great promise, this education innovation is not an instant panacea. Since it represents a serious threat to the status quo, enactment of charter school legislation across the country has been, and will continue to be, a formidable task.

Nevertheless, charter schools offer an avenue to bring together a variety of the most promising reform ideas in order to create highly autonomous and accountable learning environments. In order to better understand the charter school laws that have been enacted across the nation, an appendix has been attached to this report that compares and contrasts provisions of these statutes. The appendix refers to charter laws that are "alive" as being "more autonomous" and charter laws that have spurred little charter activity as "less autonomous."



The question that remains with many observers is whether charter schools will help students both within their confines and across the school system to obtain more rigorous and challenging outcomes. Although it is too early to offer a definitive answer, many educational theorists, policymakers, civic activists, and parents believe that charter schools are an education innovation that must be tried.

### ENDNOTES

1. Charles E. Greenawalt, II, ed., *Educational Innovation: An Agenda to Frame the Future* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1994), 248.
2. Ted Kolderie, "The Charter Idea in the 1995 Legislative Sessions," Center For Policy Studies, St. Paul, Minnesota, February 1995, 2.
3. Louann A. Bierlein and Lori A. Mulholland, "The Promise of Charter Schools," *Educational Leadership*, September 1994, 35.
4. Bierlein and Mulholland, 37.
5. Bierlein and Mulholland, 38.

COMPARISON OF "MORE AUTONOMOUS" CHARTER SCHOOL LAWS

| STATE YEAR PASSED   | ARIZONA 1994   | CALIFORNIA 1992   | COLORADO 1993   | MASSACHUSETTS 1993   | MICHIGAN 1993  | MINNESOTA 1991   |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| <b>GENERAL ISSUES:</b>  |  |   |   |  |  |  |
| <i>Date of Implementation</i>   | 1994   | 1992  | 1993  | 1995   | 1994   | 1992   |
| <i>Number Allowed in State</i>  | unlimited for local board sponsorship; up to 25 per year per state board   | 100   | 50 up to July, 1997, after which limit is removed                   | 25; number of charter students not to exceed 0.75 of 1 percent of public school students | no limit if sponsor is district or university; 1 if sponsor is community college   | originally 8, increased to 20 in 1993                        |
| <i>Number Allowed per School District</i>   | unlimited  | 10  | —   | less than 5 in Boston less than 5 in Springfield less than 2 in any other city           | —  | originally 2, increased to 5 in 1993                         |
| <i>Preference Given to:</i>   | —  | schools which target low-achieving students                       | schools which target at-risk students (13 of 50 must focus on this) | —  | —  | —  |
| <i>Automatically Free from Most State Education Code/District Rules - Super Waiver*</i> | yes, except: health, safety, civil rights, audit and student assessments, special education, and insurance                                       | yes, except health, safety, civil rights, state pupil assessments | no, only from state/district policies as agreed to in charter       | yes, except: health, safety, civil rights, state pupil assessments                       | yes, except: health, safety, civil rights, school improvement, competitive bidding | yes, except: health, safety, civil rights, special education |
| <i>Legally Autonomous</i>   | yes, if state sponsored; depends on charter if local board sponsored   | depends on charter  | no, under local board authority                                     | yes, organized as nonprofit corporation  | yes, organized as nonprofit  | yes, organized as nonprofit or cooperative                   |
| <i>Automatically Autonomous for 100 percent "Operations" Funding</i>                    | generally yes - if local board sponsored, receive district's average cost per pupil; if state sponsored, state funding formula determines amount | generally yes   | no, but will get at least 80 percent                                | generally yes  | generally yes  | generally yes  |
| <i>Length of Charter</i>  | 5 years  | up to 5 years   | up to 5 years   | 5 years  | —  | up to 3 years  |
| <i>Private School Eligibility for Charter Schools</i>                                   | yes, must be nonsectarian  | no  | no  | no   | no; MI constitution forbids public dollars going to private K-12 schools           | yes, must be nonsectarian                                    |

| STATE YEAR PASSED  | ARIZONA 1994  | CALIFORNIA 1992   | COLORADO 1993   | MASSACHUSETTS 1993  | MICHIGAN 1993  | MINNESOTA 1991   |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| <i>Public Schools Eligible for Charters</i>                            | all or portions of existing school, or new school   | all or portions of existing school, or new school   | all or portions of existing school, or new school   | all or portions of existing school, or new school   | —  | all or portions of existing school, or new school  |
| <b>GROUPS INVOLVED IN THE PROCESS</b>                                  |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| <i>Organizers</i>  | any public body, private person, or private organization  | any individual can circulate a petition to start a school                                       | any individual or group   | more than two certified teachers, or more than 10 parents, or any other individuals or groups   | any individual or entity   | licensed teachers  |
| <i>Sponsor</i>   | 1) any local school board;<br>2) State Board of Education; or 3) State Board for Charter Schools                                | local school board  | local school board  | state secretary of education  | board of a local or intermediate school district, community college, or state public university  | any local school board   |
| <i>Final Approval</i>  | none needed   | none needed   | none needed   | none needed   | none needed  | state board of education   |
| <i>Appeals Process</i>   | none; can simply seek other sponsor   | county board of education   | state board of education  | none  | when local district denies proposal, organizers may have question placed on ballot for next school election  | state board of education   |
| <i>Support Needed from Teacher/Staff Parents for School Conversion</i> | —   | 10 percent of teachers in school district or 50 percent of teachers at a school in the district | "adequate number" of parents, teachers, pupils  | —   | —  | 90 percent of teachers at the school   |
| <i>School Governance Structure</i>                                     | as specified in charter agreement   | as specified in charter agreement   | as specified in charter agreement   | board of trustees   | board of directors   | board of directors (more than 50 percent must be teachers at the school)                         |
| <b>ADMISSIONS STANDARDS</b>  |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| <i>Cannot Limit Student Admission Based on:</i>                        | ethnicity, national origin, gender, income level, disabling condition, proficiency in the English language, or athletic ability | race, ethnicity, religion, national origin, gender or residence of pupil                        | disability, race, creed, color, gender, national origin, religion, ancestry, or need for special education services | race, color, national origin, creed, sex, ethnicity, sexual orientation, mental or physical disability, age, ancestry, athletic performance, special need, proficiency in English language, or academic achievement | intellectual/athletic ability, measures of achievement/apptitude, handicapped status, or any other basis that would be illegal if used by a district | race, ethnicity, religion, intellectual or athletic ability, measures of achievement or aptitude |

| STATE YEAR PASSED                            | ARIZONA 1994   | CALIFORNIA 1992  | COLORADO 1993   | MASSACHUSETTS 1993  | MICHIGAN 1993   | MINNESOTA 1991  |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Can Limit Student Admission by:</i>       | age group or grade level   | admission requirements if applicable; however, must be nondiscriminatory                     | —   | grade levels, areas of focus of school, maintenance of reasonable academic standards                                    | age/grade level or other criteria allowed by districts  | age, grade level  |
| <i>Priority Status for Resident Students</i> | if sponsored by local board, must give preference to students within district boundaries   | an existing school converting to charter status must give preference to resident students    | open to any child residing in district, if district has open enrollment, then out of district students may attend | priority is given to students residing in city/town where school is located and siblings                                | if sponsor is local/intermediate district, or community college -- open to any child in district; if university sponsors - open to any child who is a MI resident | yes, priority is granted as long as school reflects racial and ethnic diversity of area |
| <b>EMPLOYMENT ISSUES</b>                     |  |  |   |   |   |   |
| <i>Charter School Teachers</i>               | charter must specify employee qualifications; certification not required   | charter must specify required employee qualifications; certification not required            | certified teachers only (unless approved for waiver)  | charter must specify required employee qualifications; certification not required                                       | if local/intermediate district sponsors - certified teachers; if community college/university sponsors - can also employ own post-secondary faculty               | certified teachers only   |
| <i>Job Security</i>                          | within 3 years, teacher maintains employment preference (and salary status) if suitable position is available in former district | charter describes teachers' rights to return to district employment                          | get 1 year leave of absence that can be renewed; at end of 3 years, a return is negotiated                        | districts grant teachers 2 year leave of absence; can extend for 2 years then teacher must resign or return to district | HB 5125 allows teachers to maintain district tenure   | districts must grant teachers leave of absence for length of time requested             |
| <i>Retirement Benefits</i>                   | intent is to remain part of teacher retirement system; however, law is unclear   | must specify manner in which employees will be covered by state or federal retirement system | remain members of public employee retirement association or Denver Public Schools retirement                      | eligible for state teacher retirement system  | HB 4366 makes teachers eligible for MI Public School Employees' Retirement System   | employees have district retirement benefits by paying all contributions                 |
| <i>Collective Bargaining</i>                 | "meet and confer" depends on charter   | depends on charter   | school may bargain with district or as a single unit  | school must bargain as a single unit  | if local board sponsors - same agreements apply   | school must bargain as a single unit  |

COMPARISON OF "LESS AUTONOMOUS" CHARTER SCHOOL LAWS

| STATE YEAR PASSED   | HAWAII 1994   | GEORGIA 1993  | KANSAS 1994  | NEW MEXICO 1993                                      | WISCONSIN 1993   |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| <b>GENERAL ISSUES:</b>  |   |   |  |  |  |
| <i>Date of Implementation</i>   | 1994  | 1993  | 1994   | 1994   | 1993   |
| <i>Number Allowed in State</i>  | 25  | no limit  | 15   | 5  | 10   |
| <i>Number Allowed per School District</i>   | state only has one school district  | no limit  | 2  | —  | 2  |
| <i>Preference Given to:</i>   | —   | —   | —  | —  | schools which will serve children at-risk              |
| <i>Automatically Free from Most State Education Code/District Rules -- "Super Waiver"</i> | yes, except: collective bargaining, procurement, civil rights, health and safety requirements | yes, possibly most; or from state/district policies as agreed to in charter | no, must apply to state for waivers  | no, must apply to state for waivers                  | exempt from most state laws, but not district policies |
| <i>Legally Autonomous</i>   | unclear, but teachers remain employees of state (i.e., district)                              | no, under local board authority   | no, under local board authority  | no, under local board authority                      | no, under local board authority                        |
| <i>Automatically Autonomous for 100% "Operations" Funding</i>                             | intent is "yes," but may only receive the average per pupil amount appropriated to DOE        | no, funding amount is established in charter                                | no, funding amount is established in charter   | no, appropriate administrative costs can be withheld | no, funding amount is established in charter           |
| <i>Length of Charter</i>  | 4 years   | 3 years   | 3 years  | 5 years  | up to 5 years  |
| <i>Private School Eligibility for Charter Status</i>                                      | no  | no  | no   | no   | no   |
| <i>Public Schools Eligible for Charters</i>   | only entire existing school   | all or portions of existing school, or new school                           | all or portions of existing school, or new school  | entire existing schools only                         | all or portions of existing school, or new school      |
| <b>GROUPS INVOLVED IN THE PROCESS:</b>  |   |   |  |  |  |
| <i>Organizers</i>   | existing public schools   | any Georgia public school faculty-staff                                     | a school building, a school district employees group, and educational services contractor, or any other person or entity | existing school personnel and parents                | any individual or the local school board               |
| <i>Sponsor</i>  | state board of education reviews/accepts plan   | the local school board  | the local school board   | state board of education                             | the local school board                                 |
| <i>Final Approval</i>   | none needed   | state board of education  | state board of education ensures that charters approved by districts do not violate federal, state laws                  | none needed  | state supt. of public instruction                      |

| STATE YEAR PASSED  | HAWAII 1994   | GEORGIA 1993   | KANSAS 1994  | NEW MEXICO 1993   | WISCONSIN 1993   |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| <i>Appeals Process</i>   | none  | state board allows resubmission of petition  | none   | none  | none   |
| <i>Support Needed from Teacher/Staff/Parents for School Conversion</i> | 3/5ths of school's admin., teachers, support staff, and parents   | ≥ ¾ of faculty and staff<br>≥ ¾ parents in meeting to initiate petition                | charters must describe the level of interest and support from district employees, parents, and community | 65% of faculty, and parent involvement and support                                  | 10% of teachers in district or 50% at one school in district required in some cases  |
| <i>School Governance Structure</i>                                     | must develop local governing board composed of school's principal and at least one representative of the instructional staff, support staff, parents, and student body. | as specified in charter agreement  | as specified in charter agreement  | budget is site-base managed   | as specified in charter agreement  |
| <b>ADMISSION STANDARDS:</b>  |   |  |  |   |  |
| <i>Cannot Limit Student Admission Based on:</i>                        | not specified; existing enrollment policies apply   | —  | —  | —   | sex, race, religion, national origin, ancestry, pregnancy, marital/parental status, sexual orientation, physical, mental, emotional or learning disability |
| <i>Can Limit Student Admission by:</i>                                 | not specified; existing enrollment policies apply   | —  | —  | —   | admission requirements if applicable; however, must be nondiscriminatory   |
| <i>Priority Status for Resident Students</i>                           | not specified; existing enrollment policies apply   | priority given to students in attendance zone; other students permitted as per charter | —  | (as per ed. code) priority is given to students in attendance zone of school        | priority is given to students in attendance zone of school   |
| <b>EMPLOYMENT ISSUES:</b>  |   |  |  |   |  |
| <i>Charter School Teachers</i>   | certified teachers  | certified teachers (unless waived)   | certified teachers (unless waived)   | certified teachers (unless waived) or alternative licenses                          | licensed teachers  |
| <i>Job Security</i>  | remain state employees  | remain district employees  | remain district employees but terms and conditions of employment to be set in charter                    | remain district employees   | remain district employees  |
| <i>Retirement Benefits</i>   | remain state employees  | remain district employees  | remain district employees  | remain district employees   | remain district employees  |
| <i>Collective Bargaining</i>   | continues as is, as part of district/state system   | no collective bargaining allowed; "meet and confer" remains as is                      | —  | continues as is since remain district employees; but could waive certain provisions | continues as is since remain district employees  |



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)  
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



**REPRODUCTION RELEASE**  
(Specific Document)

UD031368

**I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:**

|  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Title: <b>Charter Schools: A National Innovation for Penn.</b> |                                     |
| Author(s): <b>Dr. Charles E. Greenawalt, Ph. D.</b>            |                                     |
| Corporate Source: <b>Commonwealth Foundation</b>               | Publication Date: <b>April 1995</b> |

**II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:**

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

← Sample sticker to be affixed to document      Sample sticker to be affixed to document →

**Check here**

Permitting microfiche (4" x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY \_\_\_\_\_ *Sample* \_\_\_\_\_ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY \_\_\_\_\_ *Sample* \_\_\_\_\_ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

**or here**

Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

**Sign Here, Please**

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Signature: <i>Clifford Frick</i>                                    | Position: <i>Communications Director</i>                                    |
| Printed Name: <i>Clifford Frick</i>                                 | Organization: <i>Commonwealth Foundation for Public Policy Alternatives</i> |
| Address: <i>3544 N. Progress Ave Suite 101 Harrisburg, PA 17110</i> | Telephone Number: <i>(717) 671-1901</i>                                     |
|   | Date: <i>May 20, 1996</i>   |

### III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of this document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS).

|                        |                 |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| Publisher/Distributor: |                 |
| Address:               |                 |
| Price Per Copy:        | Quantity Price: |

### IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

|   |
|---|
| Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder: |
| Name:   |
| Address:  |

### V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

|   |
|---|
| Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:<br><br><b>ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education</b><br><b>Box 40, Teachers College</b><br><b>Columbia University</b><br><b>New York, NY 10027</b> |
|---|

If you are making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, you may return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

~~ERIC Facility  
1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 300  
Rockville, Maryland 20850-4305  
Telephone: (301) 258-5500~~