



## Chartering Pre-K: How Natural Synergies Between the Charter and Pre-K Movements Can Improve Public Education

SARA MEAD, BELLWETHER EDUCATION PARTNERS

The Red Lava Bears are sitting in a circle on the carpet. Their teacher, Ms. Ortiz, has a surprise for them this morning—a large plush puppet shaped like a furry puppy. Ms. Ortiz explains that the puppy sometimes has trouble controlling his behavior and needs the students to help him make good choices (the importance of making good choices is a common theme for the Red Lava Bears). How, she asks, can the Red Lava Bears help the puppy learn how to make good choices in school?

Children in Miss Annemarie’s classroom 1,400 miles away are making pizza. As the children rolls balls of Play-doh into pizza “crusts” and put them into an “oven” made of an empty box, Miss Annemarie engages them in a running conversation about what they are doing. What kinds of toppings could they put on the pizza? Does chocolate go on pizza? Why not? What happens when we put the pizza in the oven?

The Red Lava Bears are not, in fact, bears at all, but four-year-old pre-kindergartners attending KIPP SHINE, a charter school in Houston, Texas. They, and Miss Annemarie’s students at AppleTree Early Learning Public Charter School, in Washington, D.C., are receiving high-quality pre-kindergarten learning opportunities. And while they do not know it (they are only 4 years old, after all), these youngsters are at the confluence of two of the most significant public-education movements of the past decade—the charter school and universal pre-kindergarten movements. These two movements share common goals, face similar challenges, and can benefit from the use of similar tools to overcome those challenges. But there has been surprisingly little collaboration or knowledge sharing between the two movements. This paper explores how natural synergies between the charter and pre-K movements can help both movements to be even more effective in improving public education.

### INTRODUCTION

Both the charter school and universal pre-K movements have grown substantially during the past 10 years. Nearly 5,000 charter schools now exist in 40 states and the District of Columbia, serving some 1.6 million students—up from 2,300 schools serving 580,000 students only a decade ago. The growth in state pre-kindergarten enrollments has paralleled the growth of charter schools. From 2001–2009, the number of children enrolled in state pre-K programs rose from 700,000 to more than 1.2 million, and state spending on pre-kindergarten more than doubled, from \$2.4 billion to \$5 billion.

Even more important than their numerical growth are the gains both movements have made in public awareness and support. High-performing charter schools, which are redefining what is possible in public education, and are now at the center of the national debate over education—the primary focus of the documentary *Waiting for Superman* and an important part of the Obama administration’s education agenda. Similarly, state pre-kindergarten programs are increasingly viewed not just as “something nice for kids,” but as critical investments in improving educational outcomes—as demonstrated by bipartisan efforts to maintain state pre-K funding even in tough fiscal times.

The charter and pre-K movements have progressed on largely separate tracks. A silo effect in our education policies and institutions tends to segregate issues related to the education of our youngest children from those related to the K-12 public schools. There is limited overlap between the organizations and leaders who champion charter schools and those who advocate on behalf of pre-K programs.

This is unfortunate, because the charter school and universal pre-kindergarten movements actually have a great deal in common. Both the charter and pre-K movements seek to improve children’s educational outcomes and close achievement gaps for low-income and minority youngsters. More fundamentally, each of these movements

*Viewpoint* is a series of articles written by leaders in charter school authorizing and the education reform movement. The series is meant to foster thoughtful discussion and idea exchange on current topics and emerging trends in the sector. The views, opinions, and recommendations expressed in these articles are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

seeks to expand the boundaries of public education—the charter school movement by enabling new providers to deliver public education, and the universal pre-K movement by extending public education to 3- and 4-year-olds. And both movements face similar challenges related to accountability, ensuring quality across diverse providers, building supply, and accessing funding and facilities.

During the past two decades, policymakers have used chartering as a tool to make the K–12 public education system more market oriented, to allow a greater diversity of education providers, to free public schools from unnecessary bureaucracy and regulation, and to provide increased options for children and their families.

The early childhood sector, in contrast, is already quite market based. It includes a diverse array of providers—from home-based child care to community-based and for-profit child care centers to Head Start—many of whom operate with minimal regulation or oversight of their quality. This system provides choices for parents but does not ensure the quality of those choices. And quality options are often beyond the financial reach of low-income and middle-class families. In trying to address these quality and accessibility problems—to establish uniform quality standards and make publicly funded pre-K available to low-income and middle class families—the universal pre-K movement is essentially trying to make part of the early childhood sector much more like K–12 public education.

But that does not mean that universal pre-K should mirror the existing K–12 public school system. Pre-K advocates must avoid replicating the flaws of the existing K–12 system, such as school district monopolies, excess bureaucracy and regulation, a flawed teacher credentialing system, and inequities in opportunities and outcomes for different student groups. And the early childhood sector has some features, such as parental choice and workforce diversity, that are desirable to incorporate into the K–12 system.

Ultimately, a high-quality public education system—for both young children and older students—would occupy a middle ground that includes both the universal access and public accountability of the current K–12 system, and some of the more market-based elements of the early childhood system. Chartering, created as a tool to help the K–12 system become more market-based and diverse, also can be used to create new systems of public education for pre-K that incorporate diverse providers and hold them accountable for common quality standards and results. This is about much more than simply allowing charter schools to operate pre-K programs; it has fundamental implications for how policymakers design and deliver publicly funded pre-K.

### **CHARTERING AS A TOOL FOR PRE-K**

When we talk about charter schools, we tend to focus on the schools themselves. We debate how charter schools are performing relative to their district-run peers, highlight examples of high-performing charter schools, and bemoan the failures of underperforming schools. But the key innovation in charter schooling is not the schools themselves. It is the charter—a tool that enables the creation of new, publicly accountable schools that operate independently from the traditional district system. This tool also has tremendous potential to support the development of new public-education systems for pre-kindergarten delivery.

Chartering offers a way to incorporate diverse providers into the public education system. When a school receives a charter, it becomes part of the public education system—even though it is not necessarily part of a school district, the entities that have historically had the exclusive franchise for public education. Such chartered schools are

**The charter and pre-K movements have progressed on largely separate tracks. A silo effect in our education policies and institutions tends to segregate issues related to the education of our youngest children from those related to the K-12 public schools.**

**The key innovation in charter schooling is not the schools themselves. It is the charter – a tool that enables the creation of new, publicly accountable schools that operate independently from the traditional district system.**

eligible to receive public funding and is publicly accountable for its results. This is important for pre-K because large numbers of community-based providers already care for and serve pre-K children in the market. Well-designed universal pre-K programs must incorporate these providers into new publicly funded and accountable pre-K systems. Some states have done this by allowing community-based providers to receive state pre-K grants or contracts, by allowing districts to sub-contract with community-based providers for pre-K, or by requiring that a certain percentage of pre-K funds go to community-based providers. These strategies allow community-based providers to receive state pre-K funds, but they do not make them part of the public education system. The result, in many states, is a two-tiered system, with one set of requirements for pre-K programs in public school settings and another, often lower, set of standards for community-based pre-K providers.

Chartering resolves this problem by allowing community-based preschool providers to apply for charters, which enable them to become public schools. These “pre-K charter schools” would then be able to receive public education funds as other public schools and school districts do and would be subject to the same quality standards and public accountability for results.

Pre-K charter schools would also allow state policymakers to fund diverse pre-K providers through the state school-finance system. There are significant advantages to funding pre-kindergarten through state school-finance systems, rather than through a separate pot of money. Using the state school-finance system for pre-K makes pre-K funding more stable and responsive to demographic shifts, and helps to protect pre-K funds from the budget ax. But community-based providers typically cannot receive funding through the school finance system, or can do so only as sub-grantees of a willing district—and many districts prefer to keep pre-K money under their control. Policies that enable community-based providers to become Pre-K charter schools, will make it possible for them to receive funding directly through the state school-finance system, as existing charter schools now do.

Finally, chartering provides a mechanism for injecting public accountability into the pre-K sector, in a way that reflects the unique challenges of accountability in early childhood education. Most early childhood education providers today operate outside the public education system, with little regulation of their quality or assessment of or accountability for their results. As public investment in pre-K increases, however, policymakers and taxpayers increasingly will demand evidence of the effectiveness and quality of the programs they fund.

But getting accountability right in early childhood programs is a challenge. For example, the familiar standardized tests used for accountability in grades K–12 will not fly with preschoolers, who one kindergarten teacher notes “try to color the pictures and circle the page numbers as their answer choices,” when confronted with a pencil-and-paper test.

That does not mean, though, that we must give up on accountability for pre-K programs. A variety of measures—including observational assessments, portfolios, and appropriately used standardized assessments—can be used to measure children’s progress toward school readiness and to inform evaluations of program quality. A number of states have developed kindergarten readiness screenings that could also be linked back to pre-K charter schools to measure their effectiveness in preparing children for kindergarten. Researchers have also developed process quality measures that assess the quality of children’s actual experiences in pre-K settings. These measures, which are predictive of children’s learning and developmental outcomes in pre-K, can also be used for pre-K program accountability; the federal Head Start program is currently implementing one such measure, the Classroom Assessment Scoring System, to evaluate the quality of Head Start classrooms.

Good accountability systems for pre-K programs should incorporate a mix of process and outcome measures to arrive at a comprehensive assessment of pre-K quality. Quality charter school authorizers, who already consider a mix of indicators when holistically assessing the performance of K–12 schools they authorize, are well positioned to serve as laboratories for the development of such nuanced accountability systems for pre-K charter schools. For example, the District of Columbia Public Charter School Board (DCPCSB), which authorizes charter schools in Washington, D.C., is developing a Performance Management Framework for the pre-K charter schools it oversees that will allow providers to select measures appropriate to their student population and mission, and will consider evidence of learning across multiple domains.

Authorizers—the entities that grant charters and hold charter schools accountable for performance—are key to the promise of chartering as a tool to expand high-quality pre-K options. Some authorizers, such as the DCPCSB, already oversee pre-K charter schools. And in some states, such as Arkansas, the agencies that oversee pre-K programs already play an authorizer-like role in approving and monitoring the quality of their diverse pre-K providers. But this authorizing function does not exist in many states, where pre-K programs tend to be either highly regulatory and input-focused, or largely hands-off, about quality. By creating an authorizing function to ensure quality and learning outcomes, chartering can add value to states' pre-K efforts.

### **ELIMINATING BARRIERS TO CHARTERING PRE-K**

Chartering has tremendous potential as a tool to help build diverse and accountable public systems of pre-kindergarten delivery. But in order to use this tool effectively, policymakers must first eliminate barriers that prevent charter schools from serving pre-kindergarten students. Many high-performing charter schools want to offer pre-K because they recognize that the achievement gaps they seek to close begin long before kindergarten. But existing policies and structural arrangements too often prevent them from doing so.

#### **Lack of specific authorization to serve pre-kindergarten students**

How state laws define charter schools can create obstacles or uncertainty about whether or not charter schools may offer pre-K. For example, New York state law has been interpreted as precluding charter schools from offering programs outside the standard K–12 education program, including pre-K. Other states do not prohibit charter schools from offering pre-K but also do not specifically authorize them to do so. States should clarify both charter and pre-K statutes to clearly state that charter schools may offer pre-K and are eligible to participate in state-funded pre-K programs.

#### **Funding barriers**

Funding is the biggest barrier that currently prevents charter schools from offering pre-kindergarten. Charter schools in most states simply do not have access to stable funding streams that provide adequate resources to support quality pre-K programs.

This problem is hardly unique to charter schools. Fragmented funding streams and inadequate funding are endemic challenges across the early childhood landscape. Public funding for pre-kindergarten flows through a variety of different funding systems—state and federal childcare subsidies for low-income families, the federal Head Start program, state pre-K programs, and local early childhood initiatives. These programs operate in separate silos, are often administered by different agencies, and have different purposes, eligibility requirements, and quality standards, with little coordination across programs or funding streams. Accessing and cobbling together funds from across different programs can be extremely difficult, both for charter schools and other early childhood providers.

**Authorizers – the entities that grant charters and hold charter schools accountable for performance – are key to the promise of chartering as a tool to expand high-quality pre-K options.**

**Funding is the biggest barrier that currently prevents charter schools from offering pre-kindergarten. Charter schools in most states simply do not have access to stable funding streams that provide adequate resources to support quality pre-K programs.**

But charter schools can face additional difficulties in accessing pre-K and other early childhood funds. Pre-K, Head Start, and childcare funding programs were typically not designed with charter schools in mind, creating unintended difficulties for charter schools seeking to access funds. State agencies that administer early childhood programs may be unfamiliar with charter schools and may not know how to work with them. Pre-K funds in some states flow directly to school districts but not to charter schools, meaning charter schools can access these funds only if districts want to share. Similarly, Head Start funds flow directly from the federal government to local Head Start agencies. Some local Head Start agencies have been willing to work with charter schools—KIPP SHINE receives funds from its local Head Start agency to serve 3-year-olds—but this is rare.

Even when charter schools are able to access public pre-K and other early childhood funds, these funds are often inadequate to support high-quality programs. The average per-pupil funding in state pre-K programs is only \$4,143—far less than the average per-pupil spending of \$9,509 in K–12. Some states spend far less; Florida, for example, spends only \$2,500 per pupil on pre-K. Local school districts can raise funds from local property taxes to supplement state pre-K funding, but charter schools cannot. And because charter schools often receive less funding per pupil than school districts do, it is much more difficult for them to cross-subsidize pre-K with funds they receive for older students.

Ultimately, these issues cannot be resolved without fundamental changes that better integrate our currently fragmented systems of early childhood education subsidies, as well as increased investments (in some states), to bring pre-K funding to adequate levels. These policies would benefit both charter schools that want to offer pre-K and the larger pre-K sector, creating opportunities for shared advocacy between charter leaders and pre-K advocates.

But more-modest policies could also allow more charter schools to offer pre-K. States could modestly supplement per-pupil pre-K funding for charter schools, to make up for their inability to raise additional local funds for pre-K. Improving funding equity for charter schools overall would also help.

Federal policymakers should also change policies to help charter schools access federal early childhood funds. The Department of Health and Human Services recently announced a new process to terminate contracts with low-performing Head Start grantees and open new competitions for these grants. Federal officials should ensure that charter schools have the opportunity to compete for these grants. Many Head Start grantees sub-grant to a variety of other local agencies that operate Head Start classrooms. Federal officials should create incentives for grantees to sub-grant to charter schools and ensure that existing policies create no disincentive to do so. The federal government should also provide technical assistance to help charter schools access federal early childhood funds and combine childcare, Head Start, and state pre-K funds to provide a high-quality learning experience for young children.

Finally, federal policymakers should ensure that pre-K charter schools have access to federal charter schools' program funds by amending the definition of a charter school in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization to state that charter schools may serve students in grades pre-K–12.

#### **Eligibility requirements and articulation challenges**

Many states fund pre-K only for children from low-income families, a reasonable effort to target limited funds to the most needy students, but one that creates problems for charter schools. As open-enrollment schools, charters cannot restrict enrollment to low-income

students. Open enrollment and lottery requirements, designed to ensure that charter schools are open to all students and cannot discriminate in admissions, unintentionally undermine charter schools' ability to offer pre-K or to allow children to move seamlessly from charter school operators' pre-K programs into their K–12 charter schools.

For example, Community Day Care, in Lawrence, Mass., operates both high-quality pre-kindergarten programs for low-income youngsters and a high-performing charter school. But because of open enrollment requirements, Community Day Care cannot seamlessly transition children from its pre-K programs into its charter school. Instead, some children who did not attend Community Day Care's pre-K programs win lottery seats in the school, while many children who did attend pre-K do not win seats in the lottery. This undermines Community Day Care's ability to provide a seamless early learning experience for young children and prevents the organization from leveraging the combined impacts of quality pre-K and an effective charter school to maximize its impact on children's learning.

Articulation problems could be resolved by enabling more charter schools to operate pre-K as part of the charter school, rather than as a separate program. This is happening in some places, particularly Washington, D.C. But in many states, differences in funding streams and eligibility requirements for pre-K programs prevent this, as do federal and state laws that define public education as including only grades kindergarten through 12, not pre-K. Policymakers can address some of these programs by funding pre-K through state school-finance formulas and by clarifying in statute that charters may serve pre-kindergarteners.

Improved state policies could also resolve the tension that currently exists between charters' open enrollment status and income-based targeting in state pre-K programs. One strategy is to target pre-K funding based on geography, rather than individual child and family characteristics. Under this approach, used in New Jersey's Abbott pre-K program, all children in identified high-need communities would be eligible for pre-K, regardless of their families' incomes. Only charter schools located in high-need communities would be permitted to offer pre-K. Alternatively, states could permit authorizers to grant a charter for pre-K only when a school's location, mission, and recruitment plan create high probability that the school will enroll primarily low-income and otherwise at-risk children. Authorizers would then be responsible for monitoring the school's pre-K enrollment to ensure it serves the intended population.

### **Overregulation**

Many states have relied on a largely input-focused approach to pre-K quality, requiring state-funded pre-K programs to employ teachers with certain credentials, to have small class sizes and certain ratios of adults to children, to use certain curricula, to have facilities and furniture in compliance with certain standards, and to meet state childcare licensure requirements. Some of these requirements are necessary to ensure pre-K providers meet basic levels of quality. But excessive input regulation prevents some charter schools from operating pre-K programs.

Moving toward a more charter-like approach would reduce the need for such micro-management. High-quality authorizers could give pre-K providers greater flexibility to innovate around such issues as curriculum and staffing, while still holding them accountable for overall quality and results.

### **Facilities**

Lack of access to or funding for facilities remains a major barrier to the growth of high-quality charter schools. This is a particular challenge for charter schools seeking to offer pre-kindergarten, because programs serving very young children need more specialized features than typical K–12 schools, including larger classrooms to accom-

**High-quality authorizers could give pre-K providers greater flexibility to innovate around such issues as curriculum and staffing, while still holding them accountable for overall quality and results.**

**Realizing the potential of chartering to expand access to quality pre-K, will require not only the elimination of barriers, but also the building of capacity among authorizers, charter schools, and community-based providers.**

moderate pre-K centers, access to bathroom facilities in or near classrooms, child-sized restroom facilities and furnishings, and access to appropriate outdoor play space. These needs can make building or retrofitting space to serve pre-kindergarteners even more costly and challenging than for regular K–12 charter schools. Policies that support charter schools in accessing or paying for facilities—including per-pupil facilities funding, access to special or subsidized financing, and requirements that districts share facilities on an equitable basis with charter schools—would also help pre-K charters. Because the facilities access and funding challenges facing community-based pre-K providers are often quite similar to those facing charter schools, allowing community-based pre-K providers to become pre-K charter schools would enable policymakers and philanthropists to support the creation of financing and other facilities solutions to meet the needs of both groups.

#### **Charter caps**

Many states have caps that limit the number of charter schools that can be created. These caps do not currently prevent high-quality charter schools from offering pre-K, but would pose a challenge for efforts to use chartering as a tool to integrate existing community-based providers into the public system. Ideally, states should eliminate these caps, which have no impact on charter school quality and constrain the growth of high-performing charter schools to meet demand. States could also choose to exempt pre-K charter schools from existing caps. On the other hand, if state policymakers are concerned about the costs of allowing charter schools to offer pre-K, they could cap the number of pre-K charter schools in order to limit state spending on them.

### **BUILDING CAPACITY TO SUPPORT PRE-K CHARTERING**

Realizing the potential of chartering to expand access to quality pre-K, will require not only the elimination of barriers, but also the building of capacity among authorizers, charter schools, and community-based providers. National nonprofit organizations and foundations can play a major role in helping to build this capacity.

#### **Authorizer capacity**

High-quality charter schools depend on effective authorizing, and this is just as true for pre-K as it is for grades K–12. High-quality charter authorizers have developed significant capacity to evaluate the quality of charter applicants, to ensure strong charter contracts and effective governance, to monitor the quality of charter schools, and to hold them accountable. These capacities would add tremendous value to publicly funded pre-K systems that seek to hold diverse providers to common quality standards.

But many charter school authorizers lack specific knowledge of early childhood education—understandably so, given the barriers that prevent most charter schools from operating pre-K programs. Expanding the number of charter schools that offer quality pre-K will also require increasing authorizer knowledge and capacity in early childhood. The best way to build capacity will vary depending on the authorizer. Large school district authorizers may be able to draw on the expertise of in-district early childhood specialists, while independent authorizers, such as postsecondary institutions or nonprofits, may need to hire or contract with individuals who have early childhood expertise. National early childhood and charter school authorizer organizations should provide training and technical assistance to help authorizers build their knowledge of the early childhood sector and adjust existing policies and practices to address the unique features of pre-kindergarten.

States could also create new statewide authorizers specifically for pre-K and early childhood charter schools. These authorizers, who would have specialized early child-

hood capacity, could authorize early-childhood-focused (pre-K and early elementary) charter schools, particularly in small districts that have limited authorizing capacity, and serve as a model and resource on early childhood for other authorizers in the state. Other authorizers could also sub-contract with the statewide early childhood authorizer to supplement their pre-K expertise. In states that allow nonprofit organizations to become authorizers, early-childhood-focused nonprofits could also become authorizers specializing in pre-K charter schools.

#### **Technical support for charter schools and community-based pre-K providers**

High-performing charter schools are a tremendous potential source of supply for high-quality pre-K schools. But a record of success in educating elementary school and secondary school students does not necessarily mean a charter school or charter network knows how to serve preschoolers well. Authorizers must carefully consider whether existing, high-performing charters that want to offer pre-K have the necessary expertise in early childhood, as well as well-designed and developmentally appropriate educational programs for 3- and 4-year-olds. Charter school leaders also need access to professional development and technical support, specifically in early childhood. Providing such technical assistance services is an appropriate role for third-party organizations—including early childhood advocacy groups and professional associations, foundations, and new vendors—not the authorizer.

Similarly, community-based providers that operate effective preschools will also need assistance and technical support to become successful pre-K charter schools. Experience in both the charter school and universal pre-kindergarten movements indicates that many community-based providers need assistance to understand their responsibilities as public schools and stewards of public funds, particularly in the areas of financial management, regulatory compliance, governance, and curriculum. In general, these technical support services should be provided by organizations other than the authorizer, such as charter school associations and support centers, foundations, universities, and state agencies. But authorizers do have a responsibility to provide clear guidance, information, and support to ensure that community-based organizations understand their new responsibilities and the requirements involved in being a public school. This is true whether the community-based organization is operating a pre-K or a K-12 charter school.

#### **BRIDGING THE PRE-K AND CHARTER MOVEMENTS**

Charter school and pre-kindergarten advocates have an opportunity to work together to advance shared goals and overcome shared challenges. But these two movements have operated in isolation, with little awareness or understanding of one another. The first step in capturing the potential synergies between the charter and pre-K movements is to expand communication and collaboration between the two movements at all levels, particularly among funders and between local-level school and program leaders.

Both the charter and pre-K movements have benefitted from significant philanthropic investments in both specific providers and broader policy advocacy. Funders within each space have collaborated effectively to maximize their combined impact. But—with a few notable exceptions—there is little overlap or interaction between funders of pre-K and funders of charter schools. NewSchools Venture Fund, a venture philanthropy that has supported the growth of high-quality charter school management organizations, has also invested in early childhood providers, including Acelero Learning, Apple-Tree Early Learning Public Charter School, and Jumpstart. The Rainwater Charitable Foundation has provided significant funding to help the KIPP charter school network to expand the numbers of pre-K and elementary schools it operates. But greater communication and collaboration between pre-K-focused and charter-focused funders would provide opportunities for even greater leverage and impact.

**Authorizers have a responsibility to provide clear guidance, information, and support to ensure that community-based organizations understand their new responsibilities and the requirements involved in being a public school.**



**Chartering has tremendous potential as a tool to incorporate existing community-based pre-K providers into the public education system.**

Joint advocacy is another promising area for greater collaboration between the charter school and pre-K movements. State policy environments are critical to the ability of both the pre-K and charter school movements to achieve their goals. Pre-K programs and charter schools face some related challenges, and a number of policy changes, such as those discussed above, have the potential to benefit both movements. This creates an opportunity for the charter school and pre-K movements to work together to advocate for shared policy goals. For example, charter schools and pre-K advocates could advocate jointly for equitable per-pupil funding for pre-K or programs to help both charters and community-based pre-K providers finance or obtain facilities. Despite the challenges they continue to face, both the charter and pre-K movements have achieved significant progress towards policy goals in the past decade, and leaders in both movements could benefit from learning about one another's advocacy experiences.

Both the pre-K and charter school movements also could benefit from greater collaboration between local-level charter school operators and early childhood providers. Greater collaboration and relationships between individual charter schools and preschool providers could help families find their way from quality pre-K programs into effective charter schools and support more seamless transitions for children. Individual charter schools and pre-K programs can begin to work together now to build these relationships, even in the absence of other policy changes.

## CONCLUSION

Schools such as KIPP SHINE and AppleTree demonstrate that high-performing charter schools can offer high-quality pre-kindergarten experiences for children who need them. Chartering has tremendous potential as a tool to incorporate existing community-based pre-K providers into the public education system. Unfortunately, existing policies prevent more charter schools from offering quality pre-K, as well as high-quality pre-K providers from becoming charter schools. And a lack of greater understanding and interaction between the charter school and universal pre-K movements has led to missed opportunities for collaboration. By working together to bridge this gap and eliminate policy barriers to chartering in pre-K, charter school and pre-K leaders can help increase the number of children who benefit from the kind of high-quality pre-K experiences that other youngsters currently enjoy.

---

1 Rachel Schumacher, Danielle Ewen, Katherine Hart, and Joan Lombardi, "All Together Now: State Experiences in Using Community-Based Child Care to Provide Pre-Kindergarten," paper prepared for Brookings Institution and University of North Carolina Conference "Creating a National Plan for the Education of 4-Year-Olds," Washington, D.C., September 9–10, 2004. [www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/0211.pdf](http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/0211.pdf)

2 [www.eduwonk.com/2006/02/measuring-up.html](http://www.eduwonk.com/2006/02/measuring-up.html)

3 Appropriate standardized assessments for young children are not pencil-and-paper tests such as those used in K–12. Rather, they are typically administered in one-on-one interactions between the child and teacher or other familiar adult.

4 W. Steven Barnett, Dale J. Epstein, Allison H. Friedman, Rachel Sansanelli, and Jason T. Hustedt, *The State of Preschool 2009*. (New Brunswick, N.J.: National Institute for Early Education Research. 2010). <http://nieer.org/yearbook>

5 Under this arrangement, authorizers would need the ability to revoke a school's charter for pre-K if it routinely fails to meet targets for low-income and at-risk enrollment, without affecting the charter for the entire school.