THE BEST OF BOTH WORLDS:
Can District-Charter Co-Location Be a Win-Win?

Michael DeArmond, Elizabeth Cooley Nelson, and Angela Bruns
August 2015

CRPE
REINVENTING PUBLIC EDUCATION

About This Report

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. We thank the Foundation for its support. The findings and conclusions presented here are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the Foundation. We would also like to thank Parker Baxter and Becca Bunn for reviewing the report and CRPE colleagues Robin Lake, Alison Krupnick, and Sarah Yatsko for providing feedback throughout the project. Above all, we would like to thank the principals, teachers, and district staff who gave us their time and shared their perspectives on district-charter co-locations. The authors bear all responsibility for any errors, omissions, or mistakes in facts or judgments.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Michael DeArmond is a Senior Research Analyst at the Center on Reinventing Public Education. Mike's research looks at educational governance, bureaucratic reform, and how schools manage teacher talent. Most recently he co-authored two CRPE reports on the challenges of public oversight in cities with large charter school sectors: "Making School Choice Work: It Still Takes a City" and "How Parents Experience Public School Choice." In addition to policy reports, Mike's research has been published in academic journals, including *Education Finance and Policy, Education Administration Quarterly,* and *Journal of Education Finance*, as well as in edited volumes from the *Brookings Institution Press,* the *Urban Institute Press,* and *Harvard Education Press.* Mike has a PhD in Education and an MPA in Social Policy and Education, both from the University of Washington, and a BA in History from Brown University. Prior to working as an education researcher, he was a middle school history teacher.

Elizabeth Cooley Nelson is a former Research Analyst at the Center on Reinventing Public Education, where she studied and supported district-charter collaboration work in 21 cities across the country. She also studied the effect of unified enrollment systems on families and schools. She was a co-author of a nationally recognized study of School Improvement Grant (SIG) implementation in Washington State, with a focus on district supports. Prior to joining CRPE, Elizabeth was in the Office of Portfolio Planning at the New York City Department of Education, where she helped open new schools. She has also worked at the Center for American Progress in Washington, D.C. Elizabeth holds a BA in Political Science from Rhodes College and an MPA from the University of Washington.

Angela Bruns is a Research Assistant at CRPE. She is involved in projects analyzing collaboration between school districts and charter schools. She is also a doctoral candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Washington where she uses quantitative and qualitative methods to study the consequences of social inequality for women and their families. Ms. Bruns received her BA in English and Rhetoric from the University of Illinois, and her MEd in Social Justice Education from the University of Massachusetts.

ABOUT THE CENTER ON REINVENTING PUBLIC EDUCATION

Through research and policy analysis, CRPE seeks ways to make public education more effective, especially for America's disadvantaged students. We help redesign governance, oversight, and dynamic education delivery systems to make it possible for great educators to do their best work with students and to create a wide range of high-quality public school options for families. Our work emphasizes evidence over posture and confronts hard truths. We search outside the traditional boundaries of public education to find pragmatic, equitable, and promising approaches to address the complex challenges facing public education. Our goal is to create new possibilities for the parents, educators, and public officials who strive to improve America's schools. CRPE is a nonpartisan, self-sustaining organization affiliated with the University of Washington Bothell. Our work is funded through private philanthropic dollars, federal grants, and contracts.

Introduction

It's no secret that advocates for district schools and charter schools are often at odds. When the two sides share the same school building—arrangements known as "co-locations"—the results can turn even messier. During last year's mayoral campaign in New York City, a favorite line of Bill de Blasio's about the co-locations in the city's schools was, according to Andrew Rotherham and Richard Whitmire, "There is no way in hell that [Success Academy Charter Schools' founder and CEO] Eva Moskowitz should get free rent."[1] Co-location remains controversial in New York, even after de Blasio's election, viewed as an "opportunity" by some and the equivalent of an "eviction notice" by others.[2]

To be sure, the conflicts over district-charter co-location in New York City are extreme. But they raise a legitimate question for district and charter leaders everywhere: Is co-location more trouble that it's worth? *Are win-win co-locations possible?*

Far from New York City, school district and charter leaders are trying to find answers to these questions by launching co-locations as part of broader cross-sector collaborations, known as district-charter compacts.[3] Unlike some co-locations that are essentially real estate deals, a handful of these compact-driven co-locations are trying to use co-location as a tool to promote school improvement by placing high-performing charter schools, often run by established charter management organizations (CMOs), in district schools that have extra space and the need for improvement.[4]

Last spring, CRPE researchers visited four of these improvement-focused co-locations to learn more about how they are playing out and what they suggest about the potential of a win-win, improvement-focused co-location. The co-location campuses the researchers visited were works in progress and their schools had accomplished varying degrees of cross-sector collaboration. In some cases, district and charter students intermingled in classrooms and sports teams, but in others, they rarely interacted. District and charter teachers at every campus participated in at least some joint professional development, and school leaders interacted regularly but teachers from each side tended to stick to their own schools and classrooms in their daily work.

These campuses show that sharing space doesn't have to result in a pitched battle. They also show that leveraging co-location for school improvement isn't easy

For district and charter leaders elsewhere who are thinking about co-location, these campuses show that sharing space doesn't have to result in a pitched battle. They also show that leveraging co-location for school improvement isn't easy. Even with strong district and charter leadership, teachers can still struggle to understand the goals of co-location and how to achieve them. They show that school culture can be a practical and productive starting point for cross-pollination, but they also show that collaboration on instruction is much harder to achieve because of incompatible school schedules, differences in curricular and teaching approaches, and time constraints.

The co-location campuses described in this report show that district and charter schools can, through considerable effort and with considerable resources, peacefully coexist. Our researchers found that both sides can benefit, with charter schools gaining access to extra-curricular activities and other enrichment, and district schools learning from and, in some cases, adopting elements of a charter school's culture. But using co-location to get to *school improvement* is a daunting task that involves costs and benefits that are, to date, neither fully realized nor, perhaps, fully understood by either side.

Four Co-Located Campuses

During the spring of 2015, CRPE researchers visited four relatively new improvement-focused co-locations in three school districts. Two of the districts were mid- to large-sized districts with between 30,000 and 70,000 students, and the third had well over 200,000 students. At the time of our visits, the three longest standing co-locations were three years old and the newest was just wrapping up its first year. All four co-locations were part of a deliberate and ambitious strategy to leverage co-location for the continued improvement of an existing district-run school, rather than part of a strategy to phase out the district school, as is the case with co-locations in some other districts.

All four co-locations were part of a deliberate and ambitious strategy to leverage co-location for the continued improvement of an existing district-run school.

At the **Watson-Crick Middle School Campus** (all names are pseudonyms), a high-performing CMO opened a new charter middle school on the same campus as an existing district middle school that was under-enrolled and whose low performance had led the state to identify it for supplemental funds and extra support. The CMO launched the new charter school by adding a new grade each year; by the if time of our visit, the charter school had expanded to three grades. Together, the two schools served about 950 students, the majority of who, in both schools, were economically disadvantaged (around 90 percent). Although they were two separate schools, students in both programs shared elective classes provided by the district school (e.g., art) and students socialized during lunch and afterschool sports programs. Most grade levels shared a common hallway with their cross-sector counterpart: for example, the district school's seventh graders were on the same hall as the charter school's seventh graders. Teachers in the two schools also participated in some shared professional development during the school year, including cross-school classroom observations. Some teachers informally shared curricula and other materials across the two schools. At the time of our visit, the district school had adopted some of the charter school's approach to character development.

The **Lewis-Clark Middle School Campus** had a similar arrangement in which a new high-performing charter middle school was started on the under-enrolled campus of a struggling district middle school. As with Watson-Crick, the charter school at Lewis-Clark was phased in a grade at a time; by the time of our visit, the charter school had expanded to two grades. Together, the two schools served around 910 students, the majority of who, in both schools, were economically disadvantaged (around 90 percent). As with Watson-Crick, students at Lewis-Clark socialized in shared electives (provided by the district school), lunch, and afterschool sports. Teachers at Lewis-Clark also participated in some shared, cross-school professional development, including a few observations and some informal, teacher-initiated collaboration. As with Watson-Crick, the district side of the campus had adopted some of the charter school's approach; in this case, the charter school's behavior management system.

The third middle school campus, **Bradshaw-Swann Middle School Campus**, also matched a high-performing CMO charter school with a struggling middle school. As with the other two middle school campuses, the charter school at Bradshaw-Swann was phasing in a grade at a time; by the time of our visit, it had expanded to two grades. Overall, the campus served about 890 students, the majority of who, in both schools, were economically disadvantaged (around 69 percent). Unlike their counterparts at Watson-Crick and Lewis-Clark, students at Bradshaw-Swann didn't share any classes. Teachers at Bradshaw-Swann had some shared professional development sessions and, at the time of our visit, a handful of teachers in one of the grade levels were starting to talk about their lessons and instruction across the schools. In general, cross-school interaction at Bradshaw-Swann was more limited than it was at the other two middle school campuses.

At the **Carson-McMahon Elementary-Middle Campus**, a charter middle school was co-located with a district elementary school. Unlike the other campuses where both schools served the same grades, students at Carson-McMahan attended elementary school at the district school and attended middle school at the charter school. Perhaps because of this division of labor, students and teachers at Carson-McMahon had little cross-school interaction, even though the two schools

Strong leadership is critical to supporting improvement-focused co-location and necessary for peaceful coexistence, but it can't guarantee that teachers understand the goals of co-location and what it means for their day-to-day work.

shared a hallway. As with some of the other campuses, the district school at Carson-McMahon had adopted some of its charter partner's approach to character development. Meanwhile, the charter school was planning to collaborate with the district school on a new restorative discipline initiative that originated with the district school.

In all four sites, principals and teachers alike talked about their co-located campus as a chance, in the words of one charter teacher, to "take the best from both sides and work together to produce great results for our students." We came away from our fieldwork with an appreciation of how hard people on all sides are working to achieve this goal and the substantial challenges they face along the way.

As we describe in the following sections, the experiences at these campuses suggest that strong leadership is critical to supporting improvement-focused co-location and necessary for peaceful coexistence, but it can't guarantee that teachers understand the goals of co-location and what it means for their day-to-day work. They also suggest that getting improvement-focused co-locations to their ultimate goal—school improvement—is harder still: we found co-located schools making progress and collaborating to improve school culture, but improving instruction via collaboration was more difficult and arguably will require bigger changes than either side has contemplated or committed to so far.

HOW WE LEARNED ABOUT CO-LOCATION

We sent a three-person research team to visit each campus. Over the course of the field visits, the team conducted a total of 40 interviews with school leaders and teachers, observed leadership meetings in two of the three districts, and collected policy documents describing the co-locations. The team analyzed the interview data by conducting a relatively low-inference content analysis, writing analytic memos about key topics (e.g., "supports for implementation" and "goals of co-location"), and arraying excerpted quotes in matrices around emerging themes and claims.

Key Takeaways

THE IMPORTANCE (AND LIMITS) OF LEADERSHIP

Even with strong leadership on both sides, teachers can still struggle to understand the goals of co-location and what they mean for their day-to-day work.

LEADERSHIP AT THE TOP

In the three middle school campuses, top executives from the school district and participating CMOs were actively involved in launching and sustaining the co-location initiative and underscoring its collaborative nature. As the district principal at Lewis-Clark campus explained, "[The superintendent] did so much work with the teachers here the year before, prepping them and answering questions and alleviating anxiety so they were prepared for the co-location."

> *"I remember feeling hesitant [at first]," said a district teacher at Lewis-Clark. "What does this mean? Does it mean our jobs are at stake? But people left the meetings [with the superintendent] definitely feeling more assured."*

At all three middle school campuses, top-level CMO staff routinely facilitated cross-sector meetings to support the co-located schools. A district leader at Watson-Crick said that the CMO leader's active involvement was critical to sustaining the partnership. "[The CMO leader] helps keep the whole partnership 'sticky' and keeps all of us together."

The active involvement of top leaders on both sides was important because it reinforced the idea that co-location was a true partnership. As a charter leader at Lewis-Clark explained, the superintendent's deep involvement in the initiative showed that top district leaders were "on board with this [the co-location]. He's committed to this work."

In addition to showing their commitment to co-location, system leaders helped broker resources and assistance for the co-located schools. For example, a district administrator explained how staff in her district's central office helped one of the co-located campuses purchase the software it needed to coordinate schedules across schools, even though the software wasn't already "in" the district's procurement system. "The company wasn't an approved vendor," she said, "but the district pushed it through. So they're willing to help in any way they can."

CMO leaders were reportedly supportive in this case as well, allowing their co-located charter school to change its schedule to align with its district counterpart. Indeed, a charter leader at Watson-Crick said that the message he got from his CMO about co-location recognized the need for flexibility. The message was,

> *"We're willing to compromise in order to make this co-location work. So tell us what you need to do, and within reason, we'll do it."*

His district counterpart was receiving exactly the same message from her superintendent.

By contrast, the Carson-McMahon campus suggested how weak system leadership undermines improvement-focused co-locations. According to the school personnel we interviewed, after several top administrators left the district, no individual champion at the system level took ownership of the co-location at Carson-McMahon. Without a system-level champion, leaders at the co-located school said that they were beginning to doubt the district's commitment to their work. Their subsequent experiences with the district reinforced that doubt.

For example, school-level leaders explained that the district had not signed a long-term facilities agreement with the co-location's charter partner, forcing the charter to "keep an eye out" for other facilities in case the district asked it to leave. They described how the district had promised them an on-site, district-funded operations manager to help with the day-to-day work of the co-location, only to eliminate the position and then, surprisingly, reinstate it a few months later, creating staffing uncertainty for both schools.

At Carson-McMahon, the district principal even said she was worried that the district would force her to transfer to a different school and neglect her successor.

> *"[If I leave], who's going tell [the new principal] about what's supposed to be happening here?" she asked. "It's not going to come from your district director, it's not going to come from the district. The co-location's very tenuous."*

LEADERSHIP AT THE MIDDLE

In addition to the stewardship of top-level system leaders, the three middle school campuses received key support from mid-level administrators who played a classic "fixer" role to support the co-location's implementation. These central-office staffers were dedicated to supporting the day-to-day work of the co-located schools and helping principals manage the extra work that came with running a co-located school. In one case, the fixer was a full-time central office position dedicated to supporting the co-location campus; but in the other cases, the fixer held additional duties and worked as co-location liaison part-time.

The support from fixers was critical. As the charter principal at Bradshaw-Swann put it, her fixer "takes care of so much that would make...[the co-location] overwhelming." Among other things, fixers helped principals manage the co-location campus' relationship with higher-level stakeholders, coordinated school visits by interested observers (e.g., leaders from other districts,

researchers), facilitated "joint chiefs of staff" meetings across co-located schools, helped school leaders solve logistical problems, and connected leaders with district and charter resources. Much of the fixers' work focused on practical, day-to-day problem solving.

Take this simple example: when leaders at Bradshaw-Swann realized that they wouldn't have enough parking spots to accommodate staff from both schools (a problem that would only grow worse as the co-located charter school added a grade the following year), they presented the problem to their fixer, who came up with a solution and presented it to the district office. By managing the parking problem—and acting as a liaison with the district—the fixer freed up the principals to focus on other, more pressing needs. When we asked about the keys to a successful co-location, Bradshaw-Swann's charter school principal didn't hesitate, saying,

> *"I would say [the fixer] is huge, maintaining that position ... she is willing to support a lot of the initiatives on the co-located campus—I love that fact about her."*

As with its system-level support, Caron-McMahon wasn't so lucky. Without a fixer, Carson-McMahon's leaders were left dealing with a host of challenges on their own, often with limited success. One small but (to anyone who has worked in a school) important example was a struggle over a copy machine used by Carson-McMahon's charter school. Given the district building's layout, Carson-McMahon's charter school didn't have access to the type of electrical outlet they needed to run their copy machine. After discussing a shared copy room with their district partner, neither side was sure if the electrical circuit in the district school's copy room would support an additional copier. The most reasonable solution—at least in the charter leader's mind—was to do the necessary electrical work so the charter school could have its own copy room. But that would have to be cleared by the district, which so far hadn't responded to the principal's requests for help.

LEADERSHIP AT THE SCHOOL

Finally, it goes without saying that co-locations require strong building leaders. Principals on both sides need to be willing to take on the extra work associated with co-locating, and to do so with an openness and commitment that arguably goes beyond the typical principalship. The charter leader at Lewis-Clark spoke about the qualities of his district counterpart this way:

> *"I give [the district principal] a tremendous amount of credit for stepping up and saying, 'This is really interesting and I'd like to be the person who helps out with this.' She could easily have ridden out the rest of her career in her comfort zone and be fine, but she was putting herself in an uncomfortable position ... she wasn't afraid of that. She approaches things with humility and passion and I've learned a ton from her and really respect her."*

At Watson-Crick, the district principal emphasized how important it was to select co-location leaders for both sides who are open to, rather than afraid of, the partnership.

> *"You've got to pick the right leaders for co-location because you have to have people that are humble. I believe you have to have humility—you're open to the ideas that are going to come in ... Maybe somebody else has the better idea."*

Others described co-location leaders as "super energetic" and "very optimistic." Energy is an important prerequisite for the job: leading any school is a tall order, but leading a school co-located with another school is even more difficult. It requires dealing not only with logistics like scheduling, spaces, and lunches, but also with deeper questions about what co-location means to a school's culture and identity.

Perhaps it's no wonder that two district principals and three charter school principals left their positions in the early years of the co-locations we visited. Recalling some of these struggles, a charter leader at one of the campuses underscored the importance of leadership when she said,

> *"A lot of people left our first year [of the co-location] to go to other schools because they felt like the leadership was not in a good place ... [leading a co-located school] is a really hard job. Things make people angry and they leave—it feels unsustainable once it starts to get a little difficult."*

Leadership turnover only reinforces the importance of having multiple layers of leadership—top to bottom—invested in supporting, sustaining, and prioritizing improvement-focused co-location. Remarking on the demands of her job, a leader at Lewis-Clark reflected,

> *"I don't know how much folks understand the negotiations that have to happen on a daily basis to actually just run the school, much less have shared values and shared vision."*

UNDERSTANDING CO-LOCATION IS STILL A STRUGGLE

In each of the districts we visited, even those with aligned and engaged leaders, some of the teachers we talked to on both sides described uncertainty around the goals of their improvement-focused co-location and how they were supposed to achieve them.

Energy is an important prerequisite for the job: leading any school is a tall order, but leading a school co-located with another school is even more difficult. It requires dealing not only with logistics like scheduling, spaces, and lunches, but also with deeper questions about what co-location means to a school's culture and identity

When we asked teachers in co-located schools what the co-location was trying to accomplish, most described the same overarching goal: to increase opportunity and performance for students. For example, a charter teacher at Lewis-Clark said, "Our goal is that kids in this building are getting a better education than they were before." The district leader at the same campus said, "I hope, obviously, that student achievement will be much higher because of the co-location." Her charter school counterpart agreed. "I'd like to see us making significant gains to catch up to the pace setters in the district," he said.

But if teachers understood that the overarching objective for co-locating schools was to improve educational outcomes, they also sometimes lacked basic information about the district's plan for the school and how the co-location should go about the work of raising achievement. A few were even still unsure about whether the co-location was a long-term collaboration plan, or if the charter would eventually take over its district partner.

When asked about the purpose of the co-location at Watson-Crick, for example, a district teacher said, "The goal? I'm not sure. I don't know if it was really written down." The same teacher recalled concerns from her colleagues about why the charter school was coming into their building when the co-location was first announced.

If teachers understood that the overarching objective for co-locating schools was to improve educational outcomes, they also sometimes lacked basic information about the district's plan for the school and how the co-location should go about the work of raising achievement.

"Are they coming in to take over our school or is this eventually going to be a charter school?" she said. "What's the real purpose behind this? You kind of still wonder that."

And at Bradshaw-Swann, some teachers voiced uncertainty about the underlying motivation behind the co-location. One district teacher said,

"Maybe there is a big picture, but I can't think of one ... As far as putting two schools in one, why would you do that?"

Even where leaders repeatedly communicated about the co-location initiative, teachers like this one struggled to fully understand its rationale and design.

More Collaboration on School Culture Than on Instruction

Our interviews and observations suggest that the collaboration between district and charter schools in the improvement-focused co-locations we studied focused primarily on exchanges around school culture, climate, and extracurricular activities rather than instruction in core content classes.

Some of the initial culture and climate work that the schools were doing was designed to build a sense of community between the two schools: for example, having common lunch periods, similar school uniforms, and shared dances, sports teams, and spirit weeks. Charter schools at two of the campuses we visited even adopted their co-located school's mascot to underscore fellowship between the two schools.

But at Watson-Crick, Lewis-Clark, and Bradshaw-Swann, district schools went beyond identity-related collaboration to adopt some aspect of their charter partner's character development and behavior management strategies. A charter teacher at Watson-Crick explained,

> *"This year [the district school] started partnering with us and focusing on the same character things. Each week, or each month, we started doing a monthly character strength. So we will talk with their staff and their administration and share with them what we're doing for character and what our focus is."*

At Watson-Crick and Lewis-Clark, the district schools adopted parts of the charter school's behavior management systems. Having a common behavior management system was particularly helpful because charter school students attended elective classes in the district school. The district leader at Lewis-Clark said, "…elective teachers were overjoyed because now it's [behavior management] just one way. So that's been really great for them." By adopting the charter's behavior management system, district teachers said they were learning to manage behaviors in their rooms better than before, instead of just removing disruptive students from class.

Most of the exchange around culture and climate appeared to flow from charter schools to the district schools. But charter school staff also said they benefited from district ideas and resources. At Carson-McMahon, for example, the charter school was planning to adopt a restorative discipline system that originated with its district counterpart. And at the two campuses where charter students attended classes in district schools, charter school leaders and teachers repeatedly said that the district's art, music, and physical education classes benefited their students. "That's one of the pluses I see for us, as opposed to a stand-alone charter," said a charter school leader at Lewis-Clark, "[Our students] get the opportunity to work in large orchestras and have resources that other charter schools might not have." Another charter leader at Watson-Crick agreed, saying,

> *"A huge part of education is experiencing the things outside of just the core content classrooms, and [an elective class] provides a lot more for our students."*

A charter teacher at Watson-Crick said that offering her students more courses "just feels more well-rounded."

In contrast to the cross-pollination we saw around school culture and non-academic subjects, instructional collaboration was either non-existent or just emerging in the campuses at the time of our visit. Teachers noted that collaborating around instruction was more difficult than collaborating around culture for two reasons. Logistically, teachers said they often didn't share planning periods and had different schedules across schools, which made it hard for them to arrange for time to work on instruction together. As a charter teacher at Lewis-Clark said, "Without the structure of [common planning time], nobody really does it on their own." A district teacher at the same campus said, "Everybody just gets going on their thing … I think they really want to [collaborate], but its just finding the time because everybody is busy."

In addition to scheduling logistics, instructional collaboration was difficult because the partner schools used different curricula and teaching methods. At Lewis-Clark, a charter school teacher explained that when the two schools had a joint professional development session they found out that "our curriculums are different … there was only so much collaboration we could do." At

Bradshaw-Swann, a charter math teacher had similar views about collaboration around math, saying, "The way we teach math is very unique." But she saw more promise in English Language Arts. "It's easy to overlap in ELA, in terms of techniques for teaching skills with texts," she said.

Teachers also had different perceptions about the quality of their partner's approach. For example, after observing a district classroom, a charter teacher thought, "Oh, [the way the teacher introduced a new topic] is really cool … how can I make that work for my classroom?" But at another co-located campus, a charter teacher was more critical of what she saw in the district school, saying, "What I've seen [of the curriculum], it's not something I would bring into my own classroom."

These challenges notwithstanding, some teachers are sharing materials with each other. For example, on one campus, a district teacher described another teacher who had informally adopted many materials from her charter school counterpart:

> *"I know they've shared stuff a lot, and [the district teacher] will basically use what [the charter teacher] has for class, because she likes the way it's structured."*

School leaders said they wanted more collaboration around instruction in their schools. Watson-Crick's charter school leader said that teacher collaboration was the "biggest area of growth" for the co-location in the near future. A charter leader at Carson-McMahon expressed a similar sentiment when talking about next steps being "collaboration around instruction and curriculum." At Bradshaw-Swann, the charter school leader said, "I'd like to see more solid structures in place for content teams to collaborate … then I would feel like we're successful on the instructional side." The question is how?

HOW MUCH CHANGE IS ENOUGH TO GET TO IMPROVEMENT?

For co-locations that hope to leverage their partnership to get to instructional improvement and build a deeper sense of collaboration, bigger changes may be needed.

By adopting the charter's behavior management system, district teachers said they were learning to manage behaviors in their rooms better than before, instead of just removing disruptive students from class.

The experiences of the co-located campuses we visited suggests that district and charter schools can peacefully coexist, but using co-location to get to instructional improvement isn't easy and will likely require bigger changes from both sides.

When students and adults collaborate and mingle in a co-location, the partner schools make compromises. The district schools at Watson-Crick and Lewis-Clark, for example, ended up becoming more structured as they welcomed charter students into their classrooms by adopting charter-based behavior systems and other formal structures. The charter schools in some sites, by contrast, found that they needed to become more flexible, letting go of some aspects of their program that didn't fit the co-location. The district principal at Watson-Crick described this give and take by both sides:

> *"Last year, I thought there were more non-negotiables on [the charter side] than there are … But as we moved into doing our same schedules, our same dress, I think [the charter school leader] has been so good at working with the CMO… to get them to be a little more flexible. And we've been working to be a little less flexible … So we're trying to meet in the middle."*

As charter and district schools try to meet in the middle, both sides have to ask themselves how much they are willing to change.

At Watson-Crick, the charter school was willing to think about departing from a network-wide school schedule to align better with its co-location partner. But deeper instructional collaboration could raise challenging questions about how far the school and its CMO are willing to adapt and change their program and curricula.

At Lewis-Clark and Watson-Crick, the district schools were willing to take on more formal behavior management routines to support the co-location. But deeper instructional collaboration might raise challenging questions about professional norms and teachers' willingness to make their teaching practice public. (Cross-school observations were reportedly more of a novelty for the district teachers in one school than they were for the charter teachers, who were used to having people visit their classrooms to observe.)

Facilitating student-to-student and teacher-to-teacher interaction may require giving up additional physical space and rethinking the social boundaries between schools. As one teacher said,

> *"I don't think you can have a partnership if you're [physically] separate ... I think for the partnership and for us to really integrate as one school with two programs, you have to have interaction between the kids because that's where the success comes."*

Conclusion

At the Bradshaw-Swann campus, one of the least-integrated campuses we visited, a long hallway ran the length of the school and divided the co-located charter and district schools. In the middle of the hallway there were signs marking out the transition zone between the two schools. A district teacher told us that the signs facing district students said, "STOP. DO NOT ENTER," but the signs facing charter students had no warning. "[The charter students] don't see a sign saying, "STOP!" she said, "but our [district] students look at it like, 'We can't go over there, but [charter students] can come over here to use our restrooms.'" But when we examined the actual signs closely, we found that neither side said, "STOP. DO NOT ENTER." All of the signs said, "You are entering the charter school" and "You are entering the district school."

The teacher's misperception of the sign speaks volumes about the gap between the two co-located schools on this particular campus and, perhaps, the power of preconceived fears. Even in more integrated co-locations, bridging this gap—let alone getting to school improvement—is a tall order.

If district and charter leaders are interested in bridging that gap and using co-location for school improvement, the early experience of the partnerships described in this report suggest they should recognize the following:

- **There is no such thing as too much communication about the goals and purpose of co-location.** In addition to regular meetings between leadership teams from both schools, co-location campuses need to build regular channels of communication for teachers about the logic and strategy behind the co-location.
- **In the short run, school culture and non-academic subjects are promising and complementary areas of collaboration and potential first steps toward leveraging co-location for school improvement.** By sharing elective classes, behavioral expectations, and grade-level hallways, co-location partners can become more familiar with one another's mutual interests and areas where they can learn from one another.
- **In the longer run, using co-location to improve instruction or develop teachers will likely require bigger changes from both sides,** including more aligned planning and teaching schedules, use of substitutes to free up teachers for collaboration time, more intentional cross-cutting collaboration in specific subjects (e.g., studying a campus-wide novel in English Language Arts), and potential shifts in professional norms around classroom observation and feedback.

Improvement-focused co-locations promise something new—a unique, dynamic blending of two schools where the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. District and charter leaders interested in the idea should be inspired by the hard work and progress made by the pioneering partnerships described in this report, but they need to approach co-location with eyes wide open about some of the challenges it brings for both sides.

Endnotes

1. Andrew J. Rotherham and Richard Whitmire, "De Blasio vs. Everyone Else," *Slate*, March 12, 2014.

2. For example, see Geoff Decker, "Success Academy Co-Location Exposes Fault Lines Among de Blasio's Allies," *Chalkbeat New York*, April 30, 2015. For a more positive take on co-location in Colorado, see Julie Poppen, "Denver Board Hears Report on Campus Sharing," *Chalkbeat Colorado*, June 19, 2013; and Parker Baxter, "For Charter Schools and Districts: Empty Space Equals Opportunity," in *Hopes, Fears, & Reality: A Balanced Look at American Charter Schools* in 2011, ed. Robin Lake and Betheny Gross (Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, 2011).

3. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation has funded a multi-year initiative to support the design and implementation of these district-charter collaboration compacts. See information on CRPE's role in the initiative here.

4. Of course, many charter schools likely could learn from district schools as well, but that type of exchange was not the primary motivation behind the cases described in this report.

5. For example, see Michael Winerip, "A City School's Uphill Fight Over Sharing Space With a Charter," *New York Times*, April 10, 2011.