

Toward Understanding Unionization’s Impacts on Charter School Students

Lesley Lavery, Ashley Jochim, Sean Gill

A few years ago, Enzo Charter School (all school names in this brief are pseudonyms) was facing hard times. Teachers left the school in droves: some involuntarily dismissed, others unwilling to take the gamble they might be a capricious administrator’s next target. Teachers sought to protect themselves by organizing a union, and found recognition with a noneducator labor organization. The subsequent contract formalized for the first time a system for evaluation and dismissal. Both teachers and administrators agreed that the effort helped to stabilize the school, increasing teacher retention and strengthening relationships between parties. As one teacher said, “The collective bargaining [agreement] allowed the focus to go back on the mission statement and the kids, as opposed to literally just surviving day by day in your classroom.”

The school’s story stood in contrast to Hornung Charter School, where several years ago problems were piling up. Teachers were underpaid and overworked and administrators just weren’t listening. Fed up, teachers turned to the local teachers union to address their grievances. Unionization secured some wins for teachers, including pay increases. But administrators worried whether the effort would be their death knell, citing escalating salary costs, new constraints on a teacher coaching model, and decision-making via “committee.” As one administrator confessed, “Unions are supposed to create standardization, charters exist to create really different environments for kids.” In this leader’s mind, the two are fundamentally incompatible.

These schools’ stories, drawn from interviews with teachers and administrators a few years after teachers at each school unionized, point to both the potential promises and pitfalls of charter school unionization. Will unionization undermine central tenets of charter schooling—flexibility, leader autonomy, distinct organizational cultures—by hamstringing administrators with new rules and hampering their efforts to serve students effectively? Or can unionization strengthen organizational cultures, lay a foundation for effective educator collaboration, and stabilize working conditions, thereby setting a stronger foundation for future results?

Three decades ago, before the first charter school legislation was enacted, proponents of increased public school choice and autonomy argued that teachers unions tended to “wage a war of formalization against principals,” curtailing their ability to instill coherent organizational cultures, assemble teams of educators committed to their schools’ missions, and remove teachers who did not fit into their organizations.¹ More recent findings from studies of traditional school districts point to some provisions in collective bargaining agreements that can hinder efforts to improve student outcomes.² But unionization efforts in charter schools are not destined to replicate these collective bargaining practices.³

Charter school teachers who choose to unionize hope that unionization efforts could help address instability and thus improve their effectiveness,⁴ but mixed results from two studies of unionized charter schools in California failed to provide definitive evidence on the matter.⁵ In this study, we set out to understand how unionization may or may not shape practices central to charter schools' ability to serve students. Our study, an exploratory one, includes 29 interviews across eight schools that unionized four to six years ago. We did not rigorously track the impact of unionization on student outcomes. Instead, we chose to get inside the “black box” of schools to understand how unionization influenced educator practices and organizational dynamics (see inset, “Inside Charter School Unionization”). Our results point to areas of concern, optimism, and future research.

Unionization may help codify systems for teacher development but it could also undermine efforts to advance teacher effectiveness. Some teachers and administrators cited improvements in how schools developed and retained teachers following unionization. But others reported that unionization had made it more difficult to provide teachers meaningful feedback on their craft or dismiss ineffective teachers. Understanding when and how unionization impacts the ways in which charter schools manage teacher talent should be a priority for researchers in the years to come.

Unionization may help to address pay inequities between districts and charter schools, but at the risk of financial sustainability. Nearly every teacher we talked with cited salary gaps between charter schools and school districts as a motivation to unionize. Newly negotiated collective bargaining agreements often resulted in salary increases and improved transparency around pay raises. But these wins came at a cost as new salary schedules put pressure on administrators to address escalating expenditures without new sources of revenue. If continued, these costs could generate important long-term challenges for charter schools that undermine their ability to effectively serve students.

How unionization plays out may hinge on teachers' choice of bargaining partner and the priorities they pursue in collective bargaining. We observed important differences in how teachers and unions approached collective bargaining in charter schools. According to both teachers and administrators, in some cases teachers unions would seek to impose policies upon charter schools that mirrored policies in local school districts—and which charter school administrators viewed as undermining their ability to serve students well. In other cases, however, unions sought instead to tailor their approach based on the unique needs of the school and its teachers. The differences may have important implications for how unionization efforts shape charter schools and the students they serve.

The stories of unionization we heard add nuance to the debate over whether unionization helps or harms public school students. Contrary to unionization's biggest detractors, we heard from teachers and administrators who felt unionization helped catalyze school improvement efforts that ultimately bore fruit for students. The introduction of a new collective bargaining agreement tends to formalize and codify rules and procedures that were previously informal and unwritten. But whether that process generates benefits for students hinges upon the specifics—including which union is bargaining and what priorities get etched into stone via collective bargaining agreements. If students' learning needs aren't at the center of negotiations over these new agreements, unionization is unlikely to generate the better outcomes for students its proponents hope for.

Inside Charter School Unionization

We set out to understand the impacts of unionization on practices inside charter schools, focusing on the experiences of educators and administrators involved in the years following unionization. Unionization is a fraught topic for affected parties and requires delicacy and doggedness in recruiting research subjects. We focused on recruiting teachers and school leaders who were part of the school's staff during the original organizing effort and had remained on staff for several years after. In order to reduce professional risks for participants, we reached out to teachers and administrators directly, rather than seeking buy-in from school sites or unions.

To identify prospective participants, we turned to the list of unionized charter schools maintained by the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools (NAPCS). We narrowed our search to schools that unionized between 2014 and 2016 to focus on schools with enough experience with collective bargaining that teachers and administrators could speak to its effects. We also excluded schools that are required under state law to join existing collective bargaining units or create new ones.⁶ We identified 45 charter schools that unionized within our focal time frame. Of these, 10 did not have working websites, five no longer served students, and two schools indicated that a unionization vote never resulted in a collective bargaining agreement. We sought to recruit participants from the remaining 28 schools but were turned down or unable to locate contact information for teachers or administrators at 20 of the schools.

In total, we made contact with teachers and administrators at eight schools reflecting the diversity of the charter sector (see table 1). This includes:

- Two West Coast schools, four Midwestern schools and two East Coast schools.
- Three suburban schools and five urban schools.
- Three NEA-affiliated schools, three AFT-affiliated schools, one AFT/NEA merge-affiliate and one school represented by a union outside the field of education.⁷
- Seven of the schools in our sample are freestanding charter schools and one school sits under a charter management organization's umbrella.

Across eight schools we conducted 29 semistructured interviews focused on motives for unionization and unionization's effects on key practices, including teacher recruitment, compensation decisions, class sizes, teacher evaluation, grievances and layoffs, length of school days, transfer and vacancy policies, school funding/budget, curriculum adoption, staff relationships, leadership and governance (see protocol in appendix A). All interviews were recorded and transcribed. Two researchers analyzed the data for patterns related to these effects.

Table 1. School Information and Interviews Conducted by Role Type

Code Name	Region	Grades	# of Students	% Low Income	Nonwhite	Teachers	Board Member	Admin	Total
Hornung	Midwest	9-12	201-400	92%	99%	1	0	2	3
Osprey	Midwest	K-8	1000+	83%	100%	6	1	0	7
Nexus	West Coast	9-12	201-400	68%	100%	2	0	2	4
Griffon	Midwest	K-8	1-200	82%	83%	4	0	1	5
Aon	East Coast	6-8	1-200	25%	81%	1	0	0	1
Enzo	East Coast	6-12	800-1000	7%	32%	4	1	2	7
Sunshine	Midwest	K-8	201-400	99%	99%	1	0	0	1
O'Sullivan	West Coast	6-12	400-600	25%	69%	0	0	1	1

Source: Enrollments drawn from National Center for Education Statistics, 2019.

Note: All school names are pseudonyms.

Our small, exploratory, sample does not include any schools located in the South, where unionization, and charter unionization, are less common.⁸ Every story of unionization we heard in part reflects the unique conditions the school faced prior to unionization, the people who negotiated the collective bargaining agreement, and those who worked to operationalize it in the school. While we deliberately sought to capture both administrator and teacher perspectives, it is possible that our interviews do not capture the full range of perspectives on unionization within any given school.

Unionization may help codify systems for teacher development but it could also undermine efforts to advance teacher effectiveness

High-quality charter schools are known for their sharp focus on teacher talent as a means to improve student outcomes, including high expectations, intensive coaching, and professional development.⁹ How unionization shapes these practices is central to understanding its impact on students.

Our interviews with teachers and administrators suggest that unionization can bring greater focus and transparency to how schools develop and retain teachers—especially in schools that lack any formal systems for managing teacher talent. But unionization can also put up new barriers that make it more difficult for administrators to offer feedback or dismiss ineffective teachers. In two cases, these tensions played out alongside leadership changes. Leader turnover could explain a gulf between teachers and administrators but also further complicate the relationship-building needed for effective coaching.

Most of the charter school administrators we spoke with articulated specific concerns about how unionization impacted their ability to develop and retain effective teachers. Several noted that collective bargaining agreements placed strict, detailed limits on contact between teachers and administrators, which thwarted their tried and true coaching and evaluation models.

According to one administrator, teacher coaching changes in a unionized context in part because collective bargaining agreements restrict the ways administrators can give feedback, and “doesn’t leave room for a lot of great coaching strategies because coaching is one part accountability, one part support. And you can’t do the accountability side of that.” Another leader worried that the collective bargaining agreement undermined her ability to support teachers effectively, limiting administrators to one round of coaching per week. According to this administrator, the prescriptive details of the contract “limit the flexibility that school has really required to function well.”

The impact of collective bargaining on teacher feedback varied, though. Teachers from two different schools noted that their schools' collective bargaining agreements actually codified a teacher evaluation system for the first time and increased the number of observations administrators conducted. As one teacher noted, "I think this is probably the first year that [administrators] are really following to the letter the evaluation process. But that has been really positive, because teachers are getting a lot more observation and feedback and a lot more professional development because they're sort of holding the admin to that evaluation process. So that's really good." Teachers at another school praised newfound collaboration around teacher evaluation. As one noted, "We can collaborate with [administrators] so that there's some documentation of what is expected on both ends in terms of evaluations."

In some cases, collective bargaining agreements butted up against larger divides between charter school administrators and teachers. At Enzo, teachers described having turnover with three school leaders in a short time, which helped contribute to a "toxic" culture or a sense that the charter school had lost its way. A former teacher turned school administrator said, "The administration was always viewed with a lot of skepticism if they came into your classroom. . . . People felt like if you could be doing everything right in the classroom, but if you said the wrong thing at a meeting . . . then your job could be on the line."

Teachers and administrators agreed that unionization brought an extended, step-by-step process for dismissing teachers but disagreed on its consequences. For administration, the new process acted as a barrier to their ability to keep ineffective teachers out of the classroom. The leader of Hornung noted, "The biggest part about the contract that bothers me is how long it takes an effective leader to move a person out of the classroom if they are not what's best for students." Or as an administrator at Osprey Charter School reported, "It feels like all these extra steps to take when we are running an organization where we have good human resource practices."

Another administrator at Nexus Charter School cited the importance of retaining administrators' flexibility to control staffing and make needed adjustments. As they said, "Management rights were a big deal for us simply because our school needs to adapt to the students' need [in] any given year."

But some teachers cited the collective bargaining agreement as bringing order to an otherwise chaotic process that left little room for professional growth. One teacher explained, "[Before] the evaluation system was in shambles, so [now] we actually have a clause in the contract that says something like, 'If you're not evaluated by April, it means you're hired back for the next year,' because maybe the admin is so disorganized they forget to evaluate a bunch of teachers."

A teacher from another campus shared a similar perspective. After unionization, they said, their school did not adopt a tenure policy for teachers, but it did establish clear standards and a process for determining whether a teacher fell short. "There has to be documentation, there has to be intervention, there has to be meetings, and there has to be an opportunity to improve. All that stuff has happened because of the union."

Some teachers we spoke with believed prescriptive performance review processes offer clear opportunities for growth. As one said, "There is a process now where if you get a bad performance review, there are steps. And I think there's a one- or two-step process that you have to go through to kind of prove that you're doing better and to show that you're developing and that we're sort of committed to helping teachers improve their craft."

Several teachers we spoke with emphasized that transparent evaluation processes are not intended to delay the removal of ineffective educators. One explained, "We are not interested

in protecting lousy teachers. We are committed to having high-quality teachers and people doing their jobs. We are not interested in protecting the mediocre. If people are mediocre, then get them training, fix it. If they can't, move on."

Some administrators and teachers seemed to thread the needle, leveraging collective bargaining to create transparent systems for development and evaluation while not hindering efforts to advance teacher effectiveness. As the administrator at O'Sullivan Charter School indicated, "We were very serious about evaluation and teacher quality and it was like, everybody felt the same way. . . . We're a school that really wants to pride ourselves on teacher quality . . . and would retain the right to performance-manage."

Unionization may help to address pay inequities between districts and charter schools but at the risk of financial sustainability

Unionization often resulted in across-the-board salary increases for teachers and improved transparency around pay raises. Teachers hoped these efforts would reduce pay gaps between districts and charter schools, making charter schools more attractive to teacher talent and stemming the departure of teachers on the basis of higher pay. But these wins came at a cost, as new salary schedules put pressure on administrators to address escalating expenditures without new sources of revenue.

Teachers from nearly every site in our sample, across all three regions, cited lower pay at their school compared to others in the area as motivation to prioritize pay in collective bargaining agreements.¹⁰ Teachers were acutely attuned to what they would be earning at a district-operated school in their region or city. One teacher told us they started out making "at least \$5,000 less than [their] peers who started in [the local district]." Another teacher from a different campus said, "Certainly, the wages were pretty low compared to other public schools in the area. . . . If I could get a job in [the district], I could easily make \$7,000 more." Another teacher claimed that "we were the lowest paid teachers in the state."

For teachers across our sample, better salaries were not just seen as a matter of fairness but as a way to reduce turnover. One teacher told us that "teachers are not getting paid anywhere near a salary where they can support themselves financially. . . . If you can't pay your bills, you can't keep working here, that's why turnover was always big." Another teacher from an urban Midwestern district echoed this sentiment: "We had a system that was fairly unsustainable where lots of teachers would work for a year or two and then go to a [school district] where they knew that they could get a good contract. And since we've had a good contract, we've had like over 90 percent retention."

Desires for increased pay found sympathy with management. Administrators from three of the schools in our sample readily acknowledged pay gaps, and wished they could do more. One said, "I think teachers just wanted to be paid what [district] teachers get paid. And I think we pay probably significantly less at our school." Another echoed, "So there were two teachers that were saying, 'I can be making more money somewhere else.' And we agreed. Right? There are always other schools that would pay more."

However, administrators referenced the need to balance their budgets and named a variety of constraints they believe impacted charter schools in particular.¹¹ Nexus Charter School's administrator openly worried about the financial sustainability of new pay schedules. "Since you've had the union, and they've been getting the union pay, we haven't covered our costs. And our parent organization is kind of floating us for some of the things we need, like books and computers and stuff like that. So we're not really financially viable now. And so how long can we live with that?"

Schools that leveraged the negotiation process to improve understanding of charter schools' financial constraints seemed better positioned to navigate this tension between higher salaries and financial sustainability. A teacher at Enzo noted, "We know that our funding is not the same as [district] public schools. We can't just go to the city and just ask for a tax increase." The school was on a fixed budget, the teacher noted, so salary increases would compete with other priorities—like a new facility. At Enzo, teachers were comparing their salaries to school districts, but administrators had used other small charter schools as their comparison. "So when we had the conversation with the teachers," explained the administrator, "I think the teachers understood what their salaries were based on. And so there wasn't a feeling of dissatisfaction and you didn't feel the negative energy in the school."

Likewise, a teacher at Griffon Charter School said, "We fundraise for like a huge part of our budget, and [administrators] were just really stressed and worried about like, 'Okay, if we put this salary schedule in and then we can't live up to it, what's going to happen to this school?'" They concluded that unionization had actually led to better understanding of the school's finances, and they had more transparency than other schools. Another teacher here noted that the school made tradeoffs: less competitive salaries, but increased utilization of paraprofessionals and smaller class sizes.

How unionization plays out may hinge on teachers' choice of a bargaining agent and the priorities they pursue in collective bargaining

Across the schools in our sample, we found noteworthy differences in how teachers and their unions approached bargaining with charter schools. These differences could have important implications for what practices—good or bad—became enshrined in charter school collective bargaining agreements. Which union charter school teachers choose as their representative may be an important shaper of bargaining priorities and the impact of unionization on charter schools.

In some cases, teachers unions could approach negotiations in ways that reflected an open-ended commitment to advancing charter school teacher priorities, rather than a preexisting agenda. For example, one teacher we spoke with suggested, "The [union] was very supportive of what we were trying to figure out. They were supportive of us working together to form something that we could all live with." Another teacher we spoke with told us that the union hosted a separate "branch" to tend to charter unionization and contract negotiation, which "had been really creative with us in realizing that the charter contract is probably going to look different from the [school district] contracts."

But in other cases, teachers unions could act to reinforce practices already in place in school districts, and at odds with those that charter school administrators viewed as important to how they serve students. One teacher, for example, cited her union's recommendation that "we draw from other contracts" in drafting a new collective bargaining agreement. An administrator observed that the union seemed to bring standard-issue priorities. "Whether it makes sense or not, it's directed by the union more than it's directed by the teachers and what they want. . . . And so they were telling their teachers, you need lower class sizes and you need higher pay and you need all these different things, better benefits. But a lot of that doesn't make sense for our school because we already have really low class sizes. It's just that they follow this agenda and it's the same agenda they have for [school districts], but it doesn't really make sense to charters." Another administrator noted, "So the union wanted the [state] education code to apply to our contract and there are many aspects of [state] education code that do not apply to charter schools."

Administrators' stories pointed to the possibility for dramatic differences among teachers unions in how they approach their work with charter schools. One administrator we spoke with cited a major change in the tenor of bargaining when teachers were no longer represented by a charter-focused branch of the local teachers union: "Now we are negotiating with a teachers union whose explicit condition is they don't think charters should exist. And frankly, have been very publicly opposed to our schools. It's a really, really different paradigm and a really, really different set of resources. . . . So it really changes our ability really to get to a contract that is both fair for the teachers and also sustainable, for the schools."

Teachers and administrators at another school cited the school's relationship with a union not affiliated with either of the nation's main teachers unions as instrumental to their school's relatively smooth path since unionization. One teacher spoke of the union's openness to working with charter schools amid a politically charged environment. "All the teachers unions, which are traditionally hostile to charter schools, wouldn't accept us. So the [noneducation affiliate] took a risk to accept a group of teachers for a union." Another noted that teachers were "disheartened by what [the state union affiliate] puts out about charters. It creates an us versus them narrative." When it came to bargaining, the union didn't focus on existing district contracts but rather on "addressing the [problems] at the school." According to the administrator, "One of the reasons that the teachers brought in the [noneducation] union was because they were not going to force us to keep teachers who shouldn't be teaching at [this school]."

Implications

In the debate over whether unionization helps or harms school effectiveness, our study suggests reasons for both optimism and concern. In schools facing high rates of teacher turnover, mistrust between teachers and administrators, and lack of clear strategies for developing teachers, unionization may offer some welcome stabilization and clarity for all involved. But our interviews with teachers and administrators also suggest unionization may interfere with human resource and financial management practices charter schools view as central to their success with students.

How collective bargaining plays out in charter schools will hinge upon whether charter school administrators and teachers unions can avoid well-traveled paths that pit one against another. Importantly, this means operationalizing collective bargaining agreements in ways that respect the unique mission of charter schools. Ensuring collective bargaining agreements can be financially sustained over the long term and that they help to reinforce rather than undermine effective teaching are two key steps toward this end.

Our sample is too small to come to definitive conclusions on these matters. But our findings do suggest some recommendations that may help charter school administrators, teachers and their unions find common ground in service of students:

For **charter school operators and administrators**, our results elevate the importance of proactively addressing teachers' concerns about problems arising in their schools. This means providing teachers a seat at the decision-making table, clarifying expectations about teachers' pay and advancement, and promoting transparency around resource use. Teachers are often motivated by perceptions of dysfunction that should be addressed—inside or outside the collective bargaining process. Charter school boards should ensure that administrators are accountable and that broken school cultures are not left to fester.

Union leaders and teachers have a role to play in ensuring unionization does not undermine practices central to charter schools' success with students. Acknowledging the limits of public dollars available and making reasonable demands will be important to ensuring pay raises don't undermine their schools' long-term financial sustainability. Unions and the teachers they represent can also work together to ensure the collective bargaining agreements prioritize student learning and well-being and don't simply recreate provisions in agreements negotiated in the nearby school districts. Unions could go a long way toward building productive working relationships with charter schools by staking out a shared advocacy agenda, such as increasing state or local funding for charter schools, and by ending efforts to depict charter schools as a dire threat to the future of public education.

Ultimately, our study just scratches the surface on how collective bargaining agreements can shape practices inside charter schools. Are charter school collective bargaining agreements destined to replicate the same old salary scales, professional development systems, and financial sustainability challenges that exist in school districts? Or can they build new systems that more effectively support teacher development and advancement and make more strategic and sustainable resource allocations? The answers will be central to understanding how unionization comes to impact charter schools and the students they serve.

Appendix A. Semi-structured interview questions

1. How long have you been teaching/leading at X school?
 - a. Probe on whether they were present for unionization
 - b. Probe on whether they have experience at another school - unionized or not
2. What do you remember about the unionization effort?
 - a. Probe: Did you support unionization? Why or why not?
3. From your point of view what were the big issues that came up in unionization?
 - a. Probe on the process, how long did it take, did the board try to delay, did the community get involved, etc.
 - b. Did these carry through to collective bargaining?
4. What parts of the contract struck you as a win and why? What did the contract seem to change?
 - a. Probe on Compensation, Class size, Teacher evaluation, Grievances & Layoffs, School day, Transfers & Vacancies
5. What parts of the contract felt like compromises? Can you describe anything that felt like a loss? Why did it feel like a loss?
 - a. What changed since the previous contract? (if applicable)
6. What other instructional or organizational changes, if any, have occurred at the school since becoming unionized?
 - a. Talent pipelines, Recruiting practices, Funding/budgets, Curriculum adoption, Training & Coaching, Leadership & Governance
 - b. Have you observed any changes to test scores, student learning, teacher retention, etc.?
7. How have relationships changed at the school since unionization? Have there been any examples of decisions that seemed harder or easier to make?
 - a. Probe on principal, teachers, students, parents
 - b. How do people communicate?
 - c. How receptive are people to each other's points of view?
8. Knowing what you know now, do you think unionization has benefited you and the school? Why?
 - a. Probe on trust, collective efficacy, student learning
9. Is there any question we didn't ask or anything else you'd like to share?
 - a. Optional probe if non-responsive: What advice would you give a colleague at a non unionized school?

Endnotes

1. John E. Chubb and Terry M. Moe, *Politics, Markets and America's Schools*, (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1990): 59-51.
2. Terry M. Moe, "Collective Bargaining and the Performance of the Public Schools," *American Journal of Political Science* 53, no. 1 (January 2009): 156-174.
3. Ashley Jochim and Lesley Lavery, *An Unlikely Bargain: Why Charter School Teachers Unionize and What Happens When They Do* (Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, 2019).
4. See Huriya Jabbar et al., *Why Do Some Charter School Teachers Try to Unionize* (New Orleans, LA: Education Research Alliance, 2020).
5. See Cassandra M.D. Hart and Aaron J. Sojourner, "Unionization and Productivity: Evidence from Charter Schools," *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* 54, no. 3 (June 2015): 422-448; and Jordan D. Matsudaira and Richard W. Patterson, "Teachers' Unions and School Performance: Evidence From California Charter Schools," *Economics of Education Review* 61 (December 2017): 35-50.
6. Six states (Alaska, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, and Virginia) require charter schools to be part of existing collective bargaining agreements. Another ten states (Arkansas, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, and Wisconsin) require that certain types of schools adhere to local districts' collective bargaining agreements or personnel policies. See "Charter Schools - Are charter schools bound by school district collective bargaining agreements?" 50-State Comparison, Education Commission of the States website, June 2014.
7. The National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) are the largest unions representing teachers; district collective bargaining units are traditionally represented by their local affiliates.
8. Given the short timeframe we sampled from, only one school in the South appeared in our sampling frame. We received no response to the study invitation from teachers or administrators at that location.
9. Betheny Gross, *Inside Charter Schools: Unlocking Doors to Student Success* (Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, 2011); Sarah Cohodes, *Charter Schools and the Achievement Gap* (Princeton, NJ: The Future of Children Princeton-Brookings, 2018).
10. On average, charter school teachers with more than a couple years of experience receive sizably less money than district peers. See Marisa Burian-Fitzgerald, *Average Teacher Salaries and Returns to Experience in Charter Schools*. Working paper. (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, 2005); Joshua Furgeson et al., *The Equity Project Charter School: Impacts on Student Achievement* (Cambridge, MA: Mathematica Policy Research, 2014); Michael Van Beek, "Average Teacher Salaries Climb," (blog) Mackinac Center for Public Policy, May 30, 2013).
11. The laws that determine how charter schools are funded vary widely by state, but most charter schools lack access to local revenues or new local taxes compared to districts. See "Charter Schools: How is the funding for a charter school determined?" 50-State Comparison, Education Commission of the States website, June 2018.

Acknowledgments

We could not have written this brief without the time and candor of the teachers and administrators who agreed to speak to us, despite the charged atmosphere and the high stakes associated with unionization efforts. Their contributions helped us bring educators' voices to a debate that rages over newspaper headlines and in heated negotiations between leaders of unions and charter schools. We would also like to thank Amanda Alpert Knight, Jesse Chanin, Peri Lynn Turnbull, and Robin Lake, who all helped sharpen the brief's analysis and findings. While this brief draws upon the help of many people, fault for any errors or omissions rests with the authors alone.

About the Center on Reinventing Public Education

CRPE is a nonpartisan research and policy analysis center at the University of Washington Bothell. We develop, test, and support bold, evidence-based, systemwide solutions to address the most urgent problems in K-12 public education across the country. Our mission is to reinvent the education delivery model, in partnership with education leaders, to prepare all American students to solve tomorrow's challenges. Since 1993 CRPE's research, analysis, and insights have informed public debates and innovative policies that enable schools to thrive. Our work is supported by multiple foundations, contracts, and the U.S. Department of Education.

CRPE Quality Assurance Process

Independent peer review is an integral part of all CRPE research projects. Prior to publication, this document was subjected to a quality assurance process to ensure that: the problem is well formulated; the research approach is well designed and well executed; the data and assumptions are sound; the findings are useful and advance knowledge; the implications and recommendations follow logically from the findings and are explained thoroughly; the documentation is accurate, understandable, cogent, and balanced in tone; the research demonstrates understanding of related previous studies; and the research is relevant, objective, and independent. Peer review was conducted by research or policy professionals who were not members of the project team.