

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
March 18, 2013**

The Senate Committee on Education was called to order by Chair Joyce Woodhouse at 3:33 p.m. on Monday, March 18, 2013, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair
Senator Aaron D. Ford, Vice Chair
Senator Ruben J. Kihuen
Senator Barbara K. Cegavske
Senator Donald G. Gustavson

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pepper Sturm, Policy Analyst
Diana Jones, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Joyce Haldeman, Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District
Lorraine Alderman, Trustee, Board of School Trustees, Clark County School District
Daniel J. Tafoya, Coordinator, Office of Charter Schools, Clark County School District
Steven Canavero, Ph.D., Director, State Public Charter School Authority
Silvia Villanueva, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce
Mary Pierczynski, Ed.D., Nevada Association of School Superintendents
Craig Hulse, Nevada State Director, StudentsFirst
Geoffrey Lawrence, Deputy Policy Director, Nevada Policy Research Institute
Stephen Augspurger, Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees

Senate Committee on Education
March 18, 2013
Page 2

Deborah H. Cunningham, Ph.D., Deputy Superintendent for Administrative and Fiscal Services, Department of Education
Ruben R. Murillo, Jr., President, Clark County Education Association
Kathleen Conaboy, Chair, State Public Charter School Authority
Michael Doering, Executive Director, Options Zones, Washoe County School District

Chair Woodhouse:

We will begin with Senate Bill (S.B.) 59 which eliminates restrictions in the times a charter school may use school district buildings.

SENATE BILL 59: Eliminates a restriction on times during which a charter school may use school buildings owned by a school district. (BDR 34-397)

Joyce Haldeman (Associate Superintendent, Community and Government Relations, Clark County School District):

I represent the Clark County School District (CCSD). This bill is one of two that our district will present to the Legislature. I will read my written statement to the Committee ([Exhibit C](#)). In a reversal of our previously expressed position, CCSD now believes local school districts should have the ability to authorize charter schools within their respective districts.

Senator Cegavske:

I support this bill, but I have concerns about the proposed amendment. The intent of the bill is clear, and I am in favor of keeping the language as it is without amendment. It is cleaner simply to delete the nine words in subsection 2, page 2, lines 7 and 8 of S.B. 59. I recommend we send it out as written.

Lorraine Alderman (Trustee, Board of School Trustees, Clark County School District):

The Committee has received CCSD's presentation ([Exhibit D](#)). The seven charter schools in CCSD each meet a unique community need. The Explore Knowledge Charter School is project-based; the Delta Academy works with students who are recovering from substance abuse; the Rainbow Dreams Academy, Andre Agassi College Preparatory School and the 100 Academy of Excellence Charter School each serve students in our African-American community; and the Odyssey Charter School is a hybrid that combines online learning with weekly teacher interaction. We support school choice and offer charter schools as

a way to fulfill needs students may not be able to meet in regular school settings.

When the CCSD does not sponsor charter schools, it is a challenge to ensure compliance. Page 3 of [Exhibit D](#) details the services provided to charter schools by CCSD. Charter schools have the same needs and requirements as regular schools, and we assist them in meeting these needs. As a sponsor, we take our responsibility of providing technical assistance to these schools very seriously. With the implementation of the Common Core State Standards and the new teacher and administrator evaluation system, we will need to focus more on curriculum, instruction and assessment as shown on page 4 of [Exhibit D](#). These are the key pieces of school reform that charter schools and public schools are required to follow.

Daniel J. Tafoya (Coordinator, Office of Charter Schools, Clark County School District):

Page 5 of [Exhibit D](#) provides information about the student composition of charter schools in CCSD. Our charter school average per-pupil funding is close to that of the district. The sponsorship fee of 1.5 percent, shown on page 6, covers the costs and technical support services previously mentioned. Student demographics are shown on the chart on page 7. These demographics are important when reviewing performance indicators.

Page 9 details academic performance at our charter schools. Agassi Prep, 100 Academy and Rainbow Dreams have African-American populations of up to 90 percent. The chart on page 9 compares academic performance in reading at CCSD elementary charter schools to the district average over the last 3 years. Delta is not represented on this chart because it does not have elementary students. Page 10 provides statistics for elementary school math. When compared to the district as a whole, students at Agassi Prep, Odyssey and Rainbow Dreams all perform well. This indicates that our African-American population is experiencing success with the charter school option. Middle school performance is shown on page 11 of [Exhibit D](#). Data from 2010-2011 are missing from Delta because the student population was too small. Page 12 charts the data for middle school math. These data show with students at Agassi Prep scoring at or above the district average for all 3 years. Information about our charter high schools is seen on page 13. Students at Agassi Prep and Explore Knowledge are scoring above the district average in

reading as shown on this graph. High school math comparisons are shown on page 14.

Ms. Haldeman:

Senate Bill 59 is important to CCSD and we ask the Committee to help us pass it.

Senator Kihuen:

What process does a school district use to sponsor a charter school? What is required?

Ms. Haldeman:

At this time, CCSD has a moratorium on sponsoring additional charter schools.

Mr. Tafoya:

In CCSD, the process is that a group of interested community members first form a committee, and then submit an application to CCSD to create a charter school. The CCSD next reviews the application to determine how well-prepared it is and whether it fits into the district's strategic process of educating children. If it meets those criteria, it goes to the Board of School Trustees, CCSD, to review and ensure it is fiscally and academically sound before granting approval.

Senator Kihuen:

To be considered, is there a requirement for minimum academic performance, or can any school submit an application to become a charter school?

Mr. Tafoya:

The committee is typically formed by a group that has an idea they would like to put a charter school in place, not a school that is already in operation. This means we do not have pre-existing data on performance. We monitor the data from the new school over the 6-year period of the charter to determine if it should be reauthorized.

Ms. Haldeman:

When schools come to us to reauthorize their charter, performance is a key consideration.

Senator Gustavson:

Do you have seven charter schools sponsored by CCSD?

Mr. Tafoya:
Yes.

Senator Gustavson:

That means there are approximately 885 students in each school. What grade levels are in your charter schools?

Mr. Tafoya:

Some of the schools are kindergarten through Grade 12, some are kindergarten through Grade 5 and some are high schools.

Steven Canavero, Ph.D. (Director, State Public Charter School Authority):

The State Public Charter School Authority supports S.B. 59 and has submitted a friendly amendment to this bill ([Exhibit E](#)). Facilities are a significant impediment to the opening of new charter schools. The Authority wishes to maintain the determination of who occupies the space within their jurisdiction.

The Authority has eight charter schools in Clark County and offers the amendment to clarify and ensure that all charter schools, regardless of sponsor, have fair and equal treatment in regard to acquiring space. We believe this amendment allows all charter schools to be treated fairly by a local board.

Senator Ford:

I support charter schools, and I support this bill. I do not understand the rationale for the amendment.

Dr. Canavero:

This amendment serves several purposes. The first is to communicate clearly opportunities for use of publicly available space. The amendment requires a district board to adopt a policy that identifies available space and to articulate how they will communicate that the space is available. They would additionally be required to identify the types of facilities that would be offered for use and the criteria that would define how a charter school would be permitted to use this space. The amendment addresses the need for development of a well-defined cost structure regarding the lease of facilities. It also addresses the need for identification of criteria to terminate the lease.

Senator Cegavske:

Why is it not enough to delete the nine words in subsection 2? I would like further explanation regarding subsection 3 of the proposed amendment. Has the Authority experienced problems that have led to the need for this amendment?

Dr. Canavero:

I will discuss the seven items in subsection 3 of the proposed amendment, [Exhibit E](#). Fewer than 5 percent of charter schools occupy public school facilities. Other states provide the opportunity for local school boards to lease or pass through the cost of a public school facility to a charter school. To ensure fair and equal access, a board must develop a process to communicate to the community that space is available for use by a charter school as listed in subsection 3, paragraph (a). This transparency would allow all charter schools, regardless of sponsor, the same opportunity to access district space.

Subsection 3, paragraph (b) discusses the policy a board would be required to develop to specify the types of facilities that would be made available for a charter school if space was available. In some models, an entire school might be available for lease; in others, only part of a school.

Subsection 3, paragraph (d), defines the need for criteria regarding how a charter school would use a district facility and expresses the need for a clear delineation of use when there is a shared agreement or a multiple-use agreement for the same facility.

The cost structure identified in subsection 3, paragraph (d) must be created so both the district and the charter school benefit. The majority of charter schools receive better rates by improving commercial space, so this must be carefully determined. Lease payments that are low—or even \$1—and that pass through for the maintenance and upkeep of the facility, or that are reasonable and in line with competitive rates will best benefit both parties.

Subsection 3, paragraph (e) requires the board to articulate a policy regarding the duration of the lease or occupancy of the site. We hope these policies would reflect long-term agreement when possible. If the district has future plans for the facility, it is important the charter school know this in advance so it can make plans accordingly.

The need for criteria to determine the pool of eligible users is addressed in subsection 3, paragraph (f). This is where selective criteria or a rationale for who could be eliminated from a list of candidates would be delineated by the board. Subsection 3, paragraph (g) would compel the district to make the grounds for termination of the lease evident to both parties.

Senator Cegavske:

I support charter schools, but I continue to be confused about why we need this amendment. Are events happening now where charter schools feel they do not have enough protection?

Chair Woodhouse:

This issue will be moved to a work session where we will discuss it further.

Silvia Villanueva (Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):

We support S.B. 59. We believe it will provide more flexibility to the school district and it will provide greater access for charter schools.

Mary Pierczynski, Ed.D. (Nevada Association of School Superintendents):

I represent the Nevada Association of School Superintendents (NASS) and am also representing Dr. Dotty Merrill, Executive Director, Nevada Association of School Boards who is attending another meeting. We support S.B. 59.

Senator Cegavske:

I request those testifying also indicate their approval or opposition to the amendment.

Dr. Pierczynski:

The NASS supports the bill and the amendment. I cannot speak on the issue for Dr. Merrill.

Chair Woodhouse:

I will check with Dr. Merrill.

Ms. Villanueva:

We support the bill and are neutral on the amendment.

Craig. Hulse (Nevada State Director, StudentsFirst):

I support the bill. I have just seen the amendment. If CCSD approves the amendment, then we also approve.

Geoffrey Lawrence (Deputy Policy Director, Nevada Policy Research Institute):

The Nevada Policy Research Institute supports the charter school movement. We support this bill because it will expand the ability of charter schools to make use of public facilities.

I am not sure the amendment is necessary. Subsection 2, lines 5-7, of the bill states: "A charter school may use school buildings owned by the school district only upon approval of the board of trustees of the school district." From this language, it appears that each district would have the capacity to develop its own policies and standards regarding these contracts. To identify these within State statute may be unnecessary.

Stephen Augspurger (Executive Director, Clark County Association of School Administrators and Professional-Technical Employees):

I support this bill. I have met with Superintendent Jones of CCSD, and we are not opposed to it. The Clark County Association of School Administrators (CCASA) has been a partner with CCSD in implementing school reform under Superintendent Jones. This is the first time I have heard charter schools are going to be used to replace one-star schools in CCSD's School Performance Framework Ranking. I am not saying I am opposed to that; it could be an excellent solution for improving these schools. If the CCASA is a true partner with CCSD, I would like to think that these types of decisions are made in conjunction with the unions.

Deborah H. Cunningham, Ph.D. (Deputy Superintendent for Administrative and Fiscal Services, Department of Education):

The Department of Education (NDE) supports S.B. 59 and the proposed amendment.

Ruben R. Murillo, Jr. (President, Clark County Education Association):

Overcrowding is a serious issue in CCSD and has not been well addressed by the district. Portable classrooms have been placed at most sites, year-round schools are being implemented, new schools have small classrooms and we have recently rezoned the district.

Use of this bill to move low-performing schools to charter schools concerns me. The Clark County Education Association has supported charter schools, but to move low-performing schools to charters appears to relieve the district of authority and their commitment to these schools. Instead of investing time and effort into low-performing schools and continuing our reform efforts, with this action, the district would appear to be passing these efforts to the charter schools. Are we going to continue to invest in school reform such as innovative schools, empowerment schools and finding ways to give stakeholders greater opportunity to participate within those school structures? It appears the potential exists for the district to wash its hands of these schools, and I am concerned.

Senator Ford:

Do you have specific opposition to this bill, or are you concerned about the CCSD's intent?

Mr. Murillo:

I do not oppose the portion of the bill that allows use of facilities during the school day, but I am not sure that is a realistic option. The schools in CCSD are overcrowded. One science class at a middle school had to move outside because it had 40 students. If facilities are available, I have no opposition to charter schools using them.

Senator Ford:

Is your primary concern about how CCSD would implement the charter school process rather than with the bill?

Mr. Murillo:

"It is with the potential movement of schools over to charter schools en masse without having the opportunity to invest in our public schools."

Senator Ford:

The CCSD has a moratorium on creating new charter schools. Do you know when we might see the transition of low-achieving schools to charter schools?

Mr. Murillo:

This is the first I have heard that the district might potentially use the bill to do this. I do not have that information.

Senator Ford:

Ms. Haldeman, would you address the concern about converting low-performing schools to charter schools. The CCSD does not have enough space now for all classes.

Ms. Haldeman:

There are no plans to convert any schools to charter schools. I used one-star schools as an example; I could have used four-star schools or five-star schools instead. This bill provides the opportunity for CCSD to recognize that charter schools should be under the direction of the local school board. There are currently no plans to start new charter schools in CCSD.

We support the amendment because it allows local boards to develop policies regarding these schools. This bill is designed to ensure the decision making authority regarding use of facilities for charter schools stays with local school boards. We would not allow a charter school to use district facilities if it would create overcrowding in another school. If there was a school with low enrollment that might be able to increase its enrollment by becoming a charter school, then we might consider it. These decisions would be made by local boards, based on what is happening in the districts.

Senator Ford:

Would you please give me information about the CCSD moratorium on new charter schools?

Ms. Haldeman:

Before the Authority was developed, we received many applications for charter schools, and we were not fully prepared to handle them. We did not anticipate the amount of work that would be involved for the CCSD in this process. It was a difficult time for the Board and for the staff. We authorized some charter schools that should not have been authorized. We had difficulties monitoring the charter schools for compliance. Some schools were not adequately staffed to provide all of the mandated services, and central office personnel had to be used to provide them. At least one school closed unexpectedly in the middle of the school year, and district property had to be retrieved from personnel at that site. Students from this site had to be placed in other schools which caused additional challenges.

We experienced a number of problems we were not prepared for and the Board decided to put a moratorium on accepting new charter school applications. The State Board of Education (SBE) continued to accept applications for new charter schools during this time. It approved some of these and denied others. The Authority provided another avenue for new charter schools wishing to be authorized.

We have an excellent working relationship with the Authority. The screening and performance-based measures they have developed are important. We hope to continue to work with the Authority when our moratorium is lifted to ensure applicants meet the minimum standards the Authority has in place. Our Board has not recently discussed this issue, but we want to be ready when it determines it is time once again to accept applications.

Senator Ford:

How long have you had the moratorium?

Ms. Haldeman:

It began in 2008 or 2009. I will check that for you.

Senator Cegavske:

The Authority has done a good job and is willing to work with districts. Does the amendment to S.B. 59 affect the empowerment schools? If Boards have the authority to negotiate with charter schools, why do we need the amendment?

Ms. Haldeman:

I do not believe it has any impact on empowerment schools. No one in CCSD has expressed a concern about this. We anticipate that striking the nine words in subsection 2 would allow local boards to develop their own policies about use of their schools. The list in subsection 3 of the proposed amendment is not necessary. We would articulate these areas in our contract with a charter school. The amendment is not necessary for CCSD to support the bill.

Senator Cegavske:

I am concerned that we put something into statute that does not need to be there.

Chair Woodhouse:

Charter schools are independent public schools responsible for their own governance and operation. The first charter school legislation in Nevada was enacted in 1997. Since that time, the law has been substantially amended. This Session, there are at least five pieces of legislation addressing charter schools. During the 2011-2012 school year, there were 32 charter schools operating in Nevada. Enrollment is increasing yearly. In 1999-2000, there were 843 students enrolled in charter schools. There are now more than 18,000 students enrolled in these schools.

Dr. Cunningham:

The Committee has received a copy of my testimony ([Exhibit F](#)) which I will read. My remarks focus on the role of the NDE in working with charter schools.

Dr. Canavero:

The Committee has received a copy of a presentation ([Exhibit G](#)) that provides an overview of the State Public Charter School Authority. As shown on page 3, charter schools are a recent development in education. They are continuing to evolve. In the last 5 years, charter schools have shifted towards focusing on performance rather than alternative delivery systems. This idea of “autonomy for accountability” is addressed on page 4. Accountability previously centered on traditional forms that were well understood by local educational agencies (LEAs). As our systems have become more sophisticated, the focus of accountability has moved toward academic measurements of results such as the Nevada School Performance Framework. The charter system and the traditional public school system seem to be converging in this area. The end result for both is clear. What is different is the means a charter school can explore to achieve the results. The roles and responsibilities of a charter school are described further on page 4. Districts in Nevada have acted correctly by issuing moratoriums to allow us time to learn from the successes and mistakes of other states.

Kathleen Conaboy (Chair, State Public Charter School Authority):

I am speaking as the chair of the Authority board. Page 7 of [Exhibit G](#) provides information on the history of the Authority. Creation of this type of board was first discussed in 2008 when the Legislative Committee on Education invited a speaker from Colorado to share information about the oversight of charter schools in that state. That Committee wholeheartedly supported the idea of creating a supervisory board. In 2009, S.B. No. 385 of the 75th Session was

presented, but it did not receive the votes needed for final approval. The bill was revised and presented as S.B. No. 212 of the 76th Session. This bill was approved and was authorized in 386.509 of *Nevada Revised Statutes*. Information about this legislation and some of the activities the Authority has undertaken since it was approved is found on page 7 of [Exhibit G](#). We have worked diligently to include national best practices in our work. We additionally work to include school districts in our decision-making process whenever possible.

Because the Authority has its own budget account, it is identified as a LEA. This allows us to distribute federally funded program money to charter schools as seen on page 8 of [Exhibit G](#). By law, charter schools sponsored by the NDE were previously not able to take advantage of these funds. In terms of student enrollment, charter schools would be the third largest school district in the state.

We are totally fee-sponsored. As a charter school sponsor, we charge a 1.5 percent sponsorship fee. This is below the statutory cap of 2 percent. This year, we were able to refund money, on a proportional basis, to our schools using reserve funds from the NDE. We work diligently to keep our overhead low and to preserve funds for instructional purposes.

Dr. Canavero:

The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools ranks state charter school law yearly. Page 9 details Nevada's progress over the last 2 years, gives reasons for improvement and identifies areas that still need improvement. In 2012, there was a slight drop in ranking due to improvement in other states' laws. We anticipate improvement in our ranking once again if we are able to make changes in statute this year.

Through the NDE Office of Charter Schools, we have received two competitive grants. These are highlighted on page 11 of [Exhibit G](#). The first was an evaluation grant that was provided by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers. We also received a competitive implementation grant to roll out and refine the decision making process for accepting charter school applications. The strategic plan we developed using grant funds will go before the SBE this week for feedback. We have also received a National Governors Association grant to explore and identify promising practices for independent chartering boards.

The improvements we would like to make this Session are listed on page 13. The Authority board members are listed on page 16. We have a close relationship with them, and they have assisted us in moving this work forward. The original board was appointed.

Pages 17 and 18 provide information about charter school sponsors and student enrollment. The Authority has seven schools that are in the interim between being awarded a charter and actually opening a school. Lack of facilities is a principal reason these charters are unable to open; they do not have access to adequate facilities. If 5 of these school are able to open, we will have 21 schools in the 2013-2014 school year.

Considerations for the future are listed on page 19, [Exhibit G](#). Charter schools across the Country are shifting their focus from compliance to performance, moving from a relational component to a contractual one. We struggle with the relationship between quality and quantity—are they inversely proportional? We believe they are not. Recent research on model charter schools has shown that some schools outperform others. From our work with the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools we have learned that best practices are essential in creating excellent programs.

Senator Ford:

A recent study indicated that charter schools are less effective with a general population of students and more effective when targeting a specific student demographic or subject area. Do you have information about this? Do you know of studies that indicate otherwise?

Dr. Canavero:

There is research that indicates charter schools are effective with all populations. Original charter school legislation in many areas addressed the need to provide specific intervention in low-performing schools. Often these schools had high populations of students who were English language learners (ELL), who qualified for free and reduced-price lunch (FRL) or who were participating in special education programs. By way of research such as this, many charter schools have been pushed to serve specific populations. Many nationally replicated programs serve historically underserved populations such as these. However high-performance is not dependent on a specific population.

Senator Ford:

Do you have data about the charter schools in Nevada related to student demographics in charter schools?

Dr. Canavero:

We are just beginning to review the growth data for charter schools. Some of these schools have mixed student populations and are doing good jobs. Some that have high ELL and FRL populations are also doing well. Some CCSD sites having a high percentage of African-American students are also doing well.

Senator Ford:

In your professional opinion, can charter schools in Nevada be as effective with a general student population as non-charter schools? Do they work as effectively with this group as they do with a targeted student population?

Dr. Canavero:

Yes. They have the capacity to do this. Nevada made a wise decision to allow both at-risk students and non-at-risk students to attend charter schools.

Senator Ford:

Some agencies that are eligible to sponsor charter schools are less than honest. How do we avoid problems with this in our State?

Dr. Canavero:

It is important to open the right schools and refuse to open schools that should not be opened. The Authority has an application process in place that reviews academic, financial and operational standards of the proposed school, including its vision. We perform a capacity and performance review. We interview applicants to probe their knowledge. We determine if they understand the complexities of governing a public school; whether they know how to manage school finances; if they understand how to remain compliant operationally and if they have the capacity to see their vision through for students. We additionally review their performance record if applicable. If a specific model is proposed, we review research about that model. If a specific company has applied to open a school, we gather performance reviews from across the County. We review independent audits of the company to determine its financial stability. If it is a company located in Nevada, we do exhaustive due diligence including a review of its contracts with schools outside of the State.

Dr. Cunningham:

Charter schools are still new when considered as part of the history of education. Performance contracts are an example of one way these schools are working to serve all populations. Improving the application process is helping ensure quality charter schools. Oversight of sponsors by NDE is intended to improve performance of these schools as is the review of their performance records.

Senator Cegavske:

If we could oversee public schools the same way we do charter schools, there would be public schools that would be shut down. Charter schools sometimes make mistakes, and there are consequences when they do. We are approaching this correctly in Nevada even though we are moving more slowly than I would like.

Dr. Cunningham:

It is important to remember that charter schools are still public schools. One of our primary points of focus is to ensure that charter schools live up to their public trust.

Senator Ford:

Do you have comparisons between charter schools and empowerment schools?

Dr. Canavero:

No I do not. I will review the data with CCSD and report it to you at a later date.

Michael Doering (Executive Director, Options Zones, Washoe County School District):

The Committee has received a copy of my presentation ([Exhibit H](#)). The eight district-sponsored charter schools in the Washoe County School District (WCSD) are listed on page 3. These offer a smaller school environment than our traditional schools. The Academy for Career Education has a career- and technical-education program focusing on the building trades and diesel mechanics. Several of our schools address the needs of our at-risk students, including Bailey Charter Elementary School, I Can Do Anything Charter High School, Rainshadow Community Charter High School and Sierra Nevada Academy Charter School. Coral Academy of Science Charter School offers a college preparatory program with a science and mathematics academy.

High Desert Montessori School is a public Montessori school. Mariposa Dual Language Academy offers a dual-language English-Spanish program for students wishing to develop literacy in both languages.

We also have signature academies at each of our high schools. These provide unique programs within each high school. Students can apply to and attend a high school outside of their zone under this program.

Nearly all of the departments in WCSD provide technical support and assistance to our charter schools. Some of these areas of support are listed in [Exhibit H](#), pages 4 and 5. We monitor our charter schools annually. We have developed achievement steering committees for charter schools in their third year of a school improvement plan. These committees are comprised of representatives from district ELL and special education departments, a principal and a district administrator. We meet monthly to help the charter school by providing support, professional development and other assistance. We collect a 1.5 percent sponsorship fee for providing services to charter schools.

Student enrollment is shown on page 6. Charter school student enrollment is approximately 4 percent of our total student population. Page 7 shows the enrollment figures for each site. Coral Academy has a larger population because it is a kindergarten through Grade 12 site.

Our district motto is "Every child, by name and face, to graduation." We pride ourselves on this motto. As a way to address this motto, charter schools provide options to our families.

Senator Ford:

Do you have data comparing charter schools to empowerment schools? Do you have data comparing charter schools that serve regular student populations to those that serve special populations?

Mr. Doering:

There are no empowerment schools in WCSD. I do not have data or research comparing charter school populations. The key factor is not the population being served, but the quality of the teachers, administrators and programs being offered at the school.

Senate Committee on Education
March 18, 2013
Page 18

Chair Woodhouse:

Seeing no further business, the meeting is adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Diana Jones,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Chair

DATE: _____

<u>EXHIBITS</u>				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness / Agency	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	3		Attendance Roster
S.B. 59	C	2	Joyce Haldeman	Written Testimony
S.B. 59	D	15	Lorraine Alderman	Charter School Presentation
S.B. 59	E	1	Dr. Steven Canavero	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 59	F	2	Deborah Cunningham	Written Testimony
S.B. 59	G	19	Dr. Steven Canavero	Charter School Presentation
S.B. 59	H	8	Michael Doering	WCSD Presentation