

# Colorado Charter Schools:

## *Examination of the Effect of House Bill 99-1113 on Charter School Funding*

*February 2004*

**Prepared By:** Colorado School Resource Center  
P.O. Box 483  
Arvada, CO 80001-0483  
<http://www.coloradoresource.org/>

**For:** Colorado Department of Education  
201 East Colfax Avenue  
Denver, CO 80203  
<http://www.cde.state.co.us>





# Colorado State Board of Education



- 
- Jared Polis, Chairman-----Boulder  
Member-at-Large
- Randy DeHoff, Vice Chairman-----Littleton  
Sixth Congressional District
- Christine Baca-----Aurora  
Seventh Congressional District
- Evie Hudak-----Arvada  
Second Congressional District
- Peggy Littleton-----Colorado Springs  
Fifth Congressional District
- D. Rico Munn-----Denver  
First Congressional District
- Clair Orr-----Kersey  
Fourth Congressional District
- Pamela Jo Suckla-----Slick Rock  
Third Congressional District
- 

William J. Moloney  
Commissioner of Education

Roscoe Davidson  
Deputy Commissioner of Education

### *Schools of Choice Unit*

William Windler — Assistant Commissioner, Special Services

Denise Mund — Senior Consultant, Schools of Choice

Merlin Holmes — Consultant, Schools of Choice

Nita Lightfoot — Administrative Assistant

---

Colorado Department of Education

## **Organizational Commitment**

The Colorado Department of Education dedicates itself to increasing achievement levels for all students through comprehensive programs of education reform involving three interlocking elements: A) High Standards for what students must know and be able to do; B) Rigorous Assessments that honestly measure whether or not students meet standards and tell citizens the truth about how well our schools serve children; C) Rigorous Accountability Measures that tie the accreditation of school districts to high student achievement.

*The Colorado Department of Education does not discriminate on the basis of disability, race, color, religion, sex, national origin or age in access to, employment in, or in the provision of any of CDE's programs, benefits or activities.*

# *Members of the Finance Study Group*

## **Primary Authors**

Russell Kellogg  
*Colorado School Resource Center*

Barry Arrington  
*Arrington and Associates*

Lee Barratt  
*Colorado School Resource Center*

## **Committee Members**

Brian Anderson  
*Colorado Business and Accountability Services*

Russell Caldwell  
*Senior Vice-President*  
*Kirkpatrick and Pettis*

Karen DeSchryver  
*Independent Educational Consultant*

Joe Kigin  
*Exabyte Corporation*

Kevin McCasky  
*County Assessor*  
*Jefferson County*

Tom Roseen  
*Senior Analyst*  
*Lipper*

# *Table of Contents*

I.	Executive Summary .....	1
II.	Introduction and Background .....	2
III.	Data.....	5
IV.	Methodology .....	7
V.	Existing Studies.....	8
VI.	Survey Results.....	10
	a. General .....	10
	b. Primary Survey Results and Analysis .....	13
	c. Summary and Analysis.....	16
VII.	Policy Recommendations .....	19
VIII.	Future Research .....	22
IX.	Concluding Remarks .....	23
	References.....	24
	Appendix A.....	25
	Appendix B.....	36
	Appendix C .....	50
	Appendix D.....	57

## **I. Executive Summary**

*The Colorado Department of Education, Schools of Choice Unit, contracted with the Colorado School Resource Center (CSRC) to study the overall effect of House Bill 99-1113 on the policies, practices and issues of Colorado charter schools. Specifically, this study seeks to address the effect of House Bill 99-1113 on charter school finance and on charter school/school district relationships. Using survey data from 97.7 percent of currently operating Colorado charter schools, and a small non-random sample of statewide school districts, results of this study found that charter schools receive statutory minimum funding levels yet many districts withhold the statutory maximum without providing itemization of central administrative overhead costs to the charter schools. In addition, district compliance with House Bill 99-1113 and the Colorado Charter Schools Act occurs amid general inequities in contract negotiation leverage and charter school bargaining ability. That is, charter schools rely on district renewal of charter contracts and maintain little or no voice in the negotiation of service levels and expense profiles. To be sure, district policy does not dictate unfair treatment of charter schools and it would be an error to suggest that all districts intentionally undermine or manipulate contract negotiations. Rather, the imbalance appears to be systemic; in the presence of disputed costs charter schools must confront the very entity that has the power to renew their charter. Final results show that while districts may overstep the boundaries of House Bill 99-1113, many charter schools remain either indifferent, unaware, or in agreement with current practices.*

*The following pages contain presentation and analysis of data obtained from the statewide survey and offer not only policy recommendations, but also suggestions for future research projects. Appendices and references offer a comprehensive view of all collected information. While every attempt has been made to create a comprehensive study, analysis of Special Education policy and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs – both important topics among charter schools and traditional district schools – are beyond the scope of this study and are therefore not included. Further, examination of raw data revealed that some schools lacked the corporate knowledge to wholly answer certain survey questions. For example, in some cases staff turnover has resulted in loss of both historical school data and of historical perspectives relative to the school's founding. Reports, numbers, names on wait lists, and other student information were not adequately archived and in some cases the importance of past successes and former failures seems to be minimized by the demands of day-to-day operations. However, these limitations did not affect the accuracy of analysis or the substance of the findings.*

## II. Introduction and Background

The 10th anniversary of the Colorado charter school movement provides an ideal time to examine the effects of state statute on charters and the financial impacts on state and school district budget models. Charter school legislation was passed in the 1993 session of the legislature and at the time allowed for a funding transfer from district coffers of 80 percent of per pupil revenue to the approved charter schools for the funding of their academic activities. Beginning in the budget year of 2000-01, this amount was raised to 95 percent of per pupil revenue, with districts being allowed to withhold up to five percent for various district administrative functions.

A short history of events is necessary to provide a historical context in which to examine how House Bill (H.B.) 99-1113 has impacted funding issues.

The Charter Schools Act was passed in 1993. Section 22-30.50-112(2)(a)(II), Colorado Revised Statutes, of the original Act provided that the charter school and the district were to agree on funding to the charter school. The law went on to provide that these funding discussions would begin at 80 percent of the district per pupil operating revenue (PPOR) as that term was defined in section 22-54-103(9) of the School Finance Act. The intent was to set a minimum funding benchmark upon which negotiations could build.

The first charter school was approved in 1993, the same year the Act passed. However, it was not until the following year (1994-95) that a significant number of charter schools negotiated contracts with their districts and began operating. As more school/district negotiations took place, it was noted that some districts negotiated a flat 80 percent of PPOR.

In 1997 Representative Doug Dean began a three-year effort to amend the Act to clarify funding for charter schools. His first bill on this issue was H.B. 97-1210, which would have increased minimum funding for charter schools to 95 percent of PPOR. The bill passed both houses of the legislature, but was vetoed by Governor Romer on June 5, 1997.

The following year Representative Dean introduced H.B. 98-1249. One facet of the bill was meant to address the stated concern that the charter funding formula did not take into account that it is much cheaper, on average, to educate elementary and junior high students than high school students. H.B. 98-1249 would have responded by creating a tiered funding formula pursuant to which charters would have received 90 percent of per pupil revenues (PPR) for K-5 students, 92.5 percent of PPR for 6-8 students and 95 percent of PPR for 9-12 students. PPR was defined as the district's total program as defined in section 22-54-103(6) of the School Finance Act divided by the district's funded pupil count. The bill passed the House but failed in the Senate.

In 1999 Representative Dean introduced H.B. 99-1113. He proposed to set 95 percent of PPR as the minimum funding level for all charter school students. The bill was introduced on January 9, 1999 and assigned to the House Education committee, which passed it to the House floor on January 28, 1999. The bill passed the House on third reading on February 1, 1999 and was sent to the Senate, where it was assigned to the Senate Education and Appropriations committees. The Senate Education Committee passed the bill to the Appropriations Committee on February 19, 1999, and the Appropriations Committee added a “no appropriations” clause and passed it to the Senate floor on March 4, 1999. The full Senate amended the bill and passed it on March 10, 1999. The House did not concur with Senate amendments and a conference committee was established. The conference committee further amended the bill and both houses passed the conference committee version of the bill on March 17, 1999. Governor Owens signed the bill into law on March 30, 1999.

The following is a summary of the provisions of the final bill:

1. The funding formula was increased in two ways. First, the minimum funding percentage was increased from 80 percent to 95 percent. Secondly, the funding base was increased from “per pupil operating revenues” (i.e., PPOR) to the slightly larger “per pupil revenues” (i.e., PPR). The difference between PPOR and PPR is the “mandatory transfer” amount for capital reserve or risk management set forth in section 22-55-105(2)(b) of the School Finance Act.
2. The bill allowed school districts to retain up to five percent of PPR for payment of the charter school’s portion of district central administrative overhead costs. To further clarify the districts’ allowable retention of funds, the bill specified that the district could withhold the charter school’s actual proportionate share of central administration expenses up to the five percent cap. The bill also specifically defined “central administrative overhead” as the expenditures accounted for by the district under the heading “Support Services – General Administration” in the school district chart of accounts specified by the State Board.
3. Pursuant to the bill, districts were required for the first time to pay to charter schools their share of the “mandatory transfer” amount for capital reserve or risk management set forth in section 22-55-105(2)(b) of the School Finance Act. In compliance with current district policies, the bill requires charter schools to set up special “capital reserve” or “risk management” funds in the same manner as school districts and transfer the “mandatory transfer” portion of their funding funds into those accounts to be used as specified by law.
4. The bill provided that charter schools could, at their option, purchase services from their districts. The districts were prohibited from charging charters more than their actual cost for these services.

5. The bill treats specially charter schools in districts of less than 500 students. In these districts the charter is entitled to 100 percent of PPR less actual central administrative costs associated with the school or a flat 85 percent of PPR, whichever is greater.
6. The bill states that districts shall provide federally required educational services to charter students on the same basis as other district students. Each charter school is required to pay its proportionate share of the costs incurred by the district in providing these services. However, the bill allows the charter and the district to mutually agree to contract for an alternate arrangement for providing and paying for these services.

This study attempts to examine the impact that H.B. 99-1113 has had on charter school funding. Data was collected to examine the negotiated funding percentages between districts and charter schools, the actual funding and reporting of retained funds by the districts, and the relationships between districts and their charter schools.

The following pages contain an explanation of data collection, description of methodological approaches, survey results and analysis, policy recommendations, ideas for future research and concluding remarks. Appendices contain a copy of all surveys and questionnaires, summary statistics of survey responses, table of non-quantified commentary, a cleaned data set in Excel format, and references.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Contact CSRC P.O. Box 483, Arvada, CO 80001-0483 for any additional information.



### III. Data

Data for this study was collected using a three-part survey with a total of 27 questions. The survey was mailed to all 97 Colorado charter schools and requested that the person most knowledgeable about specific school related issues complete the survey. The questions required discrete data responses (13), fixed responses (10), ranking and conditional ranking responses (3), and an unstructured, open response (1). Question design produced both general and specific information about charter school finance and school district/charter school relations. In addition, respondents answered questions regarding enrollment, curriculum, services purchased, charter school pupil origination, and facilities. The final survey was the result of an involved reviewing process that included the Colorado School Resource Center (CSRC) Executive Committee approval. Further, the survey was field tested among a 15–20 member sample of charter school administrators and business managers who assembled for a Colorado Business and Accountability Services monthly meeting.

The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) lists 99 charter schools in the state. For the purposes of this study, a school needed to fit a very basic set of criteria to qualify for inclusion. First, the school needed to be open. All schools that were not currently operating that began the first operating year *after* the 2001-02 school year were not included. The study contains a population of 87 schools.

All but two schools responded; the response rate was 97.7 percent. In order to achieve this, CSRC conducted not only a second mass mailing at the beginning of the 2003-04 school year, but also a follow-up, multi-method administration. This approach included emailed and faxed surveys and a generous round of phone calls from both CSRC and CDE staff. While 85 of the 87 responded, the study itself includes information from only those schools that submitted complete surveys. Schools that returned surveys high in item non-response were eliminated from the final pool of respondents due to potential result bias and skew.<sup>2</sup> Specifically, if a school returned a survey that did not include *any* data relating to questions about Per Pupil Revenue (PPR), then the school was not included in the final sample. Fifty-eight out of 87 returned surveys that matched the specific requirements for this study producing a 66.7 percent response rate.

---

<sup>2</sup> In any academic study, the existence of item non-response is important. It is indeed possible that the lack of a response informs the question as strongly as do discrete and scaled responses. While we discuss this issue in a later section, the robustness of the study suffers with the inclusion of partially completed survey data. For this reason we retained only completed surveys.

For completeness, surveys were sent to a non-random sample of school districts. The reasons for the non-random nature of the district sample are straightforward. First, sampled districts had to actually contain charter schools. In fact, of the 177 statewide school districts, only 38 had charter schools during school year 2001-02 that remained in operation in the 2002-03 school year and whose charter school submitted a usable survey. A truly random sample increases the likelihood of selecting districts that did not have charter schools. Second, sampled districts had to represent a mix of school districts from both the front-range and the western slope. For these reasons, the sample was stratified into general geographic regions and selected districts were selected based on the general ability to obtain valid and reliable information. While recognizing that randomness is an important element in the validity and reliability of survey data, it is believed that the robustness of the study would have suffered had districts without charter schools been included.

The district survey response was not initially successful. In light of this fact, and recognizing the importance of including the school districts' perspective, CSRC conducted an abbreviated survey via telephone with six districts statewide.<sup>3</sup>

In an attempt to clarify unanticipated ambiguity, CSRC staff conducted a series of follow-up phone calls. For further completeness, charter schools from the six surveyed districts were selected and asked a series of open response questions.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix [D]

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix [D]

## IV. Methodology

This study exemplifies simple analytical techniques and uses statistical tools consistent with that fact. While more advanced methods, such as ordinary regression analysis and binary probit/logit models, receive higher praise in terms of statistical significance, the research team questioned their overall usefulness to the current study. That is, it is understood that responses to survey questions and the data extracted from them are conditioned not only by the questions themselves but also by a generous supply of intangible factors, that, if included in the study, might dilute otherwise useful information. To include the survey responses *and* every personal, professional, historical, and demographic characteristic of the respondents exceeds the scope of this study. Simply stated, the methodology was selected to keep the study clear and informative.

Response computation required the use of some advanced statistical software (EViews), but in general a limited statistical program proved adequate. Responses were tabulated to each question by school and for appropriate questions a “no response” column was added ex post facto. Quantitative discrete data responses (PPR amounts, enrollment numbers, etc.) remained unchanged, while non-quantitative discrete data responses (type of building, services purchased, suggestions, etc.) required categorization. In most cases non-quantitative discrete data responses fell in to one of several common categories determined by simple item analysis. Fixed responses and both ranking and conditional ranking responses produced simple percentage calculations. As discussed below, these responses are often, but not necessarily, mutually exclusive. The unstructured, open response question required the same item analysis as the non-quantitative discrete data responses and, like them, landed nicely in to one of several common categories.

Once cleaned and properly categorized, the analytical method is straightforward. The summary statistics were computed for the quantitative discrete data responses, percentages for the remaining responses were generated, and in some cases correlation matrices between responses were produced. The subsequent discussion is founded largely on the explicit data obtained from the survey. However, many survey questions acted as double agenda questions whose purpose was not necessarily the specific answer, but whether or not the respondent had the ability to answer it in the first place. While deception is a general threat to survey validity, the double agenda questions do not fit this description.

## V. Existing Studies

Charter schools command a great deal of attention from the research community. From universities and policy institutes to private consulting firms, the charter school movement continues to fuel active debate. Even in the presence of such interest, the body of research is not sufficient to settle current disagreement about where charter schools fit in to public education.

Augenblick and Myers (A&M) produce Colorado's most detailed research on charter schools. However, they focus their work on either one school district (A&M, 2001, 2002) or on several districts (A&M 2002). Their results are generally the same for all studies and suggest that school districts lose money due to the existence of charter schools and the inherent increase in charter school enrollment. They argue that traditional district schools struggle to absorb the impact of decreased revenue amid rigid fixed costs. In a multi-district study, A&M (2002) concluded that Littleton 6, Denver 1, Jefferson County R-1, Boulder Valley Re2, Colorado Springs District 11, and Brighton 27J sustained revenue losses per charter school pupil of \$1,309, \$2,307, \$2,565, \$2,711, \$2,498, and \$2,566, respectively.

In another study, Hirsch and Anderson (1999), in conjunction with Augenblick and Myers, compare charter school and school district spending patterns. Their major findings suggest that charter schools receive and spend significantly less than the school districts in which they operate. Specifically, "charter schools spen[d] only a fraction of the amount the district spent on capital outlay."

Other extensive research is, unfortunately, not specific to Colorado. Fuller et al (2003) of Stanford University's Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), discuss, as the title of this working paper suggests, the general differences between charter schools and what they call *regular public schools*. PACE looks at nationwide disparities in funding, teacher quality, and student support and comes to the conclusion that charter schools and regular public schools are different. Specifically, they discuss the "disparities linked to charter school type," "disparities linked to the ethnic make up of the schools," and the "gaps between charter and regular public schools." The conclusions are well supported and illustrate lopsided figures in ethnic composition and income profiles, teacher credential, and categorical aid dollars. Further, they state that charter schools with mainly black or Latino students rely more heavily on non-credentialed teachers than predominantly white charters as do privately managed and start-up charters.

Anderson, Watkins and Cotton (2003), take a similar approach and analyze revenue disparities among charters in Michigan, while the Pennsylvania Economy League (2001) details the fiscal impact of charter schools in that state. These studies are indeed informative, generally, but like Fuller et al (2003), they are not Colorado specific. Those studies that do focus on Colorado charter schools, traditional public schools, and school districts, do so with certain limitations. It is for this reason that CSRC sought to produce a study that included all of Colorado's charter schools and a sample of the districts. The comprehensive nature of the survey design and administration seeks to answer the basic questions: What is the status of Colorado's charter schools since the implementation of H.B. 99-1113? What are the policies, practices, and issues surrounding charters and districts?

## VI. Survey Results<sup>5</sup>

### General

As stated, a total of 58 charter schools returned acceptable surveys. The survey asked that respondents categorize their school according to fixed responses and 100 percent of schools fell into at least one of nine paths. The Core Knowledge curriculum approach accounts for 55 percent of charter schools (33 schools), while School Developed Model curriculum and College Preparatory approach represent 21 percent (12) and 17 percent (10) of charter schools, respectively. Expeditionary Learning and Experiential schools each account for about nine percent (5) of reporting schools while Montessori schools and Place Based programs each drive seven percent (4) of Colorado's charter schools. Edison Model and one Modern Red Schoolhouse each account for two percent of schools. With these numbers in mind, two items deserve further attention. First, the percentages listed above come from a sample size of only 58. This represents 67 percent of all Colorado charter schools and is sufficient to generalize to all schools. Caldwell (2003) obtained similar numbers in a survey that garnered a 73 percent response rate. Second, the responses are not mutually exclusive: they total more than 100 percent.

The schools supplied data on wait lists for *grades that the school already serves*. The distinction, in economic terms, identifies a surplus demand for (or supply of) *existing* goods and services. Simply put, it tends to show the number of students who wanted to attend a particular school but didn't because of high demand for the good (charter school enrollment). Otherwise, waiting list numbers would tend to capture the number of students who wanted to attend the school but couldn't due to a shortage in supply (lack of classes already served by the school). Many charter schools, it should be noted, operate not with a traditional waiting list, but with a lottery enrollment system. This allows students who are currently not enrolled in the school an equal chance at enrollment each year. While this differs from the wait list in that it is not a "first-come - first-served" arrangement, the lottery system requires an ongoing list of non-enrolled pupils and can, for all intents and purposes, be considered a revolving wait list.

---

<sup>5</sup> For an item by item summary of survey responses, please see Appendix {A}.

The reported numbers are not surprising. From school year (SY) 1997-98 through school year (SY) 2001-02, the number of charter schools with enrollment waiting lists shows a steady trend and accounts for 59 percent, 56 percent, 56 percent, 54 percent, and 61 percent of all schools, respectively. This should be expected since increases in total school number and number of schools operating with an enrollment waiting list is positively correlated and will tend to move together. Charter school enrollment averages moved cyclically across the five-year span dropping from 273 students in SY 1997-98 to 254 students the following year. Between SY 1999-2000 and SY 2000-01 student enrollment averages slipped from 290 students to 272 students but then increased for SY 2001-02 to a reported average of 321 students.

The positive correlation between total number of charter schools and charters schools operating with some form of a waiting list informs debate better than do average student counts. The outcome, while anticipated, suggests that even in the face of increasing supply (more charter schools), demand for the good continues to outstrip the supply of the good. We fail to reach a market clearing condition, and operate, *ceteris paribus*, with a shortage. This is not to suggest that solving the problem requires more charter schools or even that there is problem in the first place. Rather, it simply illustrates that more students in Colorado wish to attend charter schools than space and current policy allow.

Not all charter school pupils begin their academic career at a charter school. According to the statewide survey, 30 percent of charter school students enrolled during the 2001-02 school year originated, unequivocally, from traditional district schools. Six percent moved to the charter from home school arrangements, while eight percent previously attended schools outside the district. Twenty-four percent started at the charter school, one percent had attended another charter school, and two percent originated from private schools. These statistics show that charter schools are drawing part of their student population from traditional district schools, a situation some say hurts traditional district schools by reducing revenue while maintaining fixed costs. These statistics also show that charter schools attracted 16 percent of their enrollment from outside the district, and eight percent of these came from sources previously outside public education. (Note: 24 percent of schools did not answer the question. A large portion of this figure comes from respondents who stated that they simply did not have the information available to them. The remaining four percent came from those respondents who had only information on one or several origination types.)

As Caldwell (2003) also indicates, Colorado charter schools operate in a wide variety of settings, the most common of which is a leased commercial space. Other locations include previously empty district buildings, modular buildings, existing district facilities, a former K-Mart, and privately owned spaces. The following table outlines charter school facility arrangements as reported by all surveyed schools.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Schools</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Leased commercial space	20	24%
Previously empty district building	13	15%
Church	4	5%
Purchased Modular	2	2%
Built for the school	3	4%
Lease to own	2	2%
Existing district building	4	5%
New Building	3	4%
No response	17	20%
Other**	16	19%

\*\*Please see Appendix A Q (A4) for specific detail.

Capital finance has long been an issue between charter school advocates and charter school opponents. Traditional district schools remain insulated from the capital outlay expenses faced by many charter schools - especially new and start-up schools. And while 15 percent of charter schools operate from a “previously empty district building,” (and are theoretically pardoned from annual lease/rent payments), the majority of charter schools address capital finance requirements out of operating revenues.

The survey contained a series of questions aimed at information about district-provided services. We asked respondents to indicate what services they purchased from their school district, how much each of those services cost, whether the district required them to purchase the service, and the nature of the services in the face of an actual change in charter school enrollment. In this instance too, the results may not be surprising. Most schools, 88 percent, purchase services from the district, seven percent claim they buy no district services at all, three percent did not respond to the question and one school did not know either way. Seventy-eight percent of schools who purchased district services listed services required by the district, 27 percent indicated that no services were required by the district and eight percent failed to respond to the question. Twenty-two percent of reporting schools would seek an outside vendor for some of the required district services and almost one-third of those schools would seek outside sources for all services if the opportunity presented itself. If the service were offered elsewhere at a competitive rate, then schools prefer an opportunity to employ outside service providers.



## Primary Survey Results and Analysis

The primary focus of this study is the effect of H.B. 99-1113 on charter schools and districts. As noted above, H.B. 99-1113 changed existing charter school legislation to allow for higher PPR funding levels and we sought some understanding of current practices, issues and policies in Colorado charter schools. In the pages that follow, survey results specific to the question, “What has been the effect of H.B. 99-1113?” are presented with corresponding analysis of that data.

Responding schools helped to identify whether or not districts and charters are in fact operating under the statute that raised the funding floor for most charter schools. According to that bill,

For budget year 2000-2001...each charter school and the authorizing school district shall negotiate funding under the contract *at a minimum* of ninety-five percent of the district per pupil revenues for each pupil enrolled in the charter school. The school district may choose to retain *up to* five percent of the district per pupil revenues for each pupil enrolled in the charter school as payment for *the charter school's portion* of central administrative overhead costs incurred by the district. (emphasis added)

The survey sought to answer whether or not districts were complying with the intent of the bill and passing through at least 95 percent of district PPR in school districts with more than 500 students. (As noted, school districts with 500 or fewer students operate under slightly different funding guidelines.) According to survey results and non-survey information acquired through public sources, Colorado school districts are in fact passing through at least 95 percent of PPR to charter schools. However, the statement requires substantial qualification.

Charter schools in districts with more than 500 students receive at least 95 percent of PPR, but there is more to the issue than sheer numbers. It should not be surprising that schools receive at least 95 percent of PPR because that is the law and to actively withhold a greater amount than is determined by the law is not district policy. It does appear, however, that in a large number of reporting schools the host district is withholding a flat rate of five percent. In at least 35 percent of reporting charter schools, the respondent indicated, in some way, that the district withholds a flat five percent for central administrative overhead costs.<sup>6</sup> Comments ranged from, “...prior to audit, we received 95 percent. I was not informed of any adjustment made since then,” to “...that comes out of our five percent.”

---

<sup>6</sup> 35% is a conservative number. Many schools did not address the question specifically and it is assumed that other schools may be in a similar situation.

With 35 percent of schools commenting (often parenthetically) that the district retains an automatic five percent for central administrative overhead costs, this exhibits an apparent disconnect between the intention of the law and the application of it. The district is allowed to “retain up to five percent” for central administrative overhead costs, but H.B. 99-1113 does not explicitly allow districts to take five percent of PPR automatically. Rather, it provides a price ceiling above which districts may not go without mutual agreement between it and the charter school negotiator.

It should be noted that if central administrative overhead costs equal or exceed five percent then districts have the right to withhold that amount. Also, if charter schools and districts agree to the five percent (or more), then districts are within their rights to withhold that amount.

In some cases, however, charter schools do not have the opportunity to review district accounting that determines the amount withheld. According to Colorado Revised Statute, 22-30.5-112,

Within ninety days after the end of each fiscal year, each school district shall provide to each charter school within its district an *itemized accounting of all its central administrative overhead costs*. The actual central administrative overhead costs shall be the amount charged to the charter school. (emphasis added)

Of the schools that responded to a corresponding survey question, 46 percent noted that they do not receive the “itemized accounting.” These schools are not able to identify the costs of the administrative services for which they are charged, and are therefore unable to monitor the percent of funding which is passed through from the district. Of the schools that do receive the itemization, 40 percent stated that they strongly agree or agree that the itemization was “clear and easy to understand.” On the part of the charter schools, efficient budgeting is made more difficult by missing or difficult to understand reporting of expenses.

Why wouldn't a charter school seek legal recourse when it fails to receive the information it is afforded under state law? Sixty-nine percent of schools that do not receive an itemization "have a working agreement with the district on this point," while 42 percent stated that they "do not want to tarnish [their] working relationship with the district." Twenty-seven percent didn't know that the law existed and 19 percent "couldn't afford the legal expenses and time involved in such an endeavor." Another 19 percent feared some type of district reprisal in the form of "unanticipated consequences".<sup>7</sup> It appears that schools are either not aware of their rights, financially unable, or are unwilling to pursue legal action against the districts.

On the other hand, charter schools may not care whether or not they receive itemized accounting statements or whether or not districts withhold an automatic five percent PPR. Even though 35 percent of schools received a flat five percent fee for central administrative overhead costs, and even though 46 percent of schools do not receive an itemization of costs, survey responses illustrate a level of indifference, generally, on the part of charter schools. When asked if they thought that the "district[s] made sound decisions with respect to the administration of services," just over 60 percent of schools agreed while only ten percent submitted an unequivocal "no." Seventeen percent did not know the answer to this question and twelve percent did not respond. In related questions, schools also reported that they did not have any voice in the negotiation of expenses incurred. Sixty-two percent said that there was no negotiated settlement of school expenses and of those 47 percent mentioned that there was no opportunity for them to negotiate. However, 53 percent claimed that there was no need to negotiate and that the expenses appeared well calculated. Three percent stated either a stalemate or a lack of interest in the process, respectively, and no schools claimed that a poor relationship/lack of communication with the district kept them from the negotiation table. Yet schools expressed interest in being "involved in the decision-making process." Sixty-seven percent of charters are, at the very least, interested in involvement.

Further, general commentary (see Appendix C) suggests that many charter schools do not object to the "automatic five percent." For example, in questions about required and contracted services some schools indicated that they paid their five percent and considered it fair. One school pays a flat fee each year, about \$10,000, to the district plus a per pupil amount for Special Education services and this agreement is acceptable to both charter and district. Another school pays a simple five percent and this includes all services. To that particular school, the arrangement is satisfactory and the respondent clearly admitted that the school received its contracted and central administrative services at bargain prices. That is, it would likely cost the school more to purchase services either independently or per item/per pupil. One very small school claimed that although it paid a flat five percent of PPR, it often received services that it had not paid for. These cases illustrate that open communication and flexibility are key factors in successful charter/district relationships.

---

<sup>7</sup> Percentages total more than 100%, as more than one possible response often applied to a particular school.

Yet, in an open ended, free response question, statements showed inconsistencies with the previous results. In fact, when asked to briefly explain how the process could be improved, only 25 percent said it worked well. The following table summarizes other responses: (responses outnumber schools due to multiple possible answers)

<b>Response</b>	<b>Schools</b>	<b>% of total</b>
Adherence to 2300	1	1.49%
Alternative (state) chartering authority	2	2.99%
Autonomy	1	1.49%
Better communication	4	5.97%
Did not answer the question	2	2.99%
More opportunity to negotiate	6	8.96%
More specific (detail of costs)	8	11.94%
No response	18	26.87%
Pay negotiated hourly rates for services	1	1.49%
PPR direct to charter school	1	1.49%
Separate from district	1	1.49%
Unknown	2	2.99%
Works well	17	25.37%
Opportunity to challenge the district	1	1.49%
A voice in the job description of the Liaison	1	1.49%
Opportunity to buy services	1	1.49%
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	

### **Summary and Analysis**

Colorado charter schools receive at least 95 percent of district PPR. However, there is a tendency for districts to automatically withhold five percent of PPR rather than negotiate from this baseline as described in H.B. 99-1113. In addition, many school districts do not provide an itemized accounting of all central administrative overhead costs (not to mention contracted service costs). Whether this occurs by error, neglect, or mutual agreement, it illustrates that almost half of Colorado’s school districts do not follow H.B. 99-1113. True, some charter schools seem indifferent to the unwillingness of many districts to follow the letter of the Charter Schools Act. Indeed, some charters and their corresponding districts have come to a mutual understanding about certain aspects of what is no less than a business relationship. However, this does not alter the process’ nonconformity with H.B. 99-1113.

H.B. 99-1113 gave charter schools the standards with which to communicate and negotiate with districts and to become operationally more efficient. When districts withhold an automatic five percent of PPR, or fail to provide itemization of costs incurred, it damages a charter's ability to operate efficiently, and it threatens the charters right to govern itself. It introduces additional challenges to reducing costs and increasing educational innovation. Like any other business, charter schools need to have as close to perfect information about their operating structure as possible.

As a point of consideration for the districts, if charter schools are able to operate central administrative overhead costs with five percent of PPR then districts may be able to learn better efficiency from them. Financially successful charter schools may be considered the incentive for districts to innovate.

While most charters suggest that the district is making sound decisions with respect to the administration of services, most want to be involved in the process, and most are not. Schools do not take action against their districts when they violate the Charter Schools Act even though the Colorado Department of Education provides a third party review.<sup>8</sup> Basically, charter schools do not challenge the district.

The relationship between the charter school and the district has much to do with this. The district grants the charter. The district also has the decision regarding the charter's renewal. This can place the agents of the charter school in an awkward position if they feel the need to contest expenses with the district, especially if the charter school currently has a positive working relationship with the district that they do not want to damage. The duality of the districts' role in charter approval and financial primacy could be construed as a conflict of interest.

This duality has remained a recurrent theme between charter schools and school districts. H.B. 99-1113 does not address the potential conflict of interest. The finding that some districts retain a flat five percent of PPR on 35 percent of charter schools brings three possible scenarios to the forefront.

First, it is possible that central administrative overhead costs amount to exactly five percent of district PPR. However, no schools offered documents presenting clear itemized breakdown of expenses totaling exactly five percent of PPR.

Second, it is also possible that the 2300 series of the district's expenses are greater than five percent of PPR and districts withhold the maximum they can under the law. If this is the case, then an itemized breakdown may assist charter schools to clarify and improve their spending patterns, thereby modeling spending practices beneficial to the districts as well.

---

<sup>8</sup> There are currently only three grievances that have come before CDE for review: Cardinal Community, Globe Charter and Bromley East/Brighton Charter School.

For example, charter schools pay the district, per pupil, for a Charter School Liaison, yet 34 percent of reporting charter schools indicated that they either don't have a specified Liaison or don't know if they do. Further, 84 percent of those that do have a Liaison said that the employee spends less than two hours per week with the school administrator. This example illustrates one area in which school districts may find lessons proven in the charter schools to be beneficial in helping them become more inwardly financially cognizant and less so regarding the revenue from charter schools.<sup>9</sup>

Third, it is possible that central administrative overhead costs are less than five percent of PPR and the district withholds that amount for a number of reasons. It is possible the district withholds a flat five percent out of error, in which case a process needs to be in place to recognize and rectify the error. It is also possible the district and the charter school have agreed to the five percent withholding, but the previously mentioned conflict of interest should be taken into consideration when evaluating the agreement process. It seems in everyone's best interest, even with a flat five percent withholding, to provide an itemized statement of charges to the charter schools with which they can make spending assessments and future financial plans, and to make every attempt to comply with the intent of H.B. 99-1113.

---

<sup>9</sup> 31% of charter school students originate from traditional district schools. That means any amount withheld by the district for the other 69% is actually an increase in revenue, by that amount, for students they will never have to serve except on a cursory level.

## VII. Policy Recommendations

The study generates some recommendations for legislative consideration:

First, the underlying rationale of the district holdback for central administrative services is that charter schools should be required to pay a share of the central administrative costs of the district. While this may seem reasonable at first blush, the rationale does not in fact take into account the realities of school district financing. School districts have access to revenue streams that are denied to charter schools. Furthermore, it seems that the argument focuses on the wrong point. Should we be worrying about whether district central administrative offices are properly funded? Isn't it more appropriate to invest in education reform and innovation? Moreover, does it make sense to set up districts and charter schools to dispute with one another over these funds? These considerations lead to the recommendation that the legislature should consider simply funding charter schools at a flat 100 percent of per pupil operating revenue, thereby eliminating the five percent holdback issue altogether.

Second, in larger districts the five percent the districts retain from their charter schools is insignificant to the district's overall budget, but extremely significant to the individual charter school. For example, last fiscal year Jefferson County School District R-1's overall budget was \$735 million, and it spent \$12 million on charter schools. The five percent holdback is very significant to the Jefferson County charter schools' overall budget (i.e., \$600,000 out of \$12,000,000). However, it is only .00013 percent of the district's overall budget. Because of dynamics like this, if the legislature chooses not to eliminate the holdback altogether, it should consider eliminating it for larger districts (districts with total enrollment of 15,000 or more).

Third, it is fairly clear that there is widespread failure on the part of many school districts to properly account for the five percent holdback and refund those portions to which they are not entitled under the statute. To remedy this situation, districts must be given a financial incentive to comply with the statute. One way to accomplish this goal would be to shift the default. Instead of allowing districts to retain five percent of PPR for central administrative costs, the legislature should consider requiring the districts to pay over 100 percent of PPR and then charging the charter school's pro rata share of central administrative services on a monthly basis. This will require districts to take affirmative steps to recover these funds instead of, as seems to be the case now, keeping funds to which they are not entitled. A system already exists to bill charter schools for underpayment of services and the extreme example of this arrangement is to charge, after-the-fact, for all services. Thirteen schools stated that they have reimbursed the district for extra expenses associated with the administration of services and one school receives an invoice for all services at the end of the year. It is possible. Granted, this scenario demonstrates an even greater reliance on accurate and understandable itemization of central administrative overhead costs and services.

Fourth, another way to give districts a financial incentive properly to account for central administrative expenses is to attach a financial penalty for failure to do so. For example, the legislature should consider amending the statute to provide that if the accounting is not provided to charter schools within 90 days of the end of the fiscal year as required, the district will not be entitled to retain any funds for central administrative expenses, and 100 percent of the funds previously withheld must be paid back to the charter schools.

Fifth, the legislature should consider amending the five percent holdback to a lower number, say 2.5 percent, with the same accounting procedure at the end of the fiscal year. This will allow the districts to recoup most of their central administrative costs over the course of the year. It will also give them a financial incentive to perform the required accounting if these expenses are greater than 2.5 percent and they desire to recoup the difference between what has been held back and actual expenses. The five percent cap on the amount of central administrative expenses the district may require charter schools to pay should stay in place even if the holdback level is reduced to 2.5 percent to prevent districts from charging excessive central administrative costs to charter schools.

Sixth, this study has identified that a number of districts have required their charter schools to waive any right to repayment of withheld funds in excess of actual central administrative costs. In other words, these districts require their charters to settle for a flat 95 percent funding level with no possibility of recouping any of the five percent holdback that is in excess of the district's central administrative costs. Districts requiring charter schools to waive their clear statutory funding rights as a condition of entering into a contract is another example of the inequities that may arise as a result of the current relationship duality between the charter school and its chartering district. Section 22-30.5-105(5) of the Charter Schools Act states that any term in a charter contract that requires a charter to forego receipt of any operational funds is void. Apparently, some districts have taken the position that this does not apply to the right to receive an accounting of the five percent holdback and return of funds held in excess of actual costs. Therefore, the legislature should consider revising this section to specifically state that no charter contract may require a charter school to waive its right to this accounting and refund.

Finally, in a larger context, the dynamics of charter schools struggling to require their districts to comply with the plain terms of the Charter Schools Act may be an example of a process that is fundamentally flawed. In any negotiation between a district and a charter school, the district holds 100 percent of the negotiating chips. The charter school is powerless, because its very existence depends on getting the district to sign a charter school contract. Therefore, as we have seen, many charters are forced by their districts to waive their clear statutory rights in order to earn the right to exist.



Therefore, giving charter schools more statutory rights cannot completely solve the problem in a district that forces its charter schools to waive their statutory rights. Moreover, it is no answer to say the charter school can sue the district. As a practical matter, most charter schools realize that it is very important to maintain a good working relationship with their district, and are therefore extremely reluctant to sue their district even to vindicate clear rights under the statute. Accordingly, in addition to any specific steps the legislature takes to deal with the particular manifestation of this problem resulting from districts' failure properly to follow the law with regard to the five percent holdback, it should also consider an overall structural solution. In this regard, giving charter schools a choice in chartering entities should go a long way toward giving charter schools more negotiating power and thereby eliminate not only this problem, but many other problems as well.

## VIII. Future Research

This study reflects analysis of data items obtained through a survey process, which, even under perfect circumstances, leaves topics behind. In conducting the survey and the subsequent research study, it became clear that charter schools disagree with state Special Education procedures. It is not necessarily the case that charters dislike particular Special Education teachers or consider their work inadequate (although this is sometimes the case). There are issues surrounding the expenses associated with Special Education programs and also some interest in locating private sources for these very important services. In the cases where Special Education proved inadequate, charters expressed concern about the lack of viable alternatives. A future detailed study on Special Education in charter schools would no doubt add important insight to the existing literature.

Second, the education system in general and charter schools in particular stand to gain a great deal from further research in English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. Like Special Education, survey respondents questioned the continued viability of the current ESL procedures. This study does not flush out particulars and produces no conclusions about ESL. We leave ESL for future scholars.

Also, it remains for subsequent researchers to investigate the long-term effects of H.B. 99-1113. In the event that it remains without amendment, only time will determine if the intent of the law is actually alive in practice.

## **IX. Concluding Remarks**

This study dedicates many pages to Colorado charter school issues, practices and procedures and summarizes the findings. Although it seems that school districts and charter schools have not yet reached unequivocal agreement on issues of cost and funding and do not always coexist in an amicable climate of shared resources and educational innovation, it is possible to move toward such an idealistic relationship. If a system is developed, through legislative and other means, that requires responsible behavior on the part of both districts and charter schools, then Colorado as a whole benefits.

Ideally, education in Colorado should not be about the chart of accounts or central administrative overhead costs, nor should it be about what amounts to 0.00013 percent of one district's budget. It should be about an education culture that is ripe with innovation and equality and one that truly fosters positive and reciprocal relationships. It should be about offering educational excellence to all children through choice in educational opportunities. It should be about providing our children with every possible tool they need not only to survive, but also to succeed. Truly, it should be about 'no child left behind.'

## References

- Anderson, Patrick L., Scott D. Watkins and Christopher S. Cotton, (2003). *The Public School Academy Funding Gap: Revenue Disparities between "charter" schools and traditional public schools in Michigan*. Lansing, MI.: Anderson Economic Group.
- Augenblick J. and Myers J., (2002). *Fiscal Impact of Charter Schools on Jefferson County School District R-1*. Denver, CO.: Augenblick & Myers, Inc.
- Augenblick J. and Myers J., (2002). *Fiscal Impact of Charter Schools on Boulder Valley School*. Denver, CO.: Augenblick & Myers, Inc.
- Augenblick J. and Myers J., (2002). *A Multi-District Study on the Fiscal Impact of Charter Schools on Authorizing Districts*. Denver, CO.: Augenblick & Myers, Inc.
- Caldwell, R, (2003). *Charter School Capital Finance Study*. Denver, CO.: Kirkpatrick Pettis.
- Education Commission of the States, (1998). *Charter School Finance: Policies, Activities and Challenges in Four States*. Denver, CO.: author.
- Fuller, B. Et al., (2003). *Charter Schools and Inequality: National Disparities in Funding, Teacher Quality, and Student Support*. Berkeley, CA.: Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), Working Paper Series 03-2.
- Hirsch, Eric and Anderson, Amy Berk, (1999). *Colorado Charter Schools: A Comparison of Charter and School District Spending*. Denver, CO. and Washington, D.C.: National Conference of State Legislatures.
- Pennsylvania Economy League, (2001). *Meeting the Challenge: Managing the fiscal impact of charter schools in Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia, PA.: Greater Philadelphia Urban Affairs Coalition.

# Appendix A

## Charter School Survey

### Section (A)

We would like to know if school districts are complying with H.B. 99-1113.

Specifically, are districts passing through at least 95 percent PPR?

1. What was total district PPR for each of the 1997/98 through 2001/02 school years? If you have spread sheets with this information, please include them in the enclosed envelope. (If your school hasn't been in existence that long, please date back to the school's inception.

	<i>PPR averages for schools reporting</i>				
	1997/1998	1998/1999	1999/2000	2000/2001	2001/2002
Mean	\$4,354.23	\$4,383.83	\$4,498.58	\$4,849.11	\$5,083.66
Minimum	\$3,309.73	\$3,229.62	\$1,399.02	\$1,211.52	\$1,078.14
Maximum	\$5,776.95	\$5,987.02	\$5,960.01	\$6,900.00	\$7,494.22
<b>Count</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>47</b>

2. How much total revenue did your school receive for each of these years (total or per pupil)? Again, if you have spread sheets or accounting records, please include them in the enclosed envelope.
3. How much does your charter school pay each month/year to occupy the building *in which it currently operates?*

<i>Building cost per school</i>	
Mean	\$199,305.34
Minimum	\$0.00
Maximum	\$1,600,032.00
Count	57

4. What type of building does your school currently occupy? For example, is it a previously empty district building? Is it a leased commercial space?

Category	Number
Out of district prior empty district building	1
Private	1
Rental	1
Purchase modular	2
In district prior empty district building	13
Leases commercial space	18
Church	4
Owned commercial	1
New leased	1
Own	1
Built for school	3
New and retail	1
Lease/purchase	2
Mixed	1
Leased apt. complex	1
District building	4
Leased modular	1
Factory	1
Historic school house	1
New Building	3
KMart	1
State facility	1
Supermarket	1
Donated	1
Lease	2
No response	17

5. Do you receive an *“itemized accounting of all central administrative overhead costs”* from your district?

**Yes.** (Please include this statement in the envelope provided) *Go to question 6 and skip question.*

**No.** (Please skip question 6 and continue with question 7.)

Cleaned Data	58 schools	
Yes	30	51.72%
No	26	44.83%
No response	2	3.45%

6. You answered yes to question 5. Please rate the following statement:  
**The itemization we received from the district was clear and easy to understand.**

- a) *Strongly agree*
- b) *Agree*
- c) *Somewhat agree*
- d) *Disagree*
- e) *Strongly disagree*
- f) *Don't know*

<b>Cleaned Data</b>	<b>58 schools</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16.67%</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>23.33%</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>26.67%</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>20.00%</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6.67%</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>No Response</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6.67%</b>

7. According to Colorado Revised Statute, 22-30.5-112, the district is required to provide an *“itemized accounting of all central administrative overhead costs”* no later than 90 days after the end of the fiscal year. Please circle the answer that best represents the reason(s) why you have not taken any action against the district. Mark all that apply.

- a) *We were unaware that the law exists.*
- b) *We don't want to tarnish our working relationship with the district.*
- c) *We can't afford the legal expenses and time involved in such an endeavor.*
- d) *We believe we might suffer some unanticipated consequences if we challenge the authority of the district.*
- e) *We have a working agreement with the district on this point.*
- f) *Other: Please explain briefly.*

<b>Cleaned Data</b>	<b>58 schools</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>26.92%</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>42.31%</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>19.23%</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>19.23%</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>69.23%</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>42.31%</b>
<b>No Response</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3.85%</b>

8. According to Colorado Law, “any difference between the amount initially charged and the actual cost [of the service] shall be reconciled and paid to the owed party.” Has your school ever been reimbursed by the district due to an overcharge for a district service?

<b>Cleaned Data</b>	<b>58 schools</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>29.31%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>55.17%</b>
<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13.79%</b>
<b>No response</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.72%</b>

9. Have you ever been asked to reimburse the district for underpayment of district services?

<b>Cleaned Data</b>	<b>58 schools</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>22.41%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>68.97%</b>
<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6.90%</b>
<b>No response</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.72%</b>



## Section (B)

We would also like to know a little bit about the financial relationships Colorado charter schools have with their host districts.

1. Do you now have a specified charter school liaison?

*Yes*

*No*

*Don't know*

<b>Cleaned Data</b>	<b>58 schools</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>63.79%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>29.31%</b>
<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3.45%</b>
<b>No response</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3.45%</b>

2. If yes to question 1 how much contact (face-to-face, phone, etc.) do you have with the liaison during a typical in-session school week?

*a. 0 hours*

*b. Less than 1 hour*

*c. Between 1 and 2 hours*

*d. Between 2 and 3 hours*

*e. Between 3 and 4 hours*

*f. Between 4 and 5 hours*

*g. Between 5 and 10 hours*

*h. Greater than 10 hours*

<b>Cleaned data</b>	<b>58 schools</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8.11%</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>54.05%</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>29.73%</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8.11%</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8.11%</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>G</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>H</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.70%</b>
<b>No Response</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

3. We would like to know if, in general, charter school liaisons spend more time with charter schools during the inaugural years than they do once the charter school is well established. In your experience, how has the number of liaison contact hours changed over the course of the charter school's existence?
- A. *Increased greatly*
  - B. *Increased somewhat*
  - C. *Remained the same*
  - D. *Decreased somewhat*
  - E. *Decreased greatly*
  - F. *Don't know*

<b>Cleaned data</b>	<b>58 schools</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.72%</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8.62%</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>18.97%</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>18.97%</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10.34%</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>18.97%</b>
<b>No Response</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>22.41%</b>

4. What services do you purchase from the district? Many school districts provide detailed checklists of available services that the charter school then accepts or declines. In some instances, these checklists contain a description of the service, cost per pupil, and some notation of whether or not the service is required by the school district. If you have such a document, please enclose it in the envelope provided. If not please list the services you purchase from the district and *their cost per pupil*.

**X. Please see Appendix B**

5. Please indicate which of these services are required by the school district?

**XI. Please see Appendix B**

6. Of the required district services available for purchase, which would you purchase from outside the district if given the opportunity?

**XII. Please see Appendix B**

7. What district services do you purchase that do not change when the charter school enrollment level changes? *(For example, if someone comes to remove snow in the winter or cut grass in the spring, that service does not differ if you have 50 students or 500 students.)*

**XIII. Please see Appendix B**

8. What services does the district provide that *do* change with a change in enrollment?

**XIV. Please see Appendix B**

## Section (C)

We would like to know a little about the overall effects of charter schools on the host school district.

- Please tell us the yearly enrollment for school years 1997/98 through 2001/02.

<i>Question C1 Statistical Data Enrollment</i>					
	<b>1997/1998</b>	<b>1998/1999</b>	<b>1999/2000</b>	<b>2000/2001</b>	<b>2001/2003</b>
Mean	273.9814815	253.4545	272.18919	253.39796	306.90909
Minimum students	19	17	17	20.5	19
Maximum students	747	757	850	862	1200

- During which of the aforementioned school years did your school operate with an enrollment waiting list *for grades you already serve*?

Year	Schools	
97/98	19	32.76%
98/99	22	37.93%
99/00	24	41.38%
00/01	28	48.28%
01/02	35	60.34%

- How many students were on each of the grades' waiting lists *on the first day of classes*? Please, complete the following table.
- Question dropped due to item non-response in most cases.**

Year	Grade level												
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
97/98													
98/99													
99/00													
00/01													
01/02													

5. What percentage of your *School Year 01/02* students originated from:

<i>Pupil originated from:</i>	<i>Percent of current students</i>
<b>Home schools</b>	<b>5.88%</b>
<b>District schools</b>	<b>30.69%</b>
<b>Outside district schools</b>	<b>7.60%</b>
<b>Private schools</b>	<b>2.30%</b>
<b>Another charter school</b>	<b>1.05%</b>
<b>Began at this charter school</b>	<b>24.41%</b>
<b>No response</b>	<b>24.14%</b>

6. District administrative services for charter schools are often associated with individuals other than the charter school liaison. Does your school have a voice in negotiating who performs the services and how much time/money will be devoted to them? That is, was there a negotiated settlement of these expenses?

<b>Cleaned Data</b>	<b>58 schools</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>20.69%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>62.07%</b>
<b>Don't know</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13.79%</b>
<b>No response</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3.45%</b>

7. If you answered NO to question 5, which of the following best represents the reason why you were not involved in the process.

- a) *Poor relationship/Lack of communication with the district.*
- b) *No opportunity to negotiate*
- c) *Stalemate with the district*
- d) *Not interested in the negotiation process*
- e) *There is no need to negotiate (we think the expenses are well calculated)*

<b>Cleaned data</b>	<b>58 schools</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>47.22%</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.78%</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.78%</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>52.78%</b>
<b>No response</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

8. Briefly, how would you like to see the process changed/resolved?

<b>Adherence to 2300</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.49%</b>	<b>1.72%</b>
<b>Alt. (state) chartering authority</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.99%</b>	<b>3.45%</b>
<b>Autonomy</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.49%</b>	<b>1.72%</b>
<b>Better communication</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5.97%</b>	<b>6.90%</b>
<b>Did not answer the question</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.99%</b>	<b>3.45%</b>
<b>More opportunity to negotiate</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8.96%</b>	<b>10.34%</b>
<b>More specific</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11.94%</b>	<b>13.79%</b>
<b>No response</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>26.87%</b>	<b>31.03%</b>
<b>Pay negotiated hourly rates</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.49%</b>	<b>1.72%</b>
<b>PPR direct to charter school</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.49%</b>	<b>1.72%</b>
<b>Separate from district</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.49%</b>	<b>1.72%</b>
<b>Unknown</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.99%</b>	<b>3.45%</b>
<b>Works well</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>25.37%</b>	<b>29.31%</b>
<b>Opportunity to challenge</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.49%</b>	<b>1.72%</b>
<b>Liaison</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.49%</b>	<b>1.72%</b>
<b>Opportunity to buy services</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.49%</b>	<b>1.72%</b>
		<b>100.00%</b>	

Note: N/A = Works well

67

9. In your opinion, has the district made sound decisions with respect to the administration of services?

<b>Cleaned Data</b>	<b>58 schools</b>	
<b>Yes</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>60.34%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10.34%</b>
<b>Don't know</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17.24%</b>
<b>No response</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12.07%</b>

10. How interested are you in being involved with the district administrative decision making process?

- a) *Extremely interested. This should be mandatory.*
- b) *Highly interested.*
- c) *Interested.*
- d) *Somewhat interested.*
- e) *Not at all interested.*

<b>Cleaned data</b>	<b>58 schools</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>22.41%</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>24.14%</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>20.69%</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>22.41%</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6.90%</b>
<b>No response</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3.45%</b>

10). Please tell us what type of curriculum your school offers. Circle the answer that applies.

- a) *Core Knowledge*
- b) *Montessori*
- c) *Expeditionary Learning/Outward Bound*
- d) *Place-Based*
- e) *School developed model (hybrid/homegrown)*
- f) *College Prep*
- g) *Modern Red Schoolhouse*
- h) *Experiential*
- i) *Edison Model*

<b>Cleaned data</b>	<b>58 schools</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>55.17%</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6.90%</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8.62%</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6.90%</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>20.69%</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17.24%</b>
<b>G</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.72%</b>
<b>H</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8.62%</b>
<b>I</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.72%</b>
<b>No response</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>

# Appendix B

Cleaned data set in Excel format

county	district	School Name		Enclosure Included	A1(97/98)
		Survey Question			
Douglas	Douglas County RE1	Academy Charter School	Complete	1	4517
Adams	Northglenn-Thornton 12	Academy of Charter Schools	Complete	0	4529
Prowers	Lamar RE2	Alta Vista Charter School	Complete	0	
Garfield	Aspen 1/ Roaring Fork RE1	Aspen / Carbon Community	Complete		5776.95
Arapahoe	Adams-Arapahoe 28J	Aurora Academy	Complete	0	
Boulder	Boulder Valley RE2	Boulder Preparatory High School	Complete	1	4609
Adams	Brighton 27J	Bromley East Charter School	Complete	0	
Weld	Keenesburg RE3J	Cardinal Community Academy	Complete	0	
Jefferson	Jefferson County R1	Center for Discovery Learning	Complete	1	3748.5
Pueblo	Pueblo City 60	Cesar Chavez Academy	Complete	1	
Arapahoe	Cherry Creek 5	Cherry Creek Academy	Complete	0	4594
El Paso	Cheyenne Mountain 12	Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy	Complete	1	
El Paso	Academy 20	Classical Academy, The	Complete	1	4207
Jefferson	Jefferson County R1	Collegiate Academy	Complete	1	
Denver	Denver County 1	Community Challenge School	Complete	0	
Jefferson	Jefferson County R1	Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	Complete	1	
Pueblo	Pueblo Rural 70	Connect School, The	Complete	1	
Douglas	Douglas County RE1	Core Knowledge Charter School	Complete	0	4502.44
Douglas	Douglas County RE1	DCS Montessori School	Complete	1	4646
Denver	Denver County 1	Denver Arts and Technology Academy	Complete	0	
Elbert	Elizabeth C1	Elbert County Charter School	Complete	1	4098.05
Jefferson	Jefferson County R1	Excel Academy	Complete	1	
Jefferson	Jefferson County R1	Free Horizon Montessori	Complete	0	
Weld	Greeley 6	Frontier Academy	Complete	0	3687.56
El Paso	Colorado Springs 11	GLOBE Charter School	Complete	1	
Park	Park County RE2	Guffey Community Charter School	Complete	0	
Boulder	Boulder Valley RE2	Horizons K-8 Alternative School	Complete	1	4609
Jefferson	Jefferson R1	Jefferson Academy Charter School	Complete	0	80%
Park	Park County RE2	Lake George Charter School	Complete	1	
Jefferson	Jefferson County R1	Lincoln Academy	Complete	1	see enclosures
Arapahoe	Littleton 6	Littleton Academy	Complete	1	
Gunnison	Gunnison-Watershed RE1J	Marble Charter School	Complete	0	4751.28
El Paso	Lewis-Palmer 38	Monument Academy	Complete	0	
Denver	Denver County 1	Odyssey School, The	Complete	0	
Denver	Denver County 1	P.S. 1	Complete	1	4246.35
Boulder	Boulder Valley RE2	Peak to Peak Charter School	Complete	1	
Montrose	West End RE2	Paradox Valley School	Complete	0	
Adams	Northglenn-Thornton 12	Pinnacle Charter School	Complete	1	na
Denver	Denver County 1	Pioneer Charter School	Complete	1	4013.54
Larimer	Poudre R1	Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning	Complete	0	
Adams	Strasburg 31J	Prairie Creeks Charter School	Complete	1	
Pueblo	Pueblo City 60	Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	Complete	1	3661.70
Denver	Denver County 1	Ridge View Academy	Complete	0	
Larimer	Poudre R1	Ridgeview Classical Schools	Complete	0	
Jefferson	Jefferson County R1	Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	Complete	0	
Montezuma	Montezuma-Cortez RE1	Southwest Open School	Complete	1	
Adams	Northglenn-Thornton 12	Stargate School	Complete	0	
Boulder	Boulder Valley RE2	Summit Middle School	Complete	1	4609
Pueblo	Pueblo Rural 70	Swallows Charter Academy	Complete	0	na
El Paso	Harrison 2	Tutmos Academy	Complete	1	
Boulder	St Vrain Valley RE1J	Twin Peaks Charter School	Complete	1	
Weld	Greeley 6	Union Colony Preparatory School	Complete	1	4575.5
Weld	Greeley 6	University Schools	Complete	1	
Boulder	St Vrain Valley RE1J	Ute Creek Charter School	Complete	0	
Weld	Windsor RE4	Windsor Charter Academy	Complete	1	
Jefferson	Jefferson County R1	Woodrow Wilson Academy	Complete	1	
Denver	Denver County 1	Wyatt-Edison Charter School	Complete	0	
Pueblo	Pueblo City 60	Youth and Family Academy Charter School	Complete	1	
				32	
				36.78%	
				53.33%	



School Name	98/99	99/00	00/01	2001/02	Accurate	Not Avail.	No Resp.	A2 (97/98)	98/99
Academy Charter School	4664	4820	5046	5296	1				
Academy of Charter Schools	4688	4812	4998	5281	1		3214005	3371375	
Alta Vista Charter School	4508	4897	5059	5360	1			3606.4	
Aspen / Carbon Community	5987.02	5828.07	6652.24	6789.40	0		658571.88	885184.55	
Aurora Academy			1985698	2658024	0				
Boulder Preparatory High School	4779	4599	5097	5394	1			3665	
Bromley East Charter School				5266	1				
Cardinal Community Academy			5229.69	5444.29	1				
Center for Discovery Learning	3872.6	3969.5	5062.89	5324.53	1		85%	85%	
Cesar Chavez Academy				1549828	0				
Cherry Creek Academy	4739	4857	5024	5585	0		1920674.82	2009335.99	
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy		4735	4902	5143	1				
Classical Academy, The	4353	4688	4871	5166	1		4207	4353	
Collegiate Academy			4827	5076.53	0				
Community Challenge School			565072	565072	0				
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	4039	4164	4812	4952	0			4039	
Connect School, The		95%	95%	95%	0				
Core Knowledge Charter School	4139.61	3767.04	3266.22	3021.69	0		1289320	1331155	
DCS Montessori School	4702	4862	5044	5297	1		446106	895824	
Denver Arts and Technology Academy			na	na	0	1			
Elbert County Charter School	4359.56	4186.03	4461.51	5195.80	0		630619.06	720643.56	
Excel Academy			5075	5324.53	1		4626	4779	
Free Horizon Montessori				5639.22	0				
Frontier Academy	3967.5	4034.09	4403.43	4627.9	0		1043579	1475909	
GLOBE Charter School			nr	nr	0		1		
Guffey Community Charter School				5829.77	0				
Horizons K-8 Alternative School	4779	4899	5097	5394	1		4016	4315	
Jefferson Academy Charter School	80%	95%	95%	95%	0		918027	1042423	
Lake George Charter School		5960.01	5422.97	6136.6	0				
Lincoln Academy	see enclosures	see enc	see enc	see enc			403615.72	740020.6	
Littleton Academy					0		1	4473	
Marble Charter School	4009.11	5043.51	5212.5	5493.59	1		5566	5773	
Monument Academy			4696	5174	0				
Odyssey School, The	4896.56	4338.26	4675.10	5218.08	0			487769	
P.S. 1	4538.10	4964.00	5241.62	5503.02	0		1060947	1505106	
Peak to Peak Charter School			5097	5394	1				
Paradox Valley School		5300	6900	7494.22	0				
Pinnacle Charter School	na	na	4762	5030	0	1	2182100	3247271	
Pioneer Charter School	4194.21	4221.36	4333.55	4795.58	0		2032170	1690988	
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning				5478	0				
Prairie Creeks Charter School					0		1		
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	4270.22	4138.65	3862.74	4720.44	0		4490	4713	
Ridge View Academy				3781.82	0				
Ridgeview Classical Schools				5107	1				
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen				nr	0		1		
Southwest Open School		4792	4946.67	5195.03	1				
Stargate School	nr	nr	5314	5556	0			nr	
Summit Middle School	4779	4899	5097	5394	1		4016	4252	
Swallows Charter Academy	na	na	na	na	0	1	95%	95%	
Tutmos Academy					0				
Twin Peaks Charter School			na	5314.00	1	1	na	na	
Union Colony Preparatory School	4752.2	4892.3	5101.6	5398.9	0		796137	860148	
University Schools					0		1		
Ute Creek Charter School				4645.55	0				
Windsor Charter Academy				4861.88	0				
Woodrow Wilson Academy			5075	5324.53	1				
Wyatt-Edison Charter School					0		1	nr	
Youth and Family Academy Charter School	4441	4866	5097	5377	1		244416	332257	
					20	4	6		
					34.48%	6.90%	10.34%	0.00%	
					65.52%			0.00%	

School Name	99/00	00/01	2001/02	Not Avail.	No Resp.	A3	A4	no resp
Academy Charter School	1,650,158	2108291	2874516			601760	BP	
Academy of Charter Schools	3862833	4092862	4389831			475000/y	OD	
Alta Vista Charter School	3917.6	4806.05	5092			0	PEDB	
Aspen / Carbon Community	1026169.32	1150193.59	1283145.95			180000/y*	PRIV	
Aurora Academy	.	1832669	2270775			508531/y	LCS	
Boulder Preparatory High School	4891	5122	5882			97020/y	RENT	
Bromley East Charter School	.	.	5077.21					1
Cardinal Community Academy	.	349702	406478				Purch. Mod	
Center for Discovery Learning	85%	95%	95%			210000/y	Church	
Cesar Chavez Academy	.	.	2442519			1/y	PEDB	
Cherry Creek Academy	2035083	2119716	2270321			299412.50/y	Church	
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy	1334320	1418787	1954374			0	OCS	
Classical Academy, The	4688	4871	5166			1600032/y	New leased	
Collegiate Academy	.	4585.65	4822.7			500000/y	Own	
Community Challenge School	.	565072	565072			26400	LCS	
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	4164	4812	4952			14988	LCS	
Connect School, The	3822.5	4173.31	4597			54000	LCS	
Core Knowledge Charter School	1518824	1878388	2222178			30180	BFS	
DCS Montessori School	943139	1266117	1538877			664344/y	BFS	
Denver Arts and Technology Academy	.	95%	95%			0	PEDB	
Elbert County Charter School	1056997.71	1485182.52	1643826.76			194700/y	BP	
Excel Academy	4899	4826.89	5076.53			86196.24/y	LCS	
Free Horizon Montessori	.	.	4967.91			146780.88/y	LCS	
Frontier Academy	1823407	2146673	2556917			135723	New&retail	
GLOBE Charter School	.	nr	nr			1	86661.12	Lease-purch
Guffey Community Charter School	.	.	297017.16			1.00/y	PEDB	
Horizons K-8 Alternative School	4538	5769	6060			Per Pupil	PEDB	
Jefferson Academy Charter School	3964384	3964384	3806736			306000/y	Mixed	
Lake George Charter School	524480.88	477221.36	607523.4			1.00/y	PEDB	
Lincoln Academy	898492.19	3987950.79	1599596.1			235000/y	Church	
Littleton Academy	4529	4714	5250			323268/y	LCS	
Marble Charter School	6318	6318	6584			23000/y	Historic School	
Monument Academy	.	1785639	1945084			24716	LCS	
Odyssey School, The	1197820	1645123	1588420			131808/y	DB	
P.S. 1	1806306	1766237	2068771			298200/y	LCS	
Peak to Peak Charter School	.	3697	3994			1400000	PEDB	
Paradox Valley School	0.85*5300	0.95*6900	7119.51			0	BP	
Pinnacle Charter School	2797142	3058300	4795080			0	Former kmart	
Pioneer Charter School	1855637	2085674	1897196			0	PEDB	
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning	.	.	856798			270858	LCS	
Prairie Creeks Charter School	.	.	.			14385.00/y	LCS	
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	4854	5077	5393			Ut.= 30576	PEDB	
Ridge View Academy	.	.	5539.25/pp			0	State facility	
Ridgeview Classical Schools	.	.	1924368.67			665000	Church	
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	.	.	843655			144000/y	LCS	
Southwest Open School	740364	717267.15	727304.2			0	PEDB	
Stargate School	nr	5048.3	5278.2			1	16775	LCS
Summit Middle School	4448	4606	6007			see survey	DB	
Swallows Charter Academy	95%	95%	95%			7857	Supermarket	
Tutmore Academy	95%	95%	95%			4500	LCS	
Twin Peaks Charter School	na	na	5048.30		1	0.00	PEDB	
Union Colony Preparatory School	777875.7	749935.2	826031.7			0	Donated	
University Schools	2574140	2563022	nr			1	1296000/y	New bldg.
Ute Creek Charter School	.	.	1192119			249450/y	LCS	
Windsor Charter Academy	.	.	960011			150000	Lease	
Woodrow Wilson Academy	.	4827	5076.53			280547/y	Lease to own	
Wyatt-Edison Charter School	nr	4037908	4610348			1	183113	Lease
Youth and Family Academy Charter School	621388	610639	906527			0	DB	
					1	4		1
	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.72%	6.90%			1.72%

School Name												
Survey Question	A5 yes	A5 no	no resp	if yes to A5							no res	A7 a
				A6 a	b	c	d	e	f			
Academy Charter School	0	1									0	
Academy of Charter Schools	0	1									0	
Alta Vista Charter School	0	1									0	
Aspen / Carbon Community	0	1									0	
Aurora Academy	0	1									0	
Boulder Preparatory High School	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Bromley East Charter School	0	0	1								0	
Cardinal Community Academy	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
Center for Discovery Learning	0	1									1	
Cesar Chavez Academy	1	0		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Cherry Creek Academy	1	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy	1	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Classical Academy, The	0	1									0	
Collegiate Academy	1	0		1	0	0	0			0	0	
Community Challenge School	0	1									1	
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	1	0		0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Connect School, The	0	1									1	
Core Knowledge Charter School	0	1									1	
DCS Montessori School	0	1									1	
Denver Arts and Technology Academy	0	1									0	
Elbert County Charter School	1	0		0	0	0	1	0	0	0		
Excel Academy	1	0		0	0	0	1	0	0	0		
Free Horizon Montessori	1	0								1		
Frontier Academy	0	1									0	
GLOBE Charter School	1	0		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Guffey Community Charter School	0	1									1	
Horizons K-8 Alternative School	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Jefferson Academy Charter School	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Lake George Charter School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
Lincoln Academy	1	0		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Littleton Academy	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
Marble Charter School	0	1									0	
Monument Academy	0	1	0								0	
Odyssey School, The	0	1									0	
P.S. 1	1	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Peak to Peak Charter School	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Paradox Valley School	0	1									0	
Pinnacle Charter School	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Pioneer Charter School	0	1									0	
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning	1	0		0	0	0	1	0	0	0		
Prairie Creeks Charter School	0	1									0	
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Ridge View Academy	0	1									0	
Ridgeview Classical Schools	0	1									0	
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	1	0		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Southwest Open School	1	0		0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Stargate School	0	0	1								0	
Summit Middle School	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Swallows Charter Academy	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Tutmos Academy	0	1									0	
Twin Peaks Charter School	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Union Colony Preparatory School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
University Schools	0	1									0	
Ute Creek Charter School	0	1									0	
Windsor Charter Academy	1	0		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Woodrow Wilson Academy	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
Wyatt-Edison Charter School	0	1	0								0	
Youth and Family Academy Charter School	1	0		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
	30	26	2	5	7	8	6	2	0	2	7	
	51.72%	44.83%	3.45%	16.67%	23.33%	26.67%	20.00%	6.67%	0.00%	6.67%	26.92%	
			100.00%						100.00%			

School Name	b	c	d	e	f	No Resp	A8 yes	no	dk	no res	A9 yes	no
Academy Charter School	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Academy of Charter Schools	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Alta Vista Charter School	0	0	0	1	1		0	1	0	0	1	0
Aspen / Carbon Community							1	0	1	0	0	1
Aurora Academy	0	0	0	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	1
Boulder Preparatory High School	0	0	0	1	0		1	0	0	0	1	0
Bromley East Charter School	0	1	0	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	1
Cardinal Community Academy							1	0	0	0	1	0
Center for Discovery Learning	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	1
Cesar Chavez Academy	0	1	1	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	1
Cherry Creek Academy							1	0	0	0	0	1
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy							0	0	1	0	0	0
Classical Academy, The	0	0	0	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	1
Collegiate Academy	0	0	0	0	1		0	1	0	0	0	1
Community Challenge School	0	0	0	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	1
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School							0	1	0	0	0	1
Connect School, The	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	1
Core Knowledge Charter School	1	0	0	0	0		0	1	0	0	1	0
DCS Montessori School	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	1	0	1	0
Denver Arts and Technology Academy	0	0	0	1	0		1	0	0	0	0	1
Elbert County Charter School							0	1	0	0	0	1
Excel Academy							0	0	1	0	0	0
Free Horizon Montessori							0	1	0	0	0	1
Frontier Academy	1	0	0	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	1
GLOBE Charter School	0	0	0	0	1		0	0	1	0	0	1
Guffey Community Charter School	0	0	0	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	1
Horizons K-8 Alternative School	0	0	1	0	0		1	0	0	0	1	0
Jefferson Academy Charter School							0	1	0	0	0	1
Lake George Charter School							0	1	0	0	0	1
Lincoln Academy	1	1	1	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	1
Littleton Academy							0	1	0	0	0	1
Marble Charter School	1	0	0	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Monument Academy	1	0	0	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Odyssey School, The	0	0	0	1	0		1	0	0	0	1	0
P.S. 1							0	1	0	0	0	1
Peak to Peak Charter School							0	1	0	0	1	0
Paradox Valley School	1	0	0	1	1		0	1	0	0	0	1
Pinnacle Charter School	1	0	0	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	1
Pioneer Charter School	0	0	0	1	1		0	1	0	0	0	1
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning							1	0	0	0	0	1
Prairie Creeks Charter School	0	0	0	1	0					1	0	0
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	0	0	0	0	1		1	0	0	0	0	1
Ridge View Academy	0	0	0	1	0		1	0	0	0	0	1
Ridgeview Classical Schools	0	0	0	1	0		1	0	0	0	0	1
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	0	0	0	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	1
Southwest Open School							1	0	0	0	1	0
Stargate School	0	0	0	0	1		0	0	1	0	0	1
Summit Middle School	1	1	1	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	1
Swallows Charter Academy	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	1
Tutmore Academy	1	0	1	0	1		0	1	0	0	0	1
Twin Peaks Charter School	1	0	0	0	0		0	1	0	0	1	0
Union Colony Preparatory School							0	1	0	0	0	1
University Schools	0	0	0	1	0		0	1	0	0	1	0
Ute Creek Charter School	0	1	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	1
Windsor Charter Academy	0	0	0	0	1		1	0	0	0	0	1
Woodrow Wilson Academy							0	1	0	0	0	1
Wyatt-Edison Charter School	0	0	0	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	1
Youth and Family Academy Charter School	0	0	0	0	1		1	0	0	0	1	0
	11	5	5	18	11	1	17	32	8	1	13	40
	42.31%	19.23%	19.23%	69.23%	42.31%	3.85%	29.31%	55.17%	13.79%	1.72%	22.41%	68.97%
						223.08%				100.00%		
						58						

School Name	dk	no res	B1 yes	no	dk	no resp	B2 a	b	c	d	e	f
Academy Charter School	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Academy of Charter Schools	0		0	1	0							
Alta Vista Charter School	0		0	1	0		0	0	1	0	0	0
Aspen / Carbon Community	0		0	1	0							
Aurora Academy	0		1	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0
Boulder Preparatory High School	0		0	1	0		0	0	1	0	0	0
Bromley East Charter School	0					1						
Cardinal Community Academy	0		0	1	0							
Center for Discovery Learning	0		1	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0
Cesar Chavez Academy	0		1	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0
Cherry Creek Academy	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy	1		0	1	0							
Classical Academy, The	0		1	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0
Collegiate Academy	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Community Challenge School	0		0	1	0							
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Connect School, The	0		0	1	0							
Core Knowledge Charter School	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
DCS Montessori School	0		1	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0
Denver Arts and Technology Academy	0		1	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0
Elbert County Charter School	0		0	1	0							
Excel Academy	1		1	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0
Free Horizon Montessori	0		1	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0
Frontier Academy	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
GLOBE Charter School	0		1	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0
Guffey Community Charter School	0		0	1	0							
Horizons K-8 Alternative School	0		0	0	1							
Jefferson Academy Charter School	0		1	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0
Lake George Charter School	0		1	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0
Lincoln Academy	0		1	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0
Littleton Academy	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Marble Charter School	1		0	1	0							
Monument Academy	1		0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Odyssey School, The	0		1	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0
P.S. 1	0		1	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0
Peak to Peak Charter School	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Paradox Valley School	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Pinnacle Charter School	0		0	1	0							
Pioneer Charter School	0		1	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning	0		0	1	0							
Prairie Creeks Charter School		1	0	1	0							
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Ridge View Academy	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Ridgeview Classical Schools	0		0	1	0							
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Southwest Open School	0		0	1	0		1	0	0	0	0	0
Stargate School	0		0	0	1							
Summit Middle School	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Swallows Charter Academy	0		1	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0
Tutmos Academy	0		1	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0
Twin Peaks Charter School	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Union Colony Preparatory School	0		0	1	0							
University Schools	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Ute Creek Charter School	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Windsor Charter Academy	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Woodrow Wilson Academy	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Wyatt-Edison Charter School	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
Youth and Family Academy Charter School	0		1	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0
	4	1	37	17	2	2	3	20	11	3	3	0
	6.90%	1.72%	63.79%	29.31%	3.45%	3.45%	8.11%	54.05%	29.73%	8.11%	8.11%	0.00%
		100.00%				100.00%						

School Name	g	h	no resp	B3 a	b	c	d	e	f	no resp	B4 yes	no (none)
Academy Charter School	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0		1	0
Academy of Charter Schools				0	0	0	0	0	1		1	0
Alta Vista Charter School	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0		0	1
Aspen / Carbon Community										1	0	0
Aurora Academy	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0		1	0
Boulder Preparatory High School	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0		1	0
Bromley East Charter School										1	1	0
Cardinal Community Academy										1	1	0
Center for Discovery Learning	0	1		0	0	0	1	0	0		1	0
Cesar Chavez Academy	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0		1	0
Cherry Creek Academy	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0		1	0
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy				0	0	0	0	1	0		1	0
Classical Academy, The	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0		1	0
Collegiate Academy	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0		1	0
Community Challenge School										1	1	0
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0		1	0
Connect School, The										1	0	0
Core Knowledge Charter School	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1		0	0
DCS Montessori School	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1		1	0
Denver Arts and Technology Academy	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0		1	0
Elbert County Charter School										1	1	0
Excel Academy	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1		1	0
Free Horizon Montessori	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1		1	0
Frontier Academy	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0		1	0
GLOBE Charter School	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1		1	0
Guffey Community Charter School				0	0	0	0	0	1		0	1
Horizons K-8 Alternative School				0	0	0	0	1	0		1	0
Jefferson Academy Charter School	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0		1	0
Lake George Charter School	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0		0	1
Lincoln Academy	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0		1	0
Littleton Academy	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0		1	0
Marble Charter School										1	1	0
Monument Academy	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0		1	0
Odyssey School, The	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0		1	0
P.S. 1	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0		1	0
Peak to Peak Charter School	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0		1	0
Paradox Valley School	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0		1	0
Pinnacle Charter School				0	0	0	0	1	0		1	0
Pioneer Charter School	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0		1	0
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning										1	1	0
Prairie Creeks Charter School										1	1	0
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0		1	0
Ridge View Academy	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0		0	1
Ridgeview Classical Schools										1	1	0
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0		1	0
Southwest Open School	0	0								1	1	0
Stargate School				0	0	0	0	0	1		1	0
Summit Middle School	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Swallows Charter Academy	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1		1	0
Tutmos Academy	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0		1	0
Twin Peaks Charter School	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0		1	0
Union Colony Preparatory School										1	1	0
University Schools	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1		1	0
Ute Creek Charter School	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0		1	0
Windsor Charter Academy	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1		1	0
Woodrow Wilson Academy	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0		1	0
Wyatt-Edison Charter School	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0		1	0
Youth and Family Academy Charter School	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0		1	0
	0	1	0	1	5	11	11	6	11	13	51	4
	0.00%	2.70%	0.00%		8.62%	18.97%	18.97%	10.34%	18.97%	22.41%	87.93%	6.90%
			110.81%							98.28%		
				2.38%	11.90%	26.19%	26.19%	14.29%	26.19%			
									107.14%			

School Name	no resp.	dk	B5yes	none	no resp	dk	B6yes	none	no resp	dk	all
Academy Charter School	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Academy of Charter Schools	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Alta Vista Charter School	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Aspen / Carbon Community	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Aurora Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Boulder Preparatory High School	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Bromley East Charter School	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Cardinal Community Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Center for Discovery Learning	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Cesar Chavez Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Cherry Creek Academy	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Classical Academy, The	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Collegiate Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Community Challenge School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Connect School, The	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Core Knowledge Charter School	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
DCS Montessori School	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Denver Arts and Technology Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Elbert County Charter School	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Excel Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Free Horizon Montessori	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Frontier Academy	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
GLOBE Charter School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Guffey Community Charter School	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Horizons K-8 Alternative School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Jefferson Academy Charter School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Lake George Charter School	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Lincoln Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Littleton Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Marble Charter School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Monument Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Odyssey School, The	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
P.S. 1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Peak to Peak Charter School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Paradox Valley School	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Pinnacle Charter School	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Pioneer Charter School	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Prairie Creeks Charter School	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Ridge View Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Ridgeview Classical Schools	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Southwest Open School	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Stargate School	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Summit Middle School	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Swallows Charter Academy	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Tutmore Academy	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Twin Peaks Charter School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Union Colony Preparatory School	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
University Schools	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Ute Creek Charter School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Windsor Charter Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Woodrow Wilson Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wyatt-Edison Charter School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Youth and Family Academy Charter School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	2	1	40	14	4	0	13	32	9	4	4
	3.45%	1.72%	78.43%	27.45%	7.84%	0.00%	22.41%	55.17%	15.52%	6.90%	30.77%
		100.00%				113.73%				130.77%	

School Name	B7yes	none	no resp	dk	all	B8yes	none	no resp	dk	all	C1(97/98)
Academy Charter School	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	320
Academy of Charter Schools	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	747
Alta Vista Charter School	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Aspen / Carbon Community	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	231
Aurora Academy	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Boulder Preparatory High School	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Bromley East Charter School	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Cardinal Community Academy	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Center for Discovery Learning	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	256.5
Cesar Chavez Academy	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Cherry Creek Academy	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	421
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	291
Classical Academy, The	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	403
Collegiate Academy	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	137
Community Challenge School	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	
Connect School, The	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	132
Core Knowledge Charter School	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	251
DCS Montessori School	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	96
Denver Arts and Technology Academy	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Elbert County Charter School	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	142
Excel Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0na	
Free Horizon Montessori	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Frontier Academy	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	294
GLOBE Charter School	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Guffey Community Charter School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Horizons K-8 Alternative School	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	276
Jefferson Academy Charter School	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	259
Lake George Charter School	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Lincoln Academy	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	119
Littleton Academy	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	425
Marble Charter School	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	19
Monument Academy	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	249
Odyssey School, The	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
P.S. 1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	162
Peak to Peak Charter School	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Paradox Valley School	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Pinnacle Charter School	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	500
Pioneer Charter School	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	325
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Prairie Creeks Charter School	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	403.5
Ridge View Academy	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Ridgeview Classical Schools	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Southwest Open School	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Stargate School	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Summit Middle School	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	270
Swallows Charter Academy	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0na	
Tutmore Academy	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Twin Peaks Charter School	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	408
Union Colony Preparatory School	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	158
University Schools	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Ute Creek Charter School	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Windsor Charter Academy	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Woodrow Wilson Academy	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Wyatt-Edison Charter School	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Youth and Family Academy Charter School	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	98
	17	35	6	0	1	37	12	9	0	12	7393
	29.31%	60.34%	10.34%	0.00%	1.72%	63.79%	20.69%	15.52%	0.00%	20.69%	273.81
					101.72%				120.69%		127.47



School Name	98/99	99/00	00/01	2001/02	C2 (97/98)	98/99	99/00	00/01	2001/02	C3 yes	no
Academy Charter School	314	414	525	489	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Academy of Charter Schools	757	845	862	875	na	na	na	na	na	0	0
Alta Vista Charter School	68	74	83	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Aspen / Carbon Community	110	113	99	97	dk	dk	dk	dk	dk	0	0
Aurora Academy			420	425				1	1	1	0
Boulder Preparatory High School	32	38	40	53		1	1	1	1	1	0
Bromley East Charter School				683						1	0
Cardinal Community Academy			65	81				0	0	0	1
Center for Discovery Learning	260	243	238	234	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Cesar Chavez Academy			302	384				1	1	0	0
Cherry Creek Academy	421.5	418	422	419	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy	319	303	324	375	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Classical Academy, The	460	621	822	1148	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Collegiate Academy	171	552	564	534	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Community Challenge School			101	101				0	0	0	1
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	132	154	225	285		1	1	1	1	1	0
Connect School, The	138	140	139	145	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Core Knowledge Charter School	273	300	346	374	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
DCS Montessori School	190.5	194	251	290.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Denver Arts and Technology Academy			198	235				0	1	0	0
Elbert County Charter School	157	217	278	279	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
Excel Academy	na	na	na	na	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Free Horizon Montessori				98						1	0
Frontier Academy	369	455	524	599	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
GLOBE Charter School			85	108				0	0	0	0
Guffey Community Charter School			36	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Horizons K-8 Alternative School	291	281	290	295	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Jefferson Academy Charter School	282	310	690	730	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Lake George Charter School		107	118	124			0	0	0	1	0
Lincoln Academy	209	245	271	289	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Littleton Academy	425	425	425	425	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Marble Charter School	17	17	22	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monument Academy	262	313	411	410	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Odyssey School, The	48	168	194	218		1	1	1	1	1	0
P.S. 1	213	218	262	285	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak to Peak Charter School			179	571				1	1	1	0
Paradox Valley School		17.5	20.5	24.5			0	0	1	1	0
Pinnacle Charter School	650	850	100	1200	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
Pioneer Charter School	311	309	301	272	na	na	na	na	na	0	0
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning				159						1	0
Prairie Creeks Charter School	17	23	22	31		0	0	0	1	0	1
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	346	357	382.5	313	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
Ridge View Academy			71	249	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ridgeview Classical Schools				384.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen				176						1	0
Southwest Open School		154.5	145	140			0	0	0	0	0
Stargate School	227	232	238	301		0	0	0	0	1	0
Summit Middle School	256	252	256	304	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Swallows Charter Academy	na	na	na	na						0	0
Tutmos Academy		26	48	48			0	0	0	0	1
Twin Peaks Charter School	408	408	408	408	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
Union Colony Preparatory School	181	159	147	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
University Schools		589.5	623	649	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Ute Creek Charter School			118	200				0	0	0	0
Windsor Charter Academy				157						1	0
Woodrow Wilson Academy			162	215.5				1	1	1	0
Wyatt-Edison Charter School	na	656	670	665		0	1	1	0	0	0
Youth and Family Academy Charter School	82	118	102	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	8397	11316.5	13625	18018	19	22	24	28	35	28	7
	254.45	290.17	272.50	321.75	59.38%	56.41%	55.81%	53.85%	61.40%	48.28%	12.07%
	144.78	195.11	234.91	310.66					286.85%		

School Name	no resp	no list	C4 a	b	c	d	e	f	no res	C5 yes
Academy Charter School	0		0.01	0.20	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.12		1
Academy of Charter Schools	1		0.01	0.12	0.11	0.00	0.01	0.75		0
Alta Vista Charter School	0		0.00	0.27	0.11	0.02	0.00	0.60		0
Aspen / Carbon Community	1		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0
Aurora Academy	0		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0
Boulder Preparatory High School	0		0.09	0.34	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.38		0
Bromley East Charter School	0		0.02	0.57	0.16	0.04	0.05	0.16		0
Cardinal Community Academy	0		0.02	0.69	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.22		1
Center for Discovery Learning	0		0.10	0.30	0.20	0.05	0.05	0.30		0
Cesar Chavez Academy	1		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0
Cherry Creek Academy	1		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy	0		0.03	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.83		0
Classical Academy, The	0		0.13	0.17	0.04	0.06	0.01	0.40		0
Collegiate Academy	0		0.21	0.13	0.16	0.05	na	na		0
Community Challenge School	0		0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.90		0
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	0		0.03	0.07	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.80		0
Connect School, The	0		0.05	0.50	0.40	0.05	0.00	0.00		0
Core Knowledge Charter School	0		0.04	0.28	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.56		0
DCS Montessori School	1		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0
Denver Arts and Technology Academy	1		0.00	0.95	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00		0
Elbert County Charter School	0	0	0.72	0.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0
Excel Academy	1		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0
Free Horizon Montessori	0		0.10	0.35	0.10	0.10	0.05	0.30		0
Frontier Academy	0		0.02	0.12	0.02	0.06	0.00	0.78		1
GLOBE Charter School		1	0.00	0.58	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.00		0
Guffey Community Charter School		1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00		0
Horizons K-8 Alternative School	0		0.01	0.06	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.85		0
Jefferson Academy Charter School	0		0.01	0.96	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00		0
Lake George Charter School	0		0.01	0.01	0.57	0.01	0.00	0.50		0
Lincoln Academy	1		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0
Littleton Academy	0		0.05	0.65	0.35	0.06	0.03	0.56		1
Marble Charter School		1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0
Monument Academy	0		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0
Odyssey School, The	0		0.02	0.58	0.05	0.05	0.10	0.20		1
P.S. 1		1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1
Peak to Peak Charter School	0		0.01	0.97	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.01		0
Paradox Valley School	0		0.03	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.67		0
Pinnacle Charter School	1		0.01	0.50	0.08	0.01	0.01	0.40		0
Pioneer Charter School	1	0	0.95	0.01	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00		0
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning	0		0.05	0.70	0.12	0.08	0.05	0.00		0
Prairie Creeks Charter School	0		0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		1
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	1	0	0.01	0.09	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.86		0
Ridge View Academy		1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1
Ridgeview Classical Schools	0		0.10	0.50	0.15	0.10	0.02	0.16		0
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	0		0.15	0.80	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00		1
Southwest Open School	1		0.00	0.38	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.50		0
Stargate School	0		0.01	0.48	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.50		0
Summit Middle School	0		0.03	0.72	0.02	0.23	0.05	0.00		0
Swallows Charter Academy	1		na	na	na	na	na	na	1.00	0
Tutmos Academy	0	0	0.00	0.75	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00		0
Twin Peaks Charter School	1		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1
Union Colony Preparatory School		1	0.05	0.78	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.00		0
University Schools	0		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1
Ute Creek Charter School		1	0.03	0.23	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.70		0
Windsor Charter Academy	0		0.30	0.34	0.20	0.00	0.01	0.15		0
Woodrow Wilson Academy	0		0.00	0.19	0.08	0.00	na	na		0
Wyatt-Edison Charter School	1		na	na	na	na	na	na	1.00	1
Youth and Family Academy Charter School		1	0.02	0.85	0.10	0.01	0.02	0.00		0
	15	8	3.4115	17.7977	4.4055	1.3355	0.6118	14.1585	14	12
	25.86%	13.79%	5.88%	30.69%	7.60%	2.30%	1.05%	24.41%	24.14%	20.69%
		100.00%							96.07%	

School Name				if no to c5					no res
	no	dk	no res	C6 a	b	c	d	e	
Academy Charter School	0	0							
Academy of Charter Schools	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Alta Vista Charter School	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Aspen / Carbon Community	1	0							
Aurora Academy	0	1							
Boulder Preparatory High School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Bromley East Charter School	1	0		0	1	1	0	0	
Cardinal Community Academy	0	0							
Center for Discovery Learning	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Cesar Chavez Academy	0	1							
Cherry Creek Academy	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy	0	1							
Classical Academy, The	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Collegiate Academy	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Community Challenge School			1						
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Connect School, The	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Core Knowledge Charter School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
DCS Montessori School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Denver Arts and Technology Academy	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Elbert County Charter School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Excel Academy	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Free Horizon Montessori	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Frontier Academy	0	0							
GLOBE Charter School	0	1							
Guffey Community Charter School	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Horizons K-8 Alternative School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Jefferson Academy Charter School	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Lake George Charter School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Lincoln Academy	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Littleton Academy	0	0							
Marble Charter School	0	1							
Monument Academy	0	1							
Odyssey School, The	0	0							
P.S. 1	0	0							
Peak to Peak Charter School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Paradox Valley School	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Pinnacle Charter School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Pioneer Charter School	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Prairie Creeks Charter School	0	0							
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Ridge View Academy	0	0							
Ridgeview Classical Schools			1	0	1	0	0	0	
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	0	0							
Southwest Open School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Stargate School	0	1		0	0	0	0	1	
Summit Middle School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Swallows Charter Academy	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Tutmosé Academy	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Twin Peaks Charter School	0	0							
Union Colony Preparatory School	1	0		0	0	0	1	0	
University Schools	0	0							
Ute Creek Charter School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
Windsor Charter Academy	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	
Woodrow Wilson Academy	0	1							
Wyatt-Edison Charter School	0	0							
Youth and Family Academy Charter School	1	0		0	1	0	0	0	
	36	8	2	0	17	1	1	19	0
	62.07%	13.79%	3.45%	0.00%	47.22%	2.78%	2.78%	52.78%	0.00%
			100.00%						105.56%

School Name	qualitative	No response	C8 yes	no	dk	no res	C9 a	b	
Academy Charter School	nr	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Academy of Charter Schools	nr	1	1	0	0				
Alta Vista Charter School	nr	1	1	0	0		0	1	
Aspen / Carbon Community	more specific	0				1	1	0	
Aurora Academy	nr	1	1	0	0		0	0	
Boulder Preparatory High School	unknown	0	1	0	0		0	1	
Bromley East Charter School	Alt (State) Chart. Authority	0	0	0	1		1	0	
Cardinal Community Academy	PPR direct to Charter	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Center for Discovery Learning	nr	1	1	0	0		0	0	
Cesar Chavez Academy	nr	1	0	1	0		0	1	
Cherry Creek Academy	works well	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy	nr	1	1	0	0		0	1	
Classical Academy, The	DNA the Question	0				1	1	0	
Collegiate Academy	works well	0	1	0	0		0	1	
Community Challenge School	unknown	0				1			
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	nr	1	1	0	0		0	0	
Connect School, The	more specific	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Core Knowledge Charter School	works well	0	1	0	0		0	0	
DCS Montessori School	more opp to negotiate	0	0	0	1		1	0	
Denver Arts and Technology Academy	works well	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Elbert County Charter School	pay negotiated hourly rates	0				1	0	0	
Excel Academy	Alt (State) Chart. Authority	0	1	0	0		1	0	
Free Horizon Montessori	nr	1				1	0	0	
Frontier Academy	nr	1	1	0	0		0	1	
GLOBE Charter School	better communication	0	1	0	0		1	0	
Guffey Community Charter School	nr	1	1	0	0		0	0	
Horizons K-8 Alternative School	works well	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Jefferson Academy Charter School	Adherence to 2300	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Lake George Charter School	more specific	0	0	0	1		0	1	
Lincoln Academy	nr	1	1	0	0		0	0	
Littleton Academy	works well	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Marble Charter School	nr	1	0	0	1		0	0	
Monument Academy	nr	1	0	0	1		0	0	
Odyssey School, The	works well	0	0	0	1		0	0	
P.S. 1	works well	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Peak to Peak Charter School	more specific	0	0	1	0		1	0	
Paradox Valley School	works well	0	1	0	0		0	1	
Pinnacle Charter School	separate from district	0	0	1	0		0	0	
Pioneer Charter School	works well	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning	MS, BC, Liaison	0	0	1	0		0	1	
Prairie Creeks Charter School	works well	0	1	0	0		0	1	
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	better communication	0	1	0	0		0	1	
Ridge View Academy	works well	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Ridgeview Classical Schools	works well, Opp. To buy serv.	0				1	0	0	
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	more specific	0	0	0	1		0	0	
Southwest Open School	autonomy, better comm.	0	0	1	0		1	0	
Stargate School	nr	1	1	0	0		0	0	
Summit Middle School	More Involved, opp to challenge	0	0	1	0		0	1	
Swallows Charter Academy	works well	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Tutmos Academy	works well	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Twin Peaks Charter School	more specific	0	1	0	0		1	0	
Union Colony Preparatory School	works well	0	0	0	1		0	1	
University Schools	nr	1				1	1	0	
Ute Creek Charter School	works well	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Windsor Charter Academy	DNA the Question	0	1	0	0		1	0	
Woodrow Wilson Academy	nr	1	0	0	1		1	0	
Wyatt-Edison Charter School	more opp to neg.	0	1	0	0		0	0	
Youth and Family Academy Charter School	more opp to neg.	0	0	0	1		1	0	
		0	17	35	6	10	7	13	14
		0.00%	29.31%	60.34%	10.34%	17.24%	12.07%	22.41%	24.14%
						100.00%			
									0.172644062

School Name	c	d	e	no res	C10 a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	no res
Academy Charter School	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Academy of Charter Schools					1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alta Vista Charter School	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aspen / Carbon Community	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Aurora Academy	1	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boulder Preparatory High School	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Bromley East Charter School	0	0	0	0		1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cardinal Community Academy	0	1	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Center for Discovery Learning	0	1	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Cesar Chavez Academy	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Cherry Creek Academy	0	1	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Classical Academy, The	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Collegiate Academy	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Community Challenge School					1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Compass Mont./Secondary Charter School	1	0	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Connect School, The	0	1	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Core Knowledge Charter School	0	0	1	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DCS Montessori School	0	0	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denver Arts and Technology Academy	1	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elbert County Charter School	1	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Excel Academy	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
Free Horizon Montessori	1	0	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frontier Academy	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
GLOBE Charter School	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guffey Community Charter School	0	1	0	0		0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
Horizons K-8 Alternative School	0	1	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Jefferson Academy Charter School	1	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake George Charter School	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Lincoln Academy	0	0	1	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Littleton Academy	0	1	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marble Charter School	1	0	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Monument Academy	0	1	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Odyssey School, The	1	0	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
P.S. 1	1	0	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak to Peak Charter School	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Paradox Valley School	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Pinnacle Charter School	0	0	1	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pioneer Charter School	1	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning	0	0	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prairie Creeks Charter School	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Pueblo School for Arts and Sciences	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Ridge View Academy	1	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ridgeview Classical Schools	1	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	0	1	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southwest Open School	0	0	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stargate School	0	1	0	0		1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Summit Middle School	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Swallows Charter Academy	0	0	1	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tutmore Academy	0	1	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Twin Peaks Charter School	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Union Colony Preparatory School	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
University Schools	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Ute Creek Charter School	0	1	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Windsor Charter Academy	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Woodrow Wilson Academy	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wyatt-Edison Charter School	0	1	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Youth and Family Academy Charter School	0	0	0	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	12	13	4	2	32	4	5	4	12	10	1	5	1	0
	20.69%	22.41%	6.90%	3.45%	55.17%	###	8.62%	6.90%	###	###	1.72%	8.62%	1.72%	0.00%
				100.00%										127.59%

# Appendix C

*General survey commentary.*

Academy Charter School	Not much commentary but a detailed Douglas County services list.
Academy of Charter Schools	This school pays \$475,000 per year to operate in a building that belongs to a neighboring school district. They pay no more than five percent of PPR and are happy with that. They receive services for which they are not charged.
ACE/Community Challenge	Don't receive an itemization and were unaware of the law. The numbers in A1 and A2 are actual PPR dollars received.
Alta Vista Charter School	The district takes care of payroll and audit and they feel the five percent is a fair amount. No identified charter school liaison but the administrator works closely with the district super. It says there is an attached list but it was not included.
Aspen Community	The numbers here are combined with Carbondale Community. It is important to note that the district PPOR and amount received are the same. It would seem that the schools receive 100 percent. However, there is a comment in C7 that suggests that the district is keeping five percent off the top. Further, the school doesn't know what services are included in the five percent. Believes that both school and district would benefit from clarity.
Aurora Academy	Very straightforward survey with very little commentary.
Bromley East Charter School	Establish an alternative chartering authority.
Cardinal Community Academy	Without the attachments, it's difficult to tell the fiscal story. They purchased a modular. The 2300 are required and it seems that they would like to do their own SpEd if they could do it well. Most importantly, they would like to see the PPR go directly to the charter from the state.
Center for Discovery Learning	While the school seems to have a decent relationship with the district, the enclosure shows that the district is keeping five percent off the top. And prior to H.B. 99-1113, it was keeping 15 percent off the top.
Cesar Chavez Academy	Revenue included is from all sources in A2. School occupies previously empty district building for which they pay \$1.00 per year. General administration costs are steady throughout the charter at 1.4 percent and services combined at 3.9 percent. It remains to be seen whether this is due to a charter agreement or the district. While they make no statement on how to change the process, it seems that "SpEd is horrible – too costly. Had to bring in-house."

Challenge to Excellence	First year was 2002-2003...dropped
Challenges Choices and Images	The school purchases only SpEd from the district and would provide it alone if given the chance. Concerned about the non-public perception of charters. "The process needs to take a fresh approach to choice and public charter participation in matters such as bond issues, etc." Says that they don't purchase services from districts
Cherry Creek Academy	Purchased a church and added on. Seem to have good relations with district.
Cheyenne Mountain Charter Academy	Report a great relationship with their district. Note that no money is withheld for services, rather everything is invoiced.
Collegiate Academy of Colorado	Look at the enclosures. It seems that the district is taking the five percent off of the top. However, the school is fine with that. They receive accounting of the five percent and suggest that it is easy to understand. They are happy with the services they receive.
Colorado High School - Denver	First Year was 2002-2003...dropped
Compass Montessori Elementary School	Numbers included in the Oct. 1 count are combined with Compass Secondary School. The review of the enclosure seems to show that Jefferson County takes about five percent off of the top. This can be refuted. It seems that they have a good relationship. They have access to numbers and to info.
Compass Montessori Secondary	See the comments above. Each school has its own list of services purchased.
Core Knowledge Charter School	Operate in a building built specifically for the school. Would seek SpEd and Health outside the district assuming comparable quality. District has made sound decisions and they don't care to be a part of the process.
Crestone Charter School	Small district charter school with a decent relationship with the district. Not much info available on the finance side of things and many items non-response.
Crown Pointe Academy	Only purchase snow removal and grounds maintenance from district which makes me suspect they don't know about the 2300 series. Survey contains a detailed list of the wait list. Unsure if the process needs to change at all.
DCS Montessori	Great Douglas county cost sheets. Operate in a building built in 2000 and expanded in 2002. Unaware of the itemization. Would like the opportunity to negotiate with the district.

Denver Arts & Technology Academy	Receive a flat 95 percent PPR each year and seem to be fine with that. Would seek services elsewhere if prices were lower. Don't feel a change in the process is necessary. None of the listed school types applies to this school
Eagle County Charter Academy	Buying their buildings – own three and have mortgages on the other four. Was asked to reimburse the district for charges but never received an amount. Said to have a decent relation with the Super., CFO, Personnel Director, etc. and pay for them...no specific person is assigned to the school. A great chart of expenses to be kept strictly confidential! Required services (Super, BOCES, Speech, Legal Tax Audit, Assessment and SpEd) are a “waste”.
Elbert County Charter School	Good enclosure for reference. Would like an hourly rate agreed upon and then they would bill the “services” for real-time hours. Itemization is included yet vague. The district points out that it can charge five percent, but by agreement it only charges three percent through fiscal year 2002-2003.
Excel Academy	They have a great services sheet...Jefferson County. Many answers are blank and they indicate that information on enrollment and wait lists is “not kept.” The school would like to be under a separate state authority because the district “seems to have a conflict of interest and in many cases wish the charter would go away.”
EXCEL School	Again we have a situation where there is little or no continuity of info when administration changes. They assume that all of their services are required by the district. They operate in a “surplus” building that is old and needs many repairs.
Free Horizon Montessori	They paid \$281.96 (five percent) for central services, \$275.62 for SpEd, and \$27.56 for ESL (required) and \$77.17 for insurance and \$9.00 for health screening. Total is \$671.31 in holdbacks. The school did not feel that a negotiated settlement of expenses was necessary but could participate if they wanted.
Frontier Academy – Greeley	Own buildings. One they built and the other two are renovated retail and business offices.
Frontier Charter Academy – Calhan	Their district is “great to work with.” Although they included a table of expenses, it was only for last year. However, the table illustrates that the district is taking a five percent chunk without any itemization. In year 00-01 the Oct. 1 count exceeded the enrollment cap by twelve students.
Guffey Community Charter School	Not much info here. 100 percent of the pupils began at this school.



James Irwin Charter High School	Would like to purchase SpEd independently and will be negotiating this. They'll spend the money they usually pay the district. Purchase consulting from the district "so they don't charge us back for getting information."
KIPP Sunshine Peak Academy	Started KSPA in 02/03. Lease the basement of an apartment complex. SpEd is \$351 per child. Would like to have more say in the services "given" to the school. More voice in what the school actually needs so they can control their budget.
Knowledge Quest Academy	02/03 was the first year of operation. They operate in a building built by the district to hold district offices. They share the building. Lease increases at four percent each year. BOCES and Business Services locked by charter app. until 2004.
Lake George Charter School	They would like to be informed of current services provided and the cost of these services. They would like to be informed of any changes to these services and would like to see the charter school administrator act as the Liaison.
Leadership Prep. Academy	Enclosed spreadsheet is a good tool. 02/03 was the first year of operation.
Liberty Common School	Don't have much info readily available. District provides accounting at 1.6 percent of PPOR. Enrollment is said to follow a positive trend since the school's inception.
Lincoln Academy	Extensive enclosure with some detail. Hard to determine what exactly is PPR. What is included in the "transfers" portion? Maybe get the districts' PPR from the dept. of ed. Would purchase SpEd from outside the district if given the opportunity.
Littleton Academy	Solid spreadsheets that show figures and central administrative overhead costs. Happy with the current level of service and satisfied with the district. New Principal who has not made the negotiation process a priority.
Marble Charter School	This is the only school in Marble. The nearest school is 30 miles away and the nearest "district school is a three and one-half hour commute one way". [This could be exaggeration] They have a mutual agreement with district and pay \$10,000 a year for their services plus \$250.00 per pupil for SpEd.
Montessori Peaks Academy	Colorful narrative and commentary. Keep this survey for reference.
North Routt Community Challenge	Dropped
Odyssey School	The school is satisfied with the district. While they pay nothing in rent, they do pay \$131,808 per year in utilities and other costs. The Oct.1 count exceeds the enrollment cap by two pupils in 01-02.

Paradox Valley Charter School	They get services at no charge except the mechanical services for \$25 per hour. The district is small with decreasing enrollment. They are “quite good to us and only charge five percent which includes SpEd, insurance, audit, and other services.” The district staff is small and the additional work would be a burden. They might find that they are undercharging the school. She spends two to three hours a week with the liaison staff.
Passage Charter School	Get 100 percent of PPR and told me to look the info up myself. Happy with the relationship
Pinnacle	District takes five percent and doesn’t offer a breakdown for the school, only all charters. They say that they had a charter school liaison for a couple of years but don’t seem to have one now. No amounts change for services, “strictly five percent.” “All [services required by the district], plus some unused. We even pay for the legal counsel that opposes us.” They, “plan to totally separate from the district.”
Pioneer School for Expeditionary Learning	It seems as though the district takes five percent right off the top. Get the itemizations but don’t think they are very clear. They assume that they have to “continue to be supervised by the district for services unless they go with BOCES. Would like to see a “district Liaison appointed, a list of available services provided, and the opportunity for all charters to meet with the district to discuss.”
Pioneer Charter School (DPS)	While the school doesn’t receive an itemization, it claims to have full access to the info. Further, Pioneer thinks that the system is working well and sees no reason to change it. 95 percent of its pupils come from home schools. Is this a “home school charter?” The enclosure is basic. Gives PPOR and additional revenue.
Platte River Academy	They include a good Douglas County list of services. Mention that they would like to be more involved with the job description of the charter school liaison, and would purchase a variety of services outside the district if given the chance. They don’t have info on origin of the students nor do they keep info on wait-lists. They would like more info to the schools and more involvement from the schools.
Prairie Creek Charter School	This is a difficult arrangement because the school draws from several (four) school districts. Therefore, the financial portion of the study is tough to accumulate even though there is a great spreadsheet.

PS 1 Charter School	They enjoy a good relation with the district and they have “come a long way since [they] opened for the good of all involved.” They have a say in who performs SpEd. They do have the opportunity to make changes if there are problems but don’t have a say in the costs. Meets with the Charter School Liaison about two hours each month and many phone calls. Expressed a great appreciation for the Charter School Liaison.
Pueblo School for the Arts and Sciences	Principal indicates that any lack of knowledge is a function of her one year at the school. This is again a continuity/capacity issue. Principal mentions that custodial services are per pupil and the services don’t change with enrollment...only the cost. This survey has great comments with good enclosures.
Ridge View Academy	First year was 01-02. All students at RVA originate from division of youth corrections educational programs. DPS is available and willing to work through issues.
Ridgeview Classical Academy	Operate with a triple net lease. Property purchased by an investor for the school. As far as services go, they don’t purchase any from the district and they pay the appropriate cost of the professional’s salary. “Might” be nice to have the option to buy from the district.
Rocky Mountain Academy of Evergreen	Noted in the detail of costs that certain services are “part of the five percent.” Leads one to wonder if the district is simply taking five percent off the top. Would like more detail on how much money is spent on each service and what is included in each service.
Southwest Open School	Operate out of modulars disposed of by the district and one house and one modular paid for by the SWOS. Noted that it is currently unclear what other services are available to the school and/or how much they cost. They would like more autonomy from and a better relationship with the district. They would like to receive Title I moneys.
Swallows Charter Academy	The person is new and doesn’t have info. Gets 95 percent from the district as per an agreement. Seems to have a good relationship with the district, but the person is new and was generally unable to give numbers.
The Classical Academy	When The Classical Academy first began, most of the services were unsatisfactory. As a result, they took them in house and what now remains, is OK. If the situation changes they explore other options.
The Connect School	“Prior to Audit, we received 95 percent. I was not informed of any adjustment made post-audit.” They are not informed of any budget adjustments when expenses are less than five percent. They would like to have more details and I assume that this means about the services provided by the district.

Tutmose Academy	Have been unable to review old records because they have recently moved. Owned their building but decided that leasing was the best way to go. Important here is that they receive no administrative services from the district but still receive only 95 percent of PPR. This is OK with them as they receive all of their SpEd for this cost and it seems to be a deal.
Twin Peaks Charter School	Would be helpful to have a breakdown of services provided under the five percent. SVVSD must just take the five percent. Otherwise the school has a good relation with the district.
Union Colony Preparatory School	Charged cover letter and commentary from the person at the district who provided some info for the survey. "Are we cheating the charters?" The enclosure includes PPR and expenses and shows that the district actually loses money due to the charter. However, the "expenses" included in the form are vague at best and do not specify at all how much money is being spent on overhead administrative costs.
University Schools	They operate in a new building as of 8/02. They have a working agreement with the district on the itemization point and appear to have decent relations with them. The enclosure is a good one. Administrative services are a straight five percent off the top with no detail as to how they are used.
Ute Creek Charter School	The process appears to be effective. Difficult to determine how much money is coming out in administrative fees.
Windsor Charter Academy	Enclosure attached. They are not completely happy with the itemization the charter receives. "What we consider itemized...and what they consider are two different things." The principal sees herself as the charter school liaison and spends at least one hour per week with the district and attends all the leadership and principal meetings. No list of services rendered. SpEd!
Woodrow Wilson Academy	Great Jefferson County spreadsheets. Lease to purchase.
Wyatt Edison Charter School	Responses indicate that the school received 95 percent funding for 98-99 and 99-00 and 97.04204 percent and 97.07467 percent for 00-01 & 01-02, respectively. They operate in a previously abandoned DPS building now owned by a local businessman. Important is that they don't keep enrollment and pupil origin records for more than one year. The settlement is negotiated at midyear and they would like to start the year with the negotiation complete.
Youth and Family Academy	Pueblo district and a similar enclosure to the PSAS. Would like to be more involved in the negotiating process

## Appendix D

Re: District Discussion questions pertaining to H.B. 99-1113 study.

Please contact Denise Mund ([Mund\\_D@cde.state.co.us](mailto:Mund_D@cde.state.co.us)), 303.866.6740, at the Colorado Department of Education with questions about the authorization of this study.

1. Basic introduction questions: Name, position, and tenure of the discussant.
2. How do you characterize the general relationship between the charter school(s) and the district? (Personal and/or professional relations)
3. If you could charge additional fees to charter schools under 2300 series, what would they be? Specifically, what does the district do for charter schools they do not pay for either under negotiated buy-back services, or central administrative overhead costs?
4. Has your district had any specific increases in employment and/or office space that are a direct result of charter school administration? Please specify.
5. What issues (if any) is the school district *currently* facing with regard to charter schools? What are the challenges that the district faces *in general* with regard to charter schools?
6. What is your opinion of an alternative chartering authority?
7. In your opinion, what could the charter school(s) do, that they don't do now, that might help improve
  - a) District/charter relations. (if poor)
  - b) Operational efficiency. (if poor)
8. Do you discuss with charter schools (either individually or as a group) the quality, efficiency, cost, and management of district-provided administrative services?

9. How do you bill the charter school for 2300 and contracted/buy back services? (For example, does the district withhold money and then reimburse/charge the difference to the charter school?)
10. Why, in your opinion, are services such as payroll and custodial charged on a per pupil basis?
11. General comments?

*Re: Charter School Discussion questions pertaining to H.B. 99-1113 study.*

Please contact Denise Mund ([Mund\\_D@cde.state.co.us](mailto:Mund_D@cde.state.co.us)), 303.866.6740, at the Colorado Department of Education with questions about the authorization of this study.

12. Basic introduction questions: Name, position, and tenure of the discussant.
13. How do you characterize the general relationship between the charter school and the district? (Personal and/or professional relations)
14. What would you say is the primary point of contention between the district and the charter school (if any)?
15. In your opinion, what could the charter school do, that it does not do now, that might help improve:
  - a) District/charter relations
  - b) Operational efficiency.
16. Does your school have a specific business manager? Does this person have other duties? What type of training does he or she receive in order to do their job well?
17. What auditor do you use and how was the firm selected? Was the audit performed separately or as part of the school district audit?
18. What is your opinion of an alternative chartering authority?
19. What type of oversight does the school's governing board provide?
20. Is the current formula a good formula?
21. General comments