Evaluation of New Texas Charter Schools (2007–10)

Final Report
Executive Summary
July 2011

TCER
Texas Center for Educational Research

EVALUATION OF NEW TEXAS CHARTER SCHOOLS

FINAL REPORT
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

July 2011

Prepared for
Texas Education Agency

Prepared by
Texas Center for Educational Research

Credits

Texas Center for Educational Research

The Texas Center for Educational Research (TCER) conducts and communicates nonpartisan research on education issues to serve as an independent resource for those who make, influence, or implement education policy in Texas. A 15-member board of trustees governs the research center, including appointments from the Texas Association of School Boards, Texas Association of School Administrators, and State Board of Education.

For additional information about TCER research, please contact:

Catherine Maloney, Director
Texas Center for Educational Research
12007 Research Blvd.
P.O. Box 679002
Austin, Texas 78767-9002
Phone: 512-467-3632 or 800-580-8237
Fax: 512-467-3658

Reports are available on the TEA's website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=2147485609&menu_id=949 as well as TCER's website at www.tcer.org

Contributing Authors

Texas Center for Educational Research
Catherine Maloney, Ph.D.
Daniel Sheehan, Ed.D.
Katharine Rainey, M.P.P.

Moak, Casey & Associates, LLP
Border Research Solutions
VRDC Consulting LLC

Prepared for

Texas Education Agency
1701 N. Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494
Phone: 512-463-9734

Research Funded by

Texas Education Agency

ACRONYMS

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AEA	Alternative Education Accountability
AEC	Alternative Education Campus
AEIS	Academic Excellence Indicator System
AP	Advanced Placement
AskTED	Texas Education Directory
ATT	Average Treatment Effect
ATTK	Average Treatment Effect – Kernel Matching
ATTND	Average Treatment Effect – Nearest Neighbor Random Draw
ATTNW	Average Treatment Effect – Nearest Neighbor with Replacement
ATTS	Average Treatment Effect – Stratification Matching
BRS	Border Research Solutions
BSU[a]	Bluebonnet State University
CCS[a]	Columbus Charter School
CLT	Campus Leadership Team
CMO	Charter Management Organization
CREDO	Center for Research on Education Outcomes
CSP	Charter School Program
CTC[a]	Cedar Treatment Center
ECHS	Early College High School
ELA	English/Language Arts
ELL	English Language Learner
ESC	Education Service Center
ESL	English as a Second Language
FASRG	Financial Accountability System Resource Guide
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
GAO	Government Accountability Office
HGLM	Hierarchical Generalized Linear Modeling
HISD	Houston Independent School District
HLM	Hierarchical Linear Modeling
HSS[a]	Horizon School System
HVLG[a]	Hidden Valley Learning Group
IB	International Baccalaureate
ITBS	Iowa Test of Basic Skills
K	Kindergarten
LEP	Limited English Proficient
MYFS[a]	Mesa Youth and Family Services
NCLB	No Child Left Behind
PDAS	Professional Development and Appraisal System
PEIMS	Public Education Information Management System
PEP	Personal Education Plan
PK	Pre-Kindergarten
PSM	Propensity Score Matching
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
SBOE	State Board of Education
SE	Standard Error
SEA	Standard Education Accountability

[a]Acronym represents a pseudonym. All case study charter schools and their related entities are referenced using pseudonyms throughout the report.

SEC	Standard Education Campus
SPCHS[a]	Self-Paced Charter High School
TAKS	Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills
TAKS-Alt	Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills-Alternate
TCER	Texas Center for Educational Research
TEA	Texas Education Agency
TEC	Texas Education Code
TEKS	Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills
TPRI	Texas Primary Reading Inventory
UIL	University Interscholastic League
UPS	United Parcel Service
USDE	U.S. Department of Education
VCR	Virtual Control Record

[a]Acronym represents a pseudonym. All case study charter schools and their related entities are referenced using pseudonyms throughout the report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 1994, the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) has provided funding to new charter schools through Charter School Program (CSP) grants designed to provide support for the planning and implementation of effective new charter programs. CSP funding is available for a period of 3 years, of which no more than 18 months may be used for charter school planning and program design and up to 2 years may be used to implement the educational program. Grants are awarded to state education agencies, which then provide funding to approved charter schools through a system of subgrants. As a condition of CSP funding, state education agencies are required to evaluate new charter schools using objective criteria and quantitative and qualitative data (Federal Register, 2007).

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) was awarded CSP funding in 2007, and specified that the required evaluation would focus on the experiences and outcomes of new charter schools authorized to begin serving students across 4 school years: 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10. TEA categorizes charter schools in terms of "generations" that roughly align with the years in which schools are first authorized to serve students as charter schools, which frames the evaluation in terms of Generation 11 (2006-07), Generation 12 (2007-08), Generation 13 (2008-09), and Generation 14 (2009-10) charter schools. The evaluation examines how new charter school operators plan and implement their programs and considers the following research questions:

1. How are federal CSP funds used to implement new charter school programs?
2. What processes and practices guide the planning of new charter schools?
3. What processes and practices guide the implementation of new charter school programs?
4. How effective are new charter schools at designing and implementing successful educational programs?
5. What is the effect of charter school maturity on students' academic outcomes?
6. How do students at new charter schools perform academically relative to comparable students at traditional district schools?

The evaluation has produced two interim reports (June 2009 and February 2011) as well as this final report. Results from the interim reports indicated that charter schools used the largest proportion of CSP funding to support instruction, but that new charter schools' start-up experiences differed, depending on the level of support they received from founding entities. In particular, new charter schools that operated as part of a traditional district (i.e., campus charters) tended to have an easier time getting started because most districts provided support for campus charter school management and facilities, as well as the recruitment of staff and students. In contrast, many charter schools that operated outside of traditional district structures (i.e., open-enrollment charters) struggled to locate and furnish adequate facilities, and to recruit and retain qualified staff.

Overall, results from the interim reports suggested that parents and students were satisfied with new charter schools. Interim survey results indicated that most parents and students chose new charter schools because they were small schools that offered specialized educational programs (e.g., dual language program) that were not available in other schools. Surveyed students indicated they liked attending small schools in which their teachers cared about them as individuals and their classmates had similar academic goals. Results presented in the second interim report in response to Research Question 5 indicated that charter schools' outcomes did not change as schools matured. That is, new charter schools performed no better or no worse than charter schools that had been in operation longer.

The final report builds on interim findings and presents results for Research Question 1 and Research Questions 3 through 6 drawn from data collected from Generation 11, 12, 13, and 14 charter schools. Complete results for Research Question 2 were included in the evaluation's second interim report (February 2011) and are summarized here.[1] Analyses included in this report are based on TEA's Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS), and Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) data. The report also includes the results of surveys of principals, teachers, and students in Generation 11, 12, 13, and 14 charter schools, and the parents of students attending such schools, as well as information collected during site visits to a set of seven Generation 13 charter schools. Throughout the report chapters, results are disaggregated by charter school generation and charter school type where appropriate.[2]

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW TEXAS CHARTER SCHOOLS

The sections that follow provide information about the characteristics of new Texas charter schools (i.e., Generations 11 through 14) and present comparisons to more established charter schools in Generations 1 through 10 and statewide averages where appropriate. Data about student enrollment are drawn from AEIS for the 2009-10 school year, and information about staffing in new charter schools is from 2008-09, which was the most current data available at the time of the report's writing.

Relative to charter schools authorized in Generations 1 through 10, Texas' new charter schools included proportionately more campus charters (42% vs. 9%) and proportionately fewer open-enrollment charters (56% vs. 87%).[3] Comparisons of new open-enrollment and campus charter school enrollments find that new campus charters tended to enroll larger proportions of low-income (84% vs. 54%), Hispanic (81% vs. 48%), limited English proficient (LEP) (16% vs. 8%) students, while new open-enrollment charters tended to enroll larger proportions of White (25% vs. 5%), African American (15% vs. 12%), and Asian students (11% vs. 1%).

Differences in the characteristics of new open-enrollment charter schools and their more established counterparts in Generations 1 through 10 reflected differences in authorization trends across years. Soon after Texas implemented its charter school legislation in 1995, policy makers introduced provisions that encouraged the growth of open-enrollment charters enrolling large proportions of students at risk of failure or dropping out, and the state granted many charters to alternative educational programs designed to meet the needs of at-risk high school students. Legislators eliminated the provisions favoring the authorization of alternative programs in 2001, and the effects of this change were evident in the types of charter schools authorized in subsequent years, as well as the characteristics of the students who attend them.

[1]The final report contains a summary of the second interim report's findings with respect to Research Question 2 in chapter 9. For a full discussion of results for Research Question 2, please see chapter 4 of the second interim report, which may be found on TEA's website at: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2147485609&menu_id=949

[2]Three types, or classes, of charter schools currently operate in Texas: open-enrollment, campus, and university charter schools. Open-enrollment charter schools are authorized by the State Board of Education (SBOE) and may be operated by independent nonprofit entities or governmental entities. Campus charter schools are authorized by traditional districts and may be converted district programs or programs operated under contract with an external provider of educational services. University charters are authorized by the SBOE and are operated by universities. Because only one university charter is included in Generations 11 through 14, survey and quantitative data for this school are combined with those of open-enrollment charters so that the school's results are not identifiable.

[3]University charters comprised 2% of new charter schools and 4% of more established charter schools. University charter schools are considered open-enrollment charter schools.

Relative to more established charter schools, proportionately fewer new open-enrollment charter schools were characterized as alternative education campuses (AECs) designed to serve students at risk of academic failure (11% vs. 43%). AECs typically target their programs to at-risk high school students, who are more likely to be from low-income and minority backgrounds (see TCER, 2008), and this pattern was also reflected in the enrollment characteristics of new and more established open-enrollment charter schools. Relative to more established charter schools, new open-enrollment charters enrolled smaller proportions of students in Grades 9 through 12 (17% vs. 29%), and smaller proportions of African American (15% vs. 25%), Hispanic (48% vs. 52%), economically disadvantaged (54% vs. 72%), and LEP students (8% vs. 17%). In contrast, new open-enrollment charter schools enrolled larger proportions of White (25% vs. 18%) and gifted and talented students (7% vs. 1%) than their more established peers.

Shifts in the characteristics of campus charter schools also reflected the influence of legislation addressing the need to serve at-risk student populations. In 2005, Texas introduced legislation providing for Early College High School (ECHS) programs[4] targeted to students "at risk of dropping out of school or who wish to accelerate completion of the high school program" (Texas Education Code [TEC] § 29.908[a]), and about 29% of the new campus charter schools operating in 2009-10 were ECHS programs.[5]

Compared to more established campus charter schools, new campus charters were more likely to be high schools (46% vs. 27%) and enrolled larger proportions of students in Grades 9 through 12 (24% vs. 18%). Of the 13 new charter school programs serving students in Grades 9 through 12 during the 2009-10 school year, 62% (eight campuses) were ECHS programs.

New campus charter schools served larger proportions of low-income (84% vs. 76%) and Hispanic (81% vs. 58%) students than more established campus charters in Generations 1 through 10. In contrast, new campus charter schools enrolled smaller proportions of White (5% vs. 12%), African American (12% vs. 26%), gifted and talented (9% vs. 11%) and LEP (16% vs. 23%) students than more established campus charter schools.

New open-enrollment charter schools tended to have less experienced teachers and higher teacher turnover rates than either new campus charters or traditional district schools statewide. Teachers working in new open-enrollment charter schools during the 2008-09 school year had about 4 years of average experience compared with 8 years of average experience for teachers in new campus charter schools, and 7 years of average experience for teachers in traditional district schools statewide. A third of new open-enrollment charter school teachers were beginning teachers (i.e., no years of experience). In contrast, beginning teachers made up about 7% of teachers in both new campus charters and traditional district schools statewide. Teachers working in new open-enrollment charter schools were also more likely to leave their jobs than teachers in campus charters and traditional district schools, and teacher turnover rates were higher in more established open-enrollment charter schools. The teacher turnover rate in new open-enrollment charter schools averaged about 38%, while the teacher turnover rate was 41% in more established open-enrollment charter schools (i.e., charters operating for 4 or more years). The teacher turnover rate was about 14% in new and more established campus charters and about 15% for traditional district schools statewide.

[4]ECHSs combine high school and college curricula and allow students to attend college classes and earn college credit while completing high school. ECHS programs are targeted to students who are typically underrepresented in higher education (e.g., low-income and minority students), low-performing students, and first generation college goers.

[5]Note none of the ECHS campus charter schools was registered as an AEC in 2009-10.

USE OF CSP FUNDING BY NEW CHARTER SCHOOLS

The evaluation examines trends in open-enrollment and campus charter schools' use of CSP funding across 9 school years (2000-01 through 2008-09[6]). The sections that follow summarize key findings.

Open-enrollment charter schools spent a total of almost $53 million in CSP funding from 2000-01 through 2008-09. Campus charter schools spent a total of more than $20 million in CSP funding across the same period. Average expenditure for open-enrollment charter schools per year ranged from a low of $47,746 in 2000-01 to a high of $188,025 in 2001-02. In 2008-09, the average expenditure of open-enrollment charter schools was $102,826. In contrast, over the 9-year period considered by the evaluation, the average campus charter school CSP spending was at its lowest in 2008-09 ($63,618) and at its highest in 2003-04 ($244,913).

Across years (2000-01 through 2008-09), both campus and open-enrollment charter schools tended to spend the largest share of CSP revenue on areas related to instruction. However, campus charters were able to spend a larger proportion of their CSP funding on instruction in large part because parent districts provide for many operational needs, such as facilities maintenance. Relative to campus charters, open-enrollment charters spent proportionately more CSP resources for facilities maintenance and operations, which reduced the funding available for instruction.

In 2008-09, campus charter schools' use of CSP revenue continued to reflect an increase in average funding to accelerated education programs[7] for students at risk of academic failure over previous years (from 24% in 2000-01 through 2007-08 to 48% in 2008-09). This shift likely reflects an increase in the number of programs focused on dropout recovery and at-risk students in new campus charters.

Comparisons of new charter schools' use of funding for the planning and implementation periods of CSP grants indicate that proportionately more planning funds were spent on payroll costs while proportionately more implementation funds were spent on supplies and materials and capital outlay. Open-enrollment charters used proportionately more implementation funding for professional and contracted services than did campus charters, which may reflect open-enrollment charter schools' need to contract for some services (e.g., facilities maintenance) that campus charter schools receive from their parent districts.

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW CHARTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Findings that address how new charter schools implement their programs are drawn from spring 2010 surveys of new charter school principals, teachers, and students, as well as a survey of parents of students who attended new charter schools during the 2009-10 school year. Results also include information gathered from site visits to seven Generation 13 charter schools across their first 2 years of operation (2008-09 and 2009-10). Researchers visited these charter schools three times during their first year in operation (i.e., in summer 2008, fall 2008, and spring 2009), and again at the conclusion of their second year serving students (spring 2010). Site visits included interviews with school administrators; focus group discussions with board members, teachers, and students; as well as observations in core content area classrooms.

[6]The most current data available at the time of the report's writing.

[7]Accelerated programs enable students at risk of failure or dropping out to accrue credits rapidly and recover credit for missing coursework.

Planning New Schools

The founders of Generation 13 charter schools who participated in site visits experienced a range of challenges in starting their schools. All founders of open-enrollment and university charter schools who participated in site visits experienced challenges completing TEA's application process. Founders reported difficulties obtaining the necessary information about application requirements and timelines. Some founders did not have experience working in education, and their lack of expertise created additional challenges as schools began operations. The founders' lack of experience with legal, regulatory, and reporting requirements for public schools in Texas produced confusion and tension, which may have resulted in turnover in several schools' leadership in the early months of operation.

All site visit charters involved community members in their charter school planning processes, but community involvement in some schools diminished across schools' first year of operation. New charter schools that included community members on governing boards and actively promoted opportunities for community involvement in fundraising or volunteering experienced stronger community support than schools that provided fewer opportunities for community engagement.

Facilities

Across evaluation years, most new open-enrollment charter school operators leased their facilities, while most new campus charters were located in district-provided facilities. Open-enrollment charters also tended to be located in a wider range of facilities types than their campus charter counterparts. For example, principals responding to the spring 2010 survey indicated that their open-enrollment charter schools were located in custom built facilities (20%), warehouses (16%) college or university buildings (12%), or church space (12%), while most campus charter school principals indicated that their schools were located in former traditional district facilities (56%).

Both new open-enrollment and new campus charter schools confronted facilities challenges caused by lack of sufficient space. For many open-enrollment charters, space issues were related to plans for schools to expand to serve additional grade levels as students progressed and facilities that did not accommodate growth. For campus charters, space issues arose when schools became more crowded because of increased enrollment in existing grades.

Recruiting Staff and Students

Low teacher salaries, particularly in open-enrollment charter schools, limited new charter schools' ability to recruit qualified and experienced staff. Although few surveyed teachers reported dissatisfaction with their salaries, principals of open-enrollment charters noted that low salaries were a primary barrier to recruiting effective staff.

Teachers chose to work in new charter schools because they were attracted to charters' missions and educational goals, felt schools had high academic standards, and wanted to work with like-minded educators. Surveyed teachers in both campus and open-enrollment charters reported similar reasons for working in charter schools. Teachers also appreciated working in small school environments that offered greater autonomy than traditional district schools.

Lack of extracurricular activities created challenges for some new charter schools in attracting students. Principals at both open-enrollment and campus charters reported that it was difficult to compete with traditional district schools that offered a broader range of extracurricular activities that appealed to students (e.g., sports programs, band). Principals in both types of charter schools reported that most students learned about their programs through word of mouth.

Parents and students chose new charter schools because they preferred small schools in which students felt safe and recognized. Most students attended traditional district schools prior to attending a new charter school, but few surveyed parents expressed dissatisfaction with their children's previous schools. Instead, parents reported choosing new charter schools because they were small schools that offered special programs that were not available in their previous schools (e.g., dual language). Across both open-enrollment and campus charter schools, parents and students reported feeling more comfortable in smaller school environments in which students felt safe and nurtured.

The most notable differences between the experiences reported by teachers and students in new open-enrollment and campus charters result from the degree to which school enrollment is based on choice. As entirely new schools, open-enrollment charters serve as an alternative to traditional district schools, and parents and students must choose to enroll in new open-enrollment charter programs. In contrast, many campus charters are traditional district schools that have converted to charter status, and by law, must continue to give preference in enrollment to neighborhood students. According to teachers and students who participated in evaluation surveys, many students attending campus charters were not there because they or their parents selected the schools for their educational programs—they enrolled in the schools because they were nearby or because they attended the schools prior to their conversion.

Implementing New Charter School Instructional Programs

Most of the new open-enrollment and campus charter schools that participated in surveys across evaluation years offered college preparatory programs, particularly at the high school level. At the elementary and middle school levels, new charter schools also offered programs for gifted and talented students or programs targeted to particular academic interests (e.g., science and technology, liberal arts). Eight campus charter high schools included in Generations 11 and 12 were ECHS programs in which students may receive up to 60 hours of college credit while completing the requirements for high school graduation. The campus charter ECHS programs were located in college or university facilities, where charter students attended courses taught by college or university faculty.

Across both types of new charter schools, surveyed parents reported lower levels of involvement in many school activities than at their children's previous schools. This finding suggests that new charter school operators were not able to prioritize parent engagement as schools began. Parents of students attending new open-enrollment charters had higher levels of involvement in school activities relative to campus charter parents. This finding may indicate greater buy-in on the part of parents who have actively chosen an open-enrollment charter school in comparison to parents who may have enrolled their children in a campus charter school simply because it is their neighborhood school.

Surveyed students attending some new open-enrollment charter schools experienced educational benefits in terms of peer groups with similar educational interests. Unlike students attending conversion campus charters which continue to serve as the district-assigned schools for neighborhood students, all students attending open-enrollment charters and ECHS campus charters have enrolled in the schools because either they or their parents actively chose the schools. Note that in choosing schools, parents and students also selected student peer groups who had similar educational goals. In surveys and site visit interviews conducted across evaluation years, students attending such schools commented that it was easier to learn in school environments with peers who were like themselves. Students reported that they felt more confident and supported when their classmates were focused on learning. In contrast, some students attending some conversion campus charter schools experienced difficulty focusing on instruction because of disruptive classmates and students involved with gangs and drugs.

NEW OPEN-ENROLLMENT CHARTER SCHOOLS' EFFECTS ON ACADEMIC OUTCOMES[8]

The evaluation considers the effect of new open-enrollment charter schools on students' academic outcomes and whether charter schools' effects on student outcomes improve as schools mature. Analyses measure the effects of new charter schools on four indicators of academic achievement: (1) 2009 reading/English language arts (ELA) TAKS scores, (2) 2009 mathematics TAKS scores, (3) 2008-09 attendance rates, and (4) the likelihood of being retained at grade level during the 2008-09 school year. Analyses are limited to students attending open-enrollment charters because of statistical limitations created by the processes by which campus charters are founded and by policies governing campus charter enrollments.[9]

New open-enrollment charter school students in Grades 4 through 8 experienced reduced 2009 TAKS mathematics outcomes relative to similar (or matched) students who remained in traditional district schools, and new open-enrollment charter school students in Grade 4 also had reduced 2009 TAKS reading/ELA outcomes. Grade 5 students attending open-enrollment charters also were more likely to be retained than their counterparts in traditional district schools. Although the source of the negative effect of new open-enrollment charter schools on mathematics outcomes is unclear, poor performance on the TAKS mathematics test is likely the source of increased grade level retention for Grade 5 charter school students, as Texas requires that students in Grade 5 pass both the TAKS reading and mathematics exams in order to be promoted to Grade 6.

In contrast, new open-enrollment charter school students in Grades 9 and 10 experienced improved mathematics outcomes relative to matched students who remained in traditional district schools. In addition, Grade 9 and 10 charter students also had better attendance, a behavior associated with improved testing outcomes, than matched traditional district students. Other researchers have identified similar outcomes for charter students in Grade 9 (e.g., Zimmer, Gill, Booker, Lavertu, Sass, & Witte, 2009). Although more research is needed to identify the source of the effect, Zimmer et al. suggest that charter school grade configurations (e.g., Grades 6 through 12) that eliminate the often difficult transition from middle school to high school may contribute to improved academic outcomes for charter school students in Grade 9.

The number of years an open-enrollment charter school has been in operation was not related to student academic outcomes. School maturity, or years of operation, was not related to open-enrollment charter school students' 2009 reading/ELA or mathematics TAKS scores, 2008-09 attendance rates, or to the likelihood of being retained at grade level during the 2008-09 school year. These findings suggest that open-enrollment charter schools' effects on student outcomes do not change as schools gain more experience.

---

[8]Readers are cautioned that the students included in the analyses of new open-enrollment charter schools' effects on academic outcomes may not be representative of all students attending new open-enrollment charter schools. More information on the students included in analyses and the generalizability of findings is included in Appendix B and Appendix C.

[9]As discussed in chapters 7 and 8, campus charter students are excluded from statistical analyses of academic outcomes because the models used to estimate results require that charter schools have (1) a discrete starting date and (2) that students change schools when they enroll in a charter school. Conversion campus charters do not meet these requirements because (1) they existed as a traditional district school prior to converting to charter status and do not have a discrete starting date in the way that open-enrollment charter do; and (2) many students enrolled in conversion campus charters have not changed schools. Texas requires that campus charters provide priority in enrollment to students in schools' established attendance zones, and many such students attended the school when it was traditional district school as well as when it converted to a campus charter school. For these students, no change enrollment has taken place.

DISCUSSION

The comments of survey respondents and participants in site visit interviews and focus groups indicated that new charter schools offer smaller learning environments that enable students to get to know their classmates and teachers, and that the increased familiarity in small school settings facilitates student learning. Students in many new charter schools also commented that the selection of peers with common educational goals and interests into smaller charter schools reduced the discipline problems that disrupted their learning in traditional district classrooms.

Despite site visit and survey respondents' perceptions that new charters schools, as small schools, provide improved learning environments, this evaluation provides little evidence that new open-enrollment charter schools are improving students' academic outcomes. Analyses comparing open-enrollment charter students' academic outcomes to those of similar students who remained in the traditional district schools indicate that open-enrollment charter schools had negative and statistically significant effect on students' mathematics outcomes in Grades 4 through 8. In addition, analyses comparing the performance of new open-enrollment charter schools with their more established peers find that charter school student outcomes do not improve as schools gain more experience.

Although further study is needed to identify the reasons for these outcomes, findings from this evaluation suggest that poor academic outcomes may be attributable to the characteristics of teachers who work in open-enrollment charters. Increasingly, research is noting the importance of teacher quality to student achievement, and many studies have identified teacher experience as a key factor in improving student outcomes (Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2006, 2007; Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 2004). As discussed earlier in this summary, about a third of new open-enrollment charter school teachers were in their first year of teaching in 2008-09 compared with less than 10% of teachers working in campus charters or in traditional district schools statewide. Overall levels of teacher experience (i.e., average years of experience) in open-enrollment charters tended to be about half of that of campus charters and traditional district schools statewide. In addition, new open-enrollment charter schools tended to have high rates of teacher turnover (38% vs. 15% for the statewide average), which creates challenges for schools in creating coherent educational programs. The rate of teacher turnover tended to increase in more established charters (41%), which may help to explain why academic outcomes do not improve as schools gain more experience. Correspondingly, current research on charter schools nationally has highlighted high rates of teacher attrition as "one of the greatest obstacles that will need to be overcome if the charter school reform is to deliver as promised" (Miron & Applegate, 2007, p.27).

Texas Center for Educational Research
P.O. Box 679002
Austin, Texas 78767-9002
800.580.TCER (8237)
512.467.3632 • Fax: 512.467.3658
tcer.org

TCER
Texas Center for Educational Research