Texas Charter School System
Overview
A charter school is a type of public school:

- The Texas Legislature authorized the establishment of charter schools in 1995. Some of the first charters have been in operation since Fall 1996.
- The state monitors and accredits charter schools just as the state monitor and accredits school districts.
- Reduced regulations for charter schools encourage innovation and allow more flexibility.
- State law requires fiscal and academic accountability for charter schools.
There are four types of charters in Texas:

- **Subchapter B: Home-rule School District Charters** - There are no home-rule school district charters in Texas.

- **Subchapter C: Campus or Campus Program Charters** - Independent school districts authorize and oversee these charters.

- **Subchapter D: Open-enrollment Charters** - Most charters in Texas fall under this category. The commissioner authorizes these charters. Before SB 2 passed in 2013, the State Board of Education (SBOE) was the authorizer.

- **Subchapter E: University or Junior College Charters** - The commissioner authorizes Subchapter E charters. Eligible entities include public colleges and universities.
## Admissions Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency</th>
<th>Traditional ISD</th>
<th>Charter District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Must</strong> live within the boundary of the school district.</td>
<td><strong>Must</strong> live within the boundaries established under the charter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>May</strong> exclude based on criminal offense or disciplinary problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>May</strong> exclude based on artistic ability if operating a performing arts charter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Transfer                   | **May** choose to accept transfer student from outside the school district boundary. | **May not** accept students from outside the service boundary established under the charter. |

| Expulsion                  | **May** only expel students for conduct requiring or permitting expulsion under TEC Chapter §37 | **May** expel students for reasons authorized TEC Chapter §37.007 or specified in its code of conduct that may result in expulsion |
## Enrollment Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Traditional ISD</strong></th>
<th><strong>Charter District</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>▪ Any student may enroll</td>
<td>▪ Any student may enroll <strong>at any campus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ If applications exceed available slots, a lottery is used</td>
<td>▪ If applications exceed available slots, a lottery is used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selective (Magnet) Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>Students <strong>must</strong> audition or test in</td>
<td>▪ <strong>Not</strong> authorized at the charter campus level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ <strong>Only</strong> authorized at the open-enrollment charter school level if operate a performing arts charter school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoned Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>Students enroll in campus based on home address</td>
<td>Open-enrollment charter schools <strong>can</strong> establish zoned enrollment at the campus level. This is usually done with zip codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blended Socio-economic Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>Similar to open enrollment, except enrollment weights are established for students from different income groups to create a more integrated school</td>
<td>▪ <strong>Not</strong> authorized if open-enrollment charter school seeks federal start-up funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Texas Charter School System
Portfolio Demographics
Charters employ more than 15,000 teachers
Student Enrollment Comparisons

Ethnic Distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Charters</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afr Amer</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisp</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Charters
- Traditional
Charter Student Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sprout</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Waitlist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Enrollment</td>
<td>269,127</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Inability to collect capacity or waitlist information due to differences in municipality reporting and lack of mandate.
Texas Charter School System
Portfolio Numbers
Charter School Cap

![Graph showing the number of active charters and available charters from 2013 to 2018.]

- **Active Charters**
  - 2013: 209
  - 2014: 200
  - 2015: 186
  - 2016: 182
  - 2017: 181
  - 2018: 175

- **Available Charters**
  - 2013: 6
  - 2014: 25
  - 2015: 54
  - 2016: 73
  - 2017: 89
  - 2018: 110

- **Cap**
  - 2013: 215
  - 2014: 225
  - 2015: 240
  - 2016: 255
  - 2017: 270
  - 2018: 285
Charter Awards and Closures
State-Authorized Charter Schools

Charters by Enrollment Size

- **67%** (N=118) Large operator (5,000+)
- **26%** (N=47) Medium operator (1,000-4,999)
- **7%** (N=12) Small operator (0-999)
State-Authorized Charter Campuses

Campuses per Charter

- 38% (N=67) 1 Campus
- 35% (N=61) 2-3 Campuses
- 20% (N=36) 4-9 Campuses
- 7% (N=12) 10+ Campuses
Texas Charter School System
Authorization
Authorization Offices and Portfolio Size

Authorizer Staff Members and Number of Charter Campuses

- Nevada State Public Charter School Authority: 15 Staff Members, 45 Charter Campuses
- Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education: 10 Staff Members, 82 Charter Campuses
- Philadelphia School District: 12 Staff Members, 84 Charter Campuses
- New Jersey Department of Education: 5 Staff Members, 89 Charter Campuses
- DC Public Charter School Board: 37 Staff Members, 122 Charter Campuses
- North Carolina: 7 Staff Members, 174 Charter Campuses
- Arizona State Board for Charter Schools: 11 Staff Members, 556 Charter Campuses
- Texas Education Agency: 9 Staff Members, 704 Charter Campuses

Legend:
- □ Number of Staff Members
- ■ Number of Charter Schools
### Revised Charter Application Process

#### Phase 1: Education Plan
1. **Education Plan Submission** (Applicant)
2. **Completeness Check and Internal Review of Education Plan** (TEA)
3. **Period to Remedy Incomplete Items** (Applicant)
4. **External Review of Education Plan** (Evaluators)
5. **Education Plan Score Compilation and Decision to Advance** (TEA)
6. **Conference Call to Define Questions for Advancing Applicants** (TEA & Evaluators)
7. **Dissemination of Interview Questions to Internal Stakeholders** (TEA)
8. **Preliminary Interview on Education Plan** (TEA & Applicant)
9. **Financial/Operation Plan Submission** (Applicant)
10. **Completeness Check and Internal Review of F/O Plan** (TEA)
11. **Period to Remedy Incomplete Items** (Applicant)
12. **External Review of F/O Plan** (Evaluators)
13. **F/O Plan Score Compilation and Decision to Advance** (TEA)
14. **Conference Call to Define Questions for Advancing Applicants** (TEA & Evaluators)
15. **Dissemination of Interview Questions to Internal Stakeholders** (TEA)
16. **Final Capacity Interview** (TEA & Applicant)

#### Phase 2: Evidence of Capacity
17. **Recommendation to Authorize** (TEA)
18. **Commissioner Decision to Authorize** (TEA)
19. **State Board Confirmation** (SBOE)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>COE Approval Date</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Complete &amp; Sent to External Readers</th>
<th>Interviewed</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9/20/2013</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8/20/2014</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6/2/2015</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5/31/2016</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5/24/2017</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5/31/2018</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Texas Charter School System
Renewals
Renewal Procedures

Renewal notice and designation sent

**Expeditied**
TEC §12.1141(b)
High performance last 3 years

30 days processing
Commissioner 
renews charter

**Discretionary**
TEC §12.1141(c)
Not highest performance, but not lowest performance either

90 days processing: site visits, agency research
Commissioner 
renews or denies 
renewal of charter

**Expiration**
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

Referred to Enforcement for closure process
Commissioner allows charter to expire

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

90 days processing: site visits, agency research
Commissioner 
renews or denies 
renewal of charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

Referred to Enforcement for closure process
Commissioner allows charter to expire

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

30 days processing
Commissioner 
renews charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

90 days processing: site visits, agency research
Commissioner 
renews or denies 
renewal of charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

Referred to Enforcement for closure process
Commissioner allows charter to expire

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

30 days processing
Commissioner 
renews charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

90 days processing: site visits, agency research
Commissioner 
renews or denies 
renewal of charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

Referred to Enforcement for closure process
Commissioner allows charter to expire

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

30 days processing
Commissioner 
renews charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

90 days processing: site visits, agency research
Commissioner 
renews or denies 
renewal of charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

Referred to Enforcement for closure process
Commissioner allows charter to expire

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

30 days processing
Commissioner 
renews charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

90 days processing: site visits, agency research
Commissioner 
renews or denies 
renewal of charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

Referred to Enforcement for closure process
Commissioner allows charter to expire

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

30 days processing
Commissioner 
renews charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

90 days processing: site visits, agency research
Commissioner 
renews or denies 
renewal of charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

Referred to Enforcement for closure process
Commissioner allows charter to expire

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

30 days processing
Commissioner 
renews charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

90 days processing: site visits, agency research
Commissioner 
renews or denies 
renewal of charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

Referred to Enforcement for closure process
Commissioner allows charter to expire

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

30 days processing
Commissioner 
renews charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

90 days processing: site visits, agency research
Commissioner 
renews or denies 
renewal of charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

Referred to Enforcement for closure process
Commissioner allows charter to expire

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

30 days processing
Commissioner 
renews charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

90 days processing: site visits, agency research
Commissioner 
renews or denies 
renewal of charter

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

Referred to Enforcement for closure process
Commissioner allows charter to expire

Expiration
TEC §12.1141(d)
Lowest performance 3 of last 5 years

30 days processing
Commissioner 
renews charter
# Contract Renewals 2014-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RENEWALS</th>
<th>EXPEDITED</th>
<th>DISCRETIONARY</th>
<th>EXPIRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Texas Charter School System
Closures- Revocations, Expirations, Surrenders
Charter School Closures (Post SB2)

- Revocations
- Expirations (Non-Renewals)
- Surrenders (in lieu of action)

2014 (Year 1) 2015 (Year 2) 2016 (Year 3) 2017 (Year 4) 2018 (Year 5)

- Revocations: 6, 15, 8, 6, 1
- Expirations (Non-Renewals): 6, 8, 6
- Surrenders (in lieu of action): 6, 15, 8, 6, 1
Texas Charter School System
Expansions
An expansion amendment is a substantive amendment that permits a charter school to:

• add an instructional facility **campus/site**;
• increase its maximum allowable **enrollment**;
• extend its **geographic boundaries and the students from those boundaries**; or
• extend the **grade level** it serves.
## 199 Expansion Requests filed since December 1, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Additional Campus/Site Requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Additional Enrollment – Maximum Enrollment Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Additional Geographic Boundary Requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Additional Grade Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+17</td>
<td>Substantive Waiver Requests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Expansions - Traditional ISD Notification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Expansion Amendments</th>
<th>Notification Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Site</td>
<td>Certified mail receipts required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Enrollment Increase</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Grade Levels</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Boundary Increase</td>
<td>Electronic notification is acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited expansions</td>
<td>Certified mail receipts required for districts and representatives TEC §12.1101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Texas Charter School System
Accountability
2017 Accountability Ratings: Traditional ISDs and Charters

Met Standard/Not Rated

- **Charters**
  - Met Standard: 70%
  - Met Alt. Standard: 15%
  - Not Rated: 6%

- **ISDs**
  - Met Standard/Not Rated: 97%

Improvement Required

- **Charters**
  - Improvement Required: 9%
  - Met Standard/Not Rated: 3%

- **Districts**
  - Improvement Required: 9%
  - Met Standard/Not Rated: 3%
2017 Accountability Ratings - Campus

Met Standard/Not Rated

- Charters:
  - Met Standard: 66%
  - Met Alt. Standard: 14%
  - Not Rated: 13%
  - Improvement Required: 2%

- Districts:
  - Met Standard: 88%
  - Met Alt. Standard: 6%
  - Not Rated: 2%

Improvement Required

- Charters: 7%
- Districts: 4%
Alternative Education Accountability

All Campuses

- Alternative Accountability: 4%
- Standard Accountability: 96%

Alternative Accountability

- Charter: 38%
- Traditional: 62%
High-Poverty Campuses

Statewide Campuses
- Greater than 80% of students are Eco Dis: 32%
- Less than 80% of students are Eco Dis: 68%

Traditional ISDs
- Greater than 80% of students are Eco Dis: 31%
- Less than 80% of students are Eco Dis: 69%

Charters
- Greater than 80% of students are Eco Dis: 49%
- Less than 80% of students are Eco Dis: 51%
TRS Contributions
• Contribution overview
• Comparison between school districts and charter schools

HB21 – Facilities Funding
• Statutory overview
• Implementation Status

Charter School FSP Funding
• FSP funding overview
• Charter school funding trends
• Comparison to school districts

SB1882 School District Funding
• Statutory overview (funding)
• Sample calculations
School districts are required to pay certain employees based on a minimum salary schedule outlined in the TEC, §21.402(c-1).

The state pays an amount to TRS on behalf of school districts based on the minimum salary schedule multiplied by 6.8%, the current state contribution rate.

School districts are required to pay the portion of the state TRS contribution for the amount that an employee salary exceeds the state adjusted minimum salary with local funds.
Charter schools do not have a requirement to pay their employees based on the state minimum salary table in the TEC, §21.402(c-1).

The state pays 6.8% on the total amount of charter school employees’ salaries for their TRS contributions.

Charter schools do not pay TRS contributions based on the state adjusted minimum salary schedule.
## Example of the difference in TRS contributions between school districts and charter schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A teacher with three years of experience earns an $42,000</th>
<th>School District with a 1.17</th>
<th>Charter Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Salary</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total required employer contribution into the TRS covered member account (6.8% of the full salary)</td>
<td>$2,856</td>
<td>$2,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum salary for three years experience</td>
<td>$29,890</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted minimum salary per TEC, §21.402(c-1) (Minimum Salary × Cost of Education Index (1.17))</td>
<td>$34,971</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of salary over the adjusted minimum (State does not pay the TRS contribution on this amount for districts)</td>
<td>$7,029</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Portion of the required TRS contribution ($34,971 x 6.8%)</td>
<td>$2,378</td>
<td>$2,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District portion of the required TRS contribution</td>
<td>$478</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of “State and Local” TRS Contributions for Charter Schools - current law vs. district treatment

Charter Schools – Current Law

$65M
approximate current amount of State “stat min” contribution for charters

Charter Schools – Hypothetical Calculation

$16M
potential amount of local “stat min” contribution for charters

$49M
potential amount of State “stat min” contribution for charters

This is a high-level illustration that was modeled using a weighted average CEI of 1.1259 and only considered employees subject to the minimum salary schedule in the TEC, (teachers, nurses, librarians, counselors and superintendents) and does not represent the full amount of TRS contributions TRS for all charter school employees.
Beginning in FY2019, certain charter schools will be eligible to receive a facilities allotment calculated using the state average debt service tax rate for school districts (estimated at 21 cents), limited to $60 million in additional statewide funding.

Funding is currently estimated at approximately $202 per student in average daily attendance (ADA), and is subject to change.
The Agency is undergoing the rule adoption process to select the academic rating year that will be used to determine eligibility for the funding allotment. The rule is scheduled to be finalized in September 2018 prior to the first Foundation School Program payment of FY2019.

Only charter schools that demonstrate acceptable academic performance under TEC Sec. Chapter 39, (Subchapter C) will be eligible for the allotment.
Pursuant to TEC, Section 12.106(f), funds received by a charter holder may only be used:

1. to lease an instructional facility;
2. to pay property taxes imposed on an instructional facility;
3. to pay debt service on bonds issued to finance an instructional facility; or
4. for any other purpose related to the purchase, lease, sale, acquisition, or maintenance of an instructional facility.
Charter schools are entitled to Tier I and Tier II state aid, but, because they do not have the ability to generate the local share through a property tax base, the state funds 100% of the entitlements.

Charters are funded using state average funding variables for Tier I, and state average tax rates for Tier II.

Charter schools are not eligible for facilities funding under IFA or EDA but do qualify for NIFA as part of the Tier I calculation and will qualify for facilities funding beginning in FY2019.
At an adjusted allotment of $6,540, charter schools are funded like a “small-size” school district with a regular program ADA of 824, a CEI of 1.0795, and with fewer than 300 square miles.

While 66% (116) of charter schools have less than 824 ADA, they only account for 40,000 ADA (16% of total charter ADA).

The nine largest charters have 114,000 ADA (44% of total charter ADA) but are still funded at the “small-size” state average level.

It is worth noting that over 95% of students enrolled in school districts attend a school district with an adjusted allotment below $6,540.
Charter schools do not have the authority to levy a tax rate, therefore they cannot raise local property taxes.

Therefore, charter schools’ Tier II allotments are calculated using the state average M&O tax rates for the golden and copper pennies ($0.0573 and $0.0490, respectively in FY2019).

Charters benefit as more districts hold elections to increase their M&O tax rates above $1.04.
Since FY2010, school district M&O and facilities revenue per student has grown by 19%. Meanwhile, charter revenue per student has grown by 15%.

For FY2019, it is projected that on the aggregate, school districts will have $559 more than charter schools, per enrolled student.
### FY2019 Comparison of M&O and Facilities Revenue per Enrolled Student Between Charter Schools and Some of the Larger Districts Across the State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Facilities Revenue per Student</th>
<th>M&amp;O Revenue per Student</th>
<th>Total FSP Revenue per Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin ISD</td>
<td>$1,488</td>
<td>$7,895</td>
<td>$9,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas ISD</td>
<td>$1,558</td>
<td>$8,161</td>
<td>$9,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso ISD</td>
<td>$745</td>
<td>$8,288</td>
<td>$9,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth ISD</td>
<td>$1,154</td>
<td>$7,931</td>
<td>$9,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston ISD</td>
<td>$1,372</td>
<td>$8,025</td>
<td>$9,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio ISD</td>
<td>$1,171</td>
<td>$8,275</td>
<td>$9,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School Average</td>
<td>$184 *</td>
<td>$8,654</td>
<td>$8,838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: TEA Statewide Summary of Finances, July 2018 (funding for school districts is net of recapture) (FY2019 data is preliminary

*Charter schools must have an acceptable academic performance under TEC Chapter 39 (Subchapter C) in order to qualify for facilities funding)
So, do charter schools receive more, or less funding per student than traditional school districts?
The answer is both. It depends on a number of assumptions and decisions about what are appropriate measures of comparison (i.e. context is everything)
How do we determine the answer?

- First, a decision needs to be made about whether to assume the numbers and types of students enrolled are identical between a school district and a charter school, or whether to compare the funding that has flowed as a result of actual student enrollment, which may differ between entities.

- Second, a decision needs to be made about whether to consider general operating (M&O) funds only, or “all funds”, including funding for facilities, which has traditionally only been available to school districts.

- Dividing total funding by the total number of students in each category of public school is what has traditionally been done. SB1882 controls for differences in the types of students between districts and charters, and ultimately highlights differences in entitlements caused by a specific district’s “district-level” funding adjustments, and the state averages for the adjusted allotments (after the CEI and small and mid-size adjustments) and tax rates, etc.
SB 1882
Funding of District – Charter Partnerships
How SB 1882 differs from traditional methods of funding comparisons

Despite Houston ISD having an estimated $700 more per ADA than charter schools across the state (including $1,567 for facilities funding) in FY2018, the district would have been entitled to approximately $1,800 per ADA under SB1882.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Total State &amp; Local M&amp;O + Facilities Funding) ÷ Total ADA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houston ISD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Charter Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: TEA Statewide Summary of Finances, July 2018

Why is this?

SB 1882 allows school districts that contract with a partner to operate a campus to receive additional funding equal to the difference in the Tier I and Tier II entitlements normally provided to those districts and the Tier I, Tier II and facilities entitlements provided to charter schools:

- SB1882 would run actual Houston ISD enrollment on an eligible campus through the charter state average formula.
- Houston ISD’s adjusted allotment is nearly $900 lower than that of the state average.
- Houston ISD’s tax rate is $1.04, which is six cents below the state average of $1.10
- SB1882 recognizes the facilities funding made available to charter schools in HB21.
Estimated State Aid for Austin ISD under TEC Sec. 42.2511 for a campus of 500

*Charter school facilities funding assumes charter school demonstrates acceptable academic performance under TEC Sec. Chapter 39, (Subchapter C)

Comparison uses the same inputs (i.e. charter funding is based on the same school district student characteristics (special program participation and attendance rates), and also uses the same assumed campus enrollment of 500, and excludes other line items found in Chapters 41, 42 and 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Austin ISD Using Charter Formula</th>
<th>Austin ISD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compressed M&amp;O Tax Rate</td>
<td>$0.99 $</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;O Tax Rate</td>
<td>$1.09 $</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Education Index (CEI)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Allotment</td>
<td>$6,640 $</td>
<td>$5,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Attendance</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tier I Entitlement</td>
<td>$3,802,452</td>
<td>$3,200,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tier II Entitlement</td>
<td>$516,499</td>
<td>$431,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter school facilities funding*</td>
<td>$82,475</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Entitlement (No Local or State Share Considered)</td>
<td>$4,401,427</td>
<td>$3,632,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Entitlement per ADA</td>
<td>$9,663</td>
<td>$7,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional State Aid under new TEC Sec. 42.2511</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$768,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional State Aid per ADA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Context (Other Revenues Available to Austin ISD not considered as part of the SB1882 Calculation)

| FY2019 State & Local Facilities Funding per ADA | $1,641 |
| FY2019 Other State & Local M&O Funding per ADA | $731   |
| FY2019 Total State & Local Funding per ADA      | $10,347 |

SB1882 Funding Amount per ADA

*Charter school facilities funding assumes charter school demonstrates acceptable academic performance under TEC Sec. Chapter 39, (Subchapter C)
SB 1882
District – Charter Partnerships
SB 1882 Partnership - A school district initiative to partner with a charter school, non-profit, institution of higher-education, or government entity to operate a school. Eligible partnerships have access to financial and accountability incentives.

Types of Partnerships

- **Turnaround Partnerships**: District contracts with a partner to turnaround an IR campus.
- **Innovation Partnerships**: District contracts with a partner to innovate at an non-IR campus.
- **New School Partnerships**: District contracts with a partner to launch a brand new campus/school model.

Key Requirements

1) A SB 1882 partnership must be authorized as an in-district charter.

2) A performance contract formalizes the performance and role expectations of the district and the partner.
# 2018-2019 Partnerships

### Applicants
- 17 districts submitted LOIs

### Under Review
- 4 New School Partnerships
- 2 Innovation Partnerships

### Approved
- 6 Turnaround Partnerships

## 2018 – 2019 SB 1882 Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Partnership Type</th>
<th># of Campuses</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie ISD</td>
<td>Uplift Education</td>
<td>Innovation Partnership</td>
<td>1 Campus</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio ISD</td>
<td>CAST Tech</td>
<td>Innovation Partnership</td>
<td>1 Campus</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin ISD</td>
<td>Mainspring Schools</td>
<td>New School Partnership</td>
<td>1 Campus</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio ISD</td>
<td>Texans Can Academy</td>
<td>New School Partnership</td>
<td>1 Campus</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood ISD</td>
<td>PreK4SA</td>
<td>New School Partnership</td>
<td>1 Campus</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galveston ISD</td>
<td>Moody ECE</td>
<td>New School Partnership</td>
<td>1 Campus</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio ISD</td>
<td>Relay Lab Schools</td>
<td>Turnaround Partnership</td>
<td>2 Campus</td>
<td>Approved for Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio ISD</td>
<td>Democracy Prep</td>
<td>Turnaround Partnership</td>
<td>1 Campus</td>
<td>Approved for Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ector County ISD</td>
<td>Ector County Success Network</td>
<td>Turnaround Partnership</td>
<td>1 Campus</td>
<td>Approved for Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearne ISD</td>
<td>Hearne Education Foundation</td>
<td>Turnaround Partnership</td>
<td>2 Campus</td>
<td>Approved for Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waco ISD</td>
<td>Transform Waco</td>
<td>Turnaround Partnership</td>
<td>5 Campus</td>
<td>Approved for Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin ISD</td>
<td>T-STEM Coalition</td>
<td>Turnaround Partnership</td>
<td>1 Campus</td>
<td>Approved for Benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Revenue (All funds):
School Districts & Charter Schools

School Districts Revenue (in billions)

Charter Schools Revenue (in billions)

Source: TEA PEIMS Financial Standard Reports

Note: Because school districts and charter schools are subject to different accounting rules, school district revenues include the State’s TRS on-behalf contributions, whereas charter schools are not required to record the State’s on-behalf contribution.
Total Revenue (All funds) per enrolled student: School Districts & Charter Schools

School District Revenue per Student

Charter School Revenue per Student

Source: TEA PEIMS Financial Standard Reports

Note: Because school districts and charter schools are subject to different accounting rules, school district revenues include the State’s TRS on-behalf contributions, whereas charter schools are not required to record the State’s on-behalf contribution.