

Fact Sheet

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION & THE WORKFORCE DEMOCRATS

DEMOCRATS-EDWORKFORCE.HOUSE.GOV

The Hon. Bobby Scott • Ranking Member

Good Charters vs. Bad Charters:

A Tale of Two States

Charter schools can provide high-quality educational opportunities to students while protecting civil rights and meeting the needs of students. However, some charter schools put profits before students, are plagued by civil rights concerns, and fail to educate all students. Below are qualities of good charters and bad charters with examples from Massachusetts and Michigan.

Good Charters:

- Operate under a public or non-profit authorizer with strong accountability for schools and regular state review of the authorizer
- Are led by individuals with experience in educational leadership
- Provide transparency about enrollment, civil rights protections, and academic achievement
- Support all students and hold students to high standards

Bad Charters:

- Conduct work in the name of profit, not student outcomes
- Follow minimal accountability standards
- States may have a low bar for charter renewal without an effective plan to sanction or shut down low performing authorizers and schools
- Utilize exclusionary discipline to expel students with behavior challenges or encourage parents of children with disabilities not to attend the charter school

Good Charter: Massachusetts	Bad Charter: Michigan
Rigorous authorization process, Massachusetts Department of Education is the sole authorizer of charter schools in the state	Unregulated charter process with minimal oversight and lax authorization
Ban on for-profit charter schools and for-profit Education Management Organizations (EMO)	Proliferation of for-profit charters – 80 percent of charters in Michigan are for-profit schools
Strong public school system that supports charter schools	Inadequate funding of public school system and declining outcomes as privatization expands
Rigorous renewal process with monitoring and closure if the school has poor results	No clear performance standards or accountability for charter authorizers
Collaborates between schools to share best practices and solve challenges	Increasing inequities and achievement gaps with increasing for-profit models
High standards for public schools and charter schools with similar interventions if schools are underperforming	Seventy percent of Michigan charters call within the bottom half of state rankings
Statutory cap on the number of charters that can operate in the state	Corruption, financial challenges and abrupt closure of schools
Received a grant for \$14,189,200 under the <u>Charter</u> <u>School Program</u> (CSP) funded through Elementary and Secondary Education Act in FY 2012 across 3 years. Received a second grant under Charter School Program in FY 2016 for \$15,876,092 across 3 years	Received a grant for \$6,958,250 under the Charter School Program funded through Elementary and Secondary Education Act in FY 2010 across 5 years.