

A Study to Examine the Perceptions of North Carolina School Superintendents
Regarding Charter Schools

By

Carolyn M. Penny

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in the
School of Education.

Chapel Hill
2007

Approved by:

Advisor: Professor William Malloy

Reader: Professor Frank Brown

Reader: Professor Carol Malloy

Reader: Professor Janice Smith Coaxum

@2007
Carolyn M. Penny
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

CAROLYN M. PENNY: A Study to Examine the Perceptions of North Carolina School Superintendents Regarding Charter Schools
(Under the direction of Dr. William Malloy)

This study examined the perceptions of North Carolina School Superintendents in determining the extent to which superintendents in the state of North Carolina are positive towards Charter Schools. The study also asks: Is there a significant relationship between the perceptions of superintendents who have a Charter School currently operating or in the planning stages of implementing a Charter School and superintendents whose school districts do not have a plan for a Charter School?

Eighty-five superintendents from the state of North Carolina responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of a total of thirty-seven questions. Twenty-eight questions related to the perceptions of superintendents, eight questions provided demographic characteristics of the superintendent and the school district, and an open-ended question asked superintendents to comment regarding the effects of Charter Schools on public education.

The researcher used both descriptive and inferential methods to conduct research. Frequency distributions were used to describe superintendents and their school districts. To answer the two research questions, the one-sample t-test and Mann Whitney U Test were utilized. The statistical significance of the findings was made using an alpha level of .05.

Results of the first question were similar to a study by Sperling (1999) when

examining perceptions of Michigan School Superintendents regarding Charter Schools. Both studies found the following: (a) many superintendents were skeptical about Charter Schools' ability to provide quality instruction and innovative practices to meet the needs of all students; (b) superintendents agreed that Charter Schools should provide essential services (such as special education, transportation, and lunch programs); (c) superintendents also felt that Charter Schools should provide enrichment programs (art, music, and physical education) for all students; (d) superintendents indicated that Charter Schools should pay teacher salaries the same rate as the traditional public school; and (e) superintendents recognized Charter Schools as an education reform that provided choice.

Although superintendents did not consider Charter Schools as competitive with tradition public schools, they were recognized as a viable public school alternative. Findings indicated that superintendents were suspicious that Charter Schools were politically motivated and not educational. Superintendents also voiced a concern regarding the issue surrounding financial funding. In the open-ended section and subscale (Effects of Charter Schools) on the questionnaire, superintendents agreed that Charter Schools segregate certain groups of students, the privileged from underprivileged.

In the second question, findings showed that there was not a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of superintendents with or without a Charter School operating in their school district. These findings suggested that

superintendents were in agreement with the perceptions of Charter Schools regardless of personal experience with Charter Schools or using other factors to base their opinions. Similar results were also found in the Michigan study (Sperling, 1999).

DEDICATION PAGE

This research project is dedicated to my husband, Ronald. A special thank you for always being supportive and demonstrating your unconditional love. You have helped me to recognize my special talents, encouraged me to continue when the task becomes difficult, and provided avenues to ensure that I am successful in my endeavors. Thanks for believing in me, I am truly blessed to have you as a devoted friend and husband.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I deeply appreciate the leadership of my committee and especially to my advisor, Dr. William Malloy. His guidance, kindness, and knowledge proved invaluable during my research project. Thanks for going the extra mile for me; your kindness will always be remembered.

Drs. Frank Brown, Janice Smith Coaxum, and Carol Malloy, I am grateful for your insights, concise review of my work, and the genuine interest that each of you have shown during the completion of my research.

To my family members, thanks for your patience and understanding. A special thanks to my son, Ron Jr. who always had a comforting word to share, Jo Ann who radiated calmness, my brother Bertrand (Champ) who is an expert at giving pep talks, and Aunt Martha who kept me from getting overstressed.

Sisters in Christ Ministries, I want to personally thank each of you for your prayers, calls, and notes of encouragement. Thanks for providing me with a variety of scriptures and psalms to ease my path as this task was being accomplished.

A special thanks to Jacqueline Brown, Larry and Wilma Keith, Deloris McIver, Fran Venezia and Celeste Turner. I am blessed to have each of you as a friend. Your gentle reminders and ideas were so helpful during the completion of my dissertation.

I would like to thank Don Scott and George Wilson for their time, sharing of resources, knowledge of statistics, and ability to explain statistical analysis. Your input was invaluable and thanks for motivating me to get my research project completed.

To my church family members, who constantly prayed and reminded me that God is in control of all situations. A special thanks to Sister Archibald, Sister Salome McClam and Deacon Willie Graves, Sr. for the words of wisdom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES _____ xi

LIST OF CHARTS _____ xii

Chapter _____ Page

I. INTRODUCTION _____ 1

 A. Purpose of the Study _____ 1

 B. Overview of Superintendent’s Role _____ 2

 C. Background of the Study _____ 5

 D. Statement of the Problem _____ 7

 E. Significance of the Research _____ 8

 F. Overview of Methodology (Chapter III) _____ 11

 G. Hypothesis and Research Questions _____ 12

 H. Assumptions of the Study _____ 12

 I. Limitations of the Study _____ 15

 J. Definition of Terms _____ 15

 K. Summary _____ 18

II. LITERATURE REVIEW _____ 19

 A. National School Reforms _____ 20

 B. North Carolina School Reforms _____ 25

 C. History of United States Charter Schools _____ 30

D.	North Carolina Charter Schools	39
E.	Leadership Role of the School Superintendent	53
III.	METHODOLOGY	59
A.	Research Design	60
B.	The Questionnaire	61
C.	Variables in the Study	63
D.	Treatment of Data	64
E.	Questionnaire Reliability and Validity	66
F.	Questionnaire Approval and Delivery	67
G.	Summary	68
IV.	RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS	69
A.	The Michigan Study: Questionnaire and Data Collection	69
B.	The Current Study: Questionnaire and Data Collection	70
C.	Division by Characteristics of the Respondents	71
D.	Research Questions Overview	77
E.	Research Question 1	77
F.	Research Question 2	90
G.	Summary	91
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, & RECOMMENDATIONS	92
A.	Summary	92

B.	Analyses	93
C.	Findings for Research Question	94
D.	Demographics Characteristics Findings	95
E.	Discussion	97
F.	Implications	104
G.	Conclusions	105
H.	Recommendations for Future Research	107
VI.	APPENDICES	107
A.	Appendix A North Carolina Charter Law (Bill 955)	110
B.	Appendix B Superintendent’s Questionnaire	122
C.	Appendix C North Carolina School Superintendents	124
D.	Appendix D State Profile of Charter Schools	127
E.	Appendix E The Laws At a Glance (Current Ranking from First to Worst)	128
F.	Appendix F Profiles of Growth & Achievement (North Carolina Charter Schools)	129
G.	Example of descriptive Statistics Used by Sperling	130
H.	Appendix H Superintendent’s Letter	131
I.	Appendix I Charter Schools (2005-2006 ABC Results)	132
J.	Appendix J N. C. Counties & Per Pupil Expenditure	137
K.	Appendix K North Carolina Charter Schools	140
L.	Appendix L Dr. Sperling’s Permission Letter	144

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Writing Scores (2000-2001)	46
Table 2	Re-segregation of North Carolina Schools	51
Table 3	Five Subscales: Components of Charter Schools	62
Table 4	Statistical Analysis	64
Table 5	Frequency Distribution Number of Years Serving as a Superintendent	71
Table 6	Frequency Distribution Number of Students Enrolled in School District	72
Table 7	Frequency Distribution Percentage of Students Receiving Free/Reduced Lunch Cost	73
Table 8	Frequency Distribution Percentage of Minority Population in the School District	73
Table 9	Frequency Distribution Charter Schools Operating in School District	74
Table 10	Frequency Distribution School District Total Expense Budget	75
Table 11	Frequency Distribution School District Total Expense Budget	76
Table 12	The t-Test for one Sample Perceptions of Superintendents Regarding Charter Schools	88
Table 13	Mann-Whitney Test for Independent Samples Perceptions of Charter Schools	91

LIST OF CHARTS

Chart 1	Frequency Distributions Reactions to Charter Schools	79
Chart 2	Frequency Distributions Intentions of Charter Schools	81
Chart 3	Frequency Distributions Responsiveness of Charter Schools	82
Chart 4	Frequency Distributions Responsiveness of Charter Schools	84
Chart 5	Frequency Distributions Funding Issues Involving Charter Schools	86

Chapter 1 Introduction

Background

Education has always been important in America. As early as 1635, the Boston Latin School was founded as a public school. Along with the growth of public schools, educational concerns have surfaced. To meet educational and societal demands in public education, school reforms were created. Currently, educational concerns are still at the forefront of the American public. Across the nation, there has been an outcry for a better educational system. Problems such as the low student performance, increasing dropout rate, violence, lack of parental involvement, and other school deficiencies reflect the need for reform. Charter Schools, a school reform, were created to address many of the concerns of the education system.

Purpose of the Study

This study determined the extent to which superintendents in the state of North Carolina are positive towards Charter Schools. The hypothesis and research questions that follow provided a foundation for the research.

The hypothesis, stated here as a question, informed the research of the degree to which superintendents are positive about Charter Schools: to what extent are superintendents positive about Charter Schools? More specifically, was there a significant relationship between the perceptions of superintendents who have a Charter

School currently operating or in the planning stages of implementing a Charter School than superintendents whose districts have no plans for a Charter School?

In conducting this research, the author used a questionnaire consisting of five subscales: personal reaction to Charter Schools, intentions of Charter Schools, responsiveness of Charter Schools, effects of Charter Schools on public education and funding issues involving Charter Schools. A demographic survey consisting of eight questions was also used. This data provided a description of the sample. Additional space was provided for superintendents' comments relating to their personal experiences with Charter Schools. This study replicated a similar study conducted in the state of Michigan (Sperling, 1999).

General Information

Overview of Superintendent's Role

Definition of public Charter Schools. A Charter School is a semi-autonomous school of choice that operates on the basis of a charter or contract between the individual or group. The contract usually lasts from three to five years and provides operators with more autonomy than is given to the traditional public school, in exchange for "enhanced accountability" (Bulkley & Fidler, 2002). As "incubators of innovation," (Daniels, 2002) Charter Schools were created with the flexibility to address educational challenges.

Research indicated that public Charter Schools are growing in popularity and acceptance.

Research. Research particularly in the area of intra-sectional choice related to Charter Schools, has been an important step toward searching out solutions to some education shortcomings. Research studies have shown that Charter Schools are meeting

the educational needs of some children, providing avenues for parental involvement, and permitting teachers to implement innovative practices and techniques.

According to Williams & Scharer (2002), Charter School success or failure depends greatly upon the support of entities such as the General Assembly and the Department of Public Instruction. However, the potential factor in the expansion of Charter Schools was the role the superintendent plays. School superintendents play an integral role in initiating changes in reforms such as Charter Schools. School superintendents are responsible for guiding local school boards and education arena participants (administrators, teachers, parents, community leaders) regarding state mandates and regulations. Various studies have shown that it is essential that school superintendents become involved in the maintaining of momentum for the initial implementing and sustaining of reforms. Massell and Goertz (1999) found that the implementing of policies effectively depends upon how the administrator chooses to handle mandates. Also, findings by Louis, Rosenblum, and Molitor (1981) indicated that the effective implementation and continuation of a reform closely relates to district-level involvement.

Ogden (1995) noted that the “superintendents’ perceptions could prove to be critical for Charter Schools and could be the decisive factor in the success or failure of the concept.” A follow-up study of Ogden’s original research by Sperling (1999) further demonstrated that superintendents’ perceptions regarding the impact of Charter Schools are essential in identifying factors that may promote or hinder the implementing of Charter Schools. Although superintendents’ perceptions were not as negative as in the original study by Ogden (1995), Sperling (1999) found that superintendents were still

skeptical of Charter Schools in regards to funding and accountability. Sperling (1999) also found that superintendents were knowledgeable about Charter Schools and agreed that they were part of public education's future. Superintendents also indicated that the intent of Charter Schools was to increase student success, restructure public education, and to get educators involved in change. In addition, superintendents agreed that Charter Schools were somewhat competitive and would provide a valuable public school alternative.

The majority of the superintendents reported the following concerns: (a) the ability of Charter Schools to provide better educational outcomes for students; (b) that Charter Schools were not accountable as traditional public schools; (c) the financial burden placed on school districts, because money is taken away from traditional public schools for Charter Schools; and (d) teacher involvement in decision making would not be enhanced (Sperling, 1999). Results from the research also showed that there was not a significant difference between superintendent's perceptions of superintendents with Charter Schools operating in their school district and those superintendents with no plan for a Charter School.

Although research regarding Charter Schools at the national level has continued to grow, there is still a need for additional studies. Research has shown that the role of the superintendent in implementing and sustaining of reforms is vital. It has also revealed that superintendents' involvement varies from supportive to obstructive. For example, supportive superintendents have provided avenues for the Charter Schools concept to be successful, whereas less supportive superintendents have implemented obstacles making it difficult for the idea Charter Schools to be promoted.

North Carolina Specifics

Background of the Study

North Carolina has implemented 10 important school reforms that have shaped public education (Williams & Scharer, 2000). These reforms included the piloting of such programs as the following: (a) lengthening of the school day and year (1983); (b) implementing a career ladder program to reward excellent teaching, the Basic Education Plan, to provide a minimum curriculum and standards for every school, the School Improvement and Accountability Act or Senate Bill 2 and Year-round School Movement (1989); (c) the Outcome-Based Education pilot program and creating of the Low-wealth and Small School Fund to help less-provided-for and small school systems (1991); (d) the legislature's authorization of the creation of up to 100 Charter Schools, and the ABC Program that gives local school boards more flexibility in exchange for more accountability (1996); (e) the development of the North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research; and (f) the Excellent School Act's beginning of a four-year drive to raise teacher pay to the national average while holding teachers to higher professional standards (1997).

Growth of Charter Schools. Although several of the above reforms have been abandoned, the growth of Charter Schools has continued. Charter Schools are perceived by parents, teachers, students, community, and policy makers as an opportunity for effective education. Currently, Charter Schools have increased in numbers and with the preliminary approval of an additional seven Charter Schools, the provision of 100 Charter Schools permitted in North Carolina has been met. The General Assembly's decision to

remove or maintain the current cap on Charter Schools is at a turning point; ultimately its decision will determine the growth of Charter Schools.

Uniquely North Carolina. The Charter Schools Act of 1996 (House Bill 955) was passed on June 21, 1996 (North Carolina General Assembly, 1995-96). Charter Schools in North Carolina are public schools that are operated by a group of parents, teachers, and/or community members as an autonomous school of choice within a school district, operating under a Charter with the State Board of Education. Originally a two-step process was required in meeting approval from the State Board of Education; however, current applications may now be submitted directly to the State Board of Education without the preliminary approval from the local Board of Education (Thomas Fordham Institute, 2003). A component of House Bill 955 provides opportunities for teachers, parents, pupils, and community members to accomplish six major objectives: These objectives emphasize (a) improvement in student learning, (b) increase of learning opportunities for at-risk and academically gifted students, (c) use of varied and innovative teaching methods, (d) creation of new professional opportunities for teachers, (e) provision of educational choices for parents and students, and (f) making schools accountable that meet measurable student achievement results (see Appendix A).

Rapid growth. The rapid growth of Charter Schools in North Carolina has increased from 28 operating schools in 1997 to 100 schools in 2006. North Carolina's Charter Bill is ranked the 15th strongest of the nation's 41 ranked charter laws. The Bill provides for a choice of preliminary entities, allows for any individual or group to organize a Charter proposal, gives automatic exemption from state and local regulation rather than case-by-case appeals, allows up to 100 Charter Schools, does not require certification of all

the schools' teachers, and provides a high degree of fiscal autonomy to the Charter School (The Center for Education Reform, 2006).

Decision re "cap." The General Assembly is at a point where the decision regarding the removing of the Charter School cap surfaces yearly. It was clear to the researcher that a similar study would provide important information for North Carolina educational leaders and lawmakers. Studies in states such as New Jersey and Michigan have shown that the perceptions of superintendents affect the promotion or obstruction of Charter Schools. Observing this, the researcher of the current study has also chosen to concentrate on a single state—in this case, North Carolina—zeroing in on the perceptions of school superintendents in North Carolina.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of North Carolina superintendents regarding Charter Schools. This study was to: (a) determine the extent to which superintendents in the state of North Carolina were positive about Charter Schools and (b) determine if there was a relationship between the perceptions of North Carolina superintendents who had a Charter School currently operating or were in the planning stages of implementing a Charter School and those superintendents who had no plans for a Charter School. Each year, the North Carolina General Assembly has been confronted with the issue of increasing the number of Charter Schools or removing the current cap of 100 Charter Schools. As of August, 2006, the provision for creating 100 Charter Schools in North Carolina has been met. Issues surrounding the financial burden,

racial imbalance, and the compromising of quality education that Charter Schools has presented for school districts are concerns voiced by school superintendents. Sperling (1999) whose study has been guidance for this current study found that superintendents' perceptions were essential in identifying factors that might promote or hinder the implementing of Charter Schools. Research in this area of study has been limited. Further study was needed to assist educational leaders, Charter School organizers, and lawmakers in making decisions.

Significance of Research As It Relates to North Carolina Research

As the number of Charter Schools continued to grow in North Carolina, pertinent information was needed for policymakers and educational leaders to make sound decisions. School superintendents were in a position to influence the success or failure of Charter Schools. There were two significant relationships to be considered.

A first research relationship. First, were school superintendents' perceptions positive towards Charter Schools? Results from A Study of Charter Schools: First Year Report (May 1997) revealed that local school districts' relationships with Charter Schools varied from supportive to strained relationships. In the (1997) study by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement, findings showed that several superintendents and school boards played an active role in initiating and supporting the development of Charter Schools. In one case, the Charter School was utilized as a research and development site for the district. In another case, the district superintendent encouraged staff members to develop a Charter School, which resulted in the school's increasing its capacity in order to accommodate the waiting list.

Research by Hassel, Fullwood, Terrell, and Schroeder (2004) further demonstrated how the support of superintendents strengthened the operation of Charter Schools in Baltimore, Oakland, New York, Chula Vista (CA), San Diego, Milwaukee, and Philadelphia. Superintendent Dennis Chaconas of the Oakland Unified District, implemented policies and formed community partnerships to support Charter Schools. He believed that to prevent Charter Schools from getting bogged down in bureaucratic issues, the school district needed to provide infrastructure for them. As a result of his efforts, central office's functions were redefined and a positive relationship was developed with Charter Schools. Another similar example was found in San Diego, California, where Superintendent Alan Bersin promoted Charter Schools by viewing them as vehicles for informing the district's school reform efforts. With support from local civic leaders and funding from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Charter Schools were not at risk of closure due to financial reasons.

District resistance has been cited in several studies as a barrier to developing and implementing Charter Schools (Hadderman, 1998; RPP, 2000; Miron, 2005). Findings in the (1997) study conducted by the United States Office of Research and Improvement revealed that out of 252 Charter Schools, 16% of newly created Charter Schools and 22% of pre-existing Charter Schools felt that district's resistance was a difficult or very difficult barrier. Manno (2003) also found that local school districts can hinder Charter Schools in many ways from the completing of unreasonable timetables on an application to the raising of regulatory building problems, as organizers faced the difficult issue of finding a facility. To obtain funding, many Charter Schools have also been involved in unnecessary court proceedings. In 2000, although Proposition 39 entitled California

Charter Schools access to facilities similar to the districts' buildings, one of the wealthiest districts (The Sequoia Union High School District) sued to stop Aurora Charter High School from receiving funds (Manno, 2003).

In 2002, in Indiana, when a ruling was made by the state's attorney general to block Suellen Reid, Indiana's state superintendent of public instruction, refusal to provide funds to new Charter Schools during their first semester, outcry from 11 school districts located within Indianapolis protested the ruling. The schools called for a suspension of new Charter Schools until "financial inequities" were resolved (Manno, 2003).

Although Ogden's findings in 1995 showed that superintendents appeared to be more negative towards Charter Schools, overall they did not perceive Charter Schools as a threat. Sperling (1999) also found that although superintendents were not threatened by the presence of Charter Schools, they viewed Charter Schools with a degree of skepticism. The lack of accountability of Charter Schools and the financial impact were areas of concern in the study. From the research above, it is apparent that districts' relationships with Charter Schools may be supportive and strained. However, Charter Schools, like traditional schools, needed the support of the superintendent to be successful.

A second research relationship. The second relationship to be considered related to superintendents' perceptions of Charter Schools relative to whether they had a Charter School in their district. Research by Sperling (1999) found that regardless of whether superintendents had Charter Schools operating or in the planning stages of being implemented in their district or even if there were no plans for a Charter School, there was no evidence of statistically significant differences between the two groups. The

results revealed that superintendents agreed with the perceptions of Charter Schools regardless of their experience with Charter Schools. Charter Schools were also viewed as a parallel educational system that met some educational needs, but have a negative impact upon the distribution of public funds Sperling (1999).

Like Michigan, North Carolina have limited research to describe the perception of superintendents. This study, replicating the Sperling study, will have extended the existing knowledge base of superintendents' perceptions regarding Charter Schools and provided pertinent information for educators, Charter School organizers, and lawmakers.

Overview of Methodology (Chapter III) Used in the Current Study

In conducting this research, the researcher replicated a study similar to the one conducted in the state of Michigan (Sperling, 1999). The questionnaire, revised by Sperling, was used in this current study (see Appendix B). The questionnaire consisted of five subscales: personal reaction to Charter Schools, intentions of Charter Schools, responsiveness of Charter Schools, effects of Charter Schools on public education, and funding issues involving Charter Schools. A demographic questionnaire consisting of eight questions was also used. This data provided a description of the sample.

Additional space was provided for superintendents' comments relating to their personal experiences with Charter Schools.

A Sperling replication. The current study reported here has replicated the Sperling (1999) study. For example, a Sperling question would ask: "In what study did school superintendents report their perceptions and to what extent are superintendents positive about Charter Schools?" Sperling also wanted to determine whether a significant

relationship existed between the perceptions of (a) school superintendents who had a Charter School currently operating or in the planning stages of implementing a Charter School and (b) superintendents whose districts had no plans for a Charter School.

Sperling used a population of 111 school superintendents located in five counties representative of urban, suburban, and rural areas. The number of participants is considered adequate to complete the statistical analysis needed to answer the research questions appropriately.

A two-part instrument was used by Sperling to measure school superintendents' perceptions to determine whether they were supportive or non-supportive of Charter Schools. The first part consisted of 5 subscales: personal reaction to Charter Schools, intention of Charter School legislation, responsiveness of Charter Schools, effects of Charter School on public education, and funding issues involving Charter Schools. Each questionnaire was rated using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. The second part consisted of questions that described the demographics of the superintendents and the school district. Additional space was also provided for superintendents' comments relating to their personal experiences with Charter Schools.

The research questions and hypothesis. The research questions and hypotheses that follow provided a foundation for the research. The first question was: To what extent are North Carolina school superintendents positive towards Charter Schools? The null and alternative hypotheses were tested. The second question was: Is there a relationship between the perceptions of North Carolina superintendents who have a Charter School currently operating or in the planning stages of implementing a Charter

and those superintendents who have no plans for a Charter School? The null and alternative hypotheses were tested.

Assumptions of the Study

There were five assumptions in the current research (see below):

1. Superintendents are aware of the Charter Schools Act of 1996 (House Bill 955).
2. When given the opportunity, parents will make informed choices in selecting schools for their children, based on: the assessment of their children's interests, educational needs, and the capacity of schools to engage their children's interests and meet their needs.
3. Charter Schools, acting as largely autonomous units, will respond to parents' preferences.
4. Parental choice will improve educational outcomes.
5. Students' academic performance will be enhanced, and parents' satisfaction with schools will improve.

Instrument for the Study

Questionnaire. The researcher sent questionnaires to 117 superintendents (see Appendix B). In conducting the research, the researcher used a modified questionnaire, revised by Sperling (1999). Part 1 of the questionnaire consisted of 26 questions using five subscales: personal reaction to Charter Schools, intentions of Charter Schools, responsiveness of Charter Schools, effects of Charter Schools on public education, and

funding issues involving Charter Schools. Part 2 consisted of a demographic questionnaire with eight questions. Data from the demographic section of the questionnaire were used to provide a description of the sample. Questions #1 -#2 referred to the geographical location of the school district and the size of the district. Questions #3-#4 referred to the superintendent's school district, question #5 related to the professional experiences of the superintendent, and the remaining 3 questions related specifically to Charter Schools. Additional space was provided for superintendents' comments relating to their personal experiences with Charter Schools. This current study replicated a study similar to the study conducted in the state of Michigan (Sperling, 1999).

Conceptual framework. The researcher of this study used a conceptual framework derived from Schlechty (1990). This framework suggested that five functions were needed to be fulfilled in order for change to occur. The five functions were: (a) the concept of change needed to be determined, (b) people who were going to be called on to support the change, but who were not involved in the conceptualization process needed to be aware of the change, (c) feedback from those who were not involved in the initial conceptualization but who would be called on for support needed to be solicited, and wherever possible and appropriate, incorporated into the change process, (d) activity to implement the change needed to begin and people needed to be motivated to act in directions indicated by the change, and (e) a system of ongoing support and training needed to be provided for those who were being asked to support the change.

Validity and reliability. The validity and reliability established would pertain to this replication of Sperling (1999).

Limitations of the Research

Although there are many significant stakeholders in the Charter School movement; this study was limited to public school superintendents in the state of North Carolina, during the 2006-2007 school year. It was also assumed that each school superintendent would complete the questionnaire used in this study. Data derived from the study were descriptive of respondents and could not be generalized to the population of all public school superintendents in North Carolina.

The researcher of this study believes that the questionnaire method was appropriate and the best choice for this study. However, the following disadvantages needed to be considered: that (a) questionnaire methods may not have allowed very detailed information on the issue being researched, (b) the research may have been time-consuming, (c) there may have been a sampling error, and (d) the research was subject to one or more participants' "faking" replies and/or expressing biases in responding to questions (Travers, Elliott, Kratochwill, 1993). The study results may also have been limited by the number of questionnaires returned. Allowing enough time, sending the questionnaire out at a certain time of the year, sending a reminder questionnaire to non-responders, and making inferences from the literature may have helped reduce this limitation (Wiersma, 1995).

Further Definition of Terms in Context

The discussion of the study utilized several terms, listed alphabetically below, that may have enhanced the meaning in context.

General terms.

Annual Yearly Progress (AYP): looked at whether schools were meeting performance targets from subgroups within the school.

Charter School: an autonomous entity that operated on the basis of a Charter or Contract between the individual or group, organizing the school and its sponsor. The Charter or Contract specified such items as: (a) the educational plan for the Charter School, (b) specific educational outcomes and how they will be measured, (c) the management plan for the Charter School, and (d) how the Charter School would comply with other state requirements.

Home schooling: a choice by a growing number of parents for educating their children at home. Estimates indicated that two million children were being taught at home nationally and over 50, 000 students were home-schooled in North Carolina.

Intra-sectional choice: a plan, which was limited to public schools.

Open enrollment policy: a preference in a small number of counties to permit parents to specify their public school preference. Students needed to live within the borders of the residential school district.

Magnet schools and programs offerings of specialized programs concentrating on certain subjects like science, technology, arts and humanities, classical studies, and others. Magnet programs either operate within a public school or included the entire school.

Perception: mental image, attitude toward (positive, negative) interpretation.

Privately funded tuition scholarship programs: provision by a private organization of tuition assistance for underprivileged children. Scholarships could be redeemed at public, private, or religious schools-of-choice.

Publicly funded tuition scholarships: "scholarships" that offered parents options by providing publicly funded tuition scholarships for students. Usually the students involved were attending a failing school or living on low income. Scholarships could have been redeemed at private or public schools.

Tax credits or tax deductions: offers to parents eligible to claim tax credits or tax deductions on their state income taxes for specified education expenses, according to where they lived.

Terms (specifically for the State of North Carolina).

ABC's Accountability Model. The ABCs measured both student performance and growth through End of Grade exams (in grades 3 – 8) and End of Course tests (in grades 9 – 12).

House Bill 955. In 1996 the General Assembly ratified Chapter 731 House Bill 955, which allowed the opening of Charter Schools in North Carolina. Charter Schools were deregulated public schools and had more freedom and flexibility than regular public schools have through magnet status or waivers. The schools have had open enrollment with no discrimination, no religious associations, and no tuition. Often Charter Schools have been smaller than regular schools and have had a specific academic focus. The Charter Schools Advisory Committee assisted the State Board of Education in providing technical assistance to chartering entities or potential applicants and the overseeing of the

review of the educational effectiveness of Charter Schools. The State Board has had the final decision on granting Charters, but the Board has been limited by law to approving no more than 100 Charter Schools statewide, with an additional stipulation that the Board not approve more than five Charter Schools per local school district per year. By 2006, all 100 of the available Charters had been granted, and it has been expected that the General Assembly will eventually authorize additional Charter School.

Summary

Overview. The researcher of this current study, titled "A Study To Examine the Perceptions of North Carolina Superintendents Regarding Charter Schools," has summarized the goals of this research in this chapter (Chapter I, see above).

Outlook: The Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of North Carolina Superintendents regarding Charter Schools.

Chapter II, which follows, will include a review of the related literature.

Chapter II

Review of Related Literature

In order for American students to remain competitive in a changing world, education must be in a continuous state of reform. As the need for change in education has surfaced, one such reform devised to meet the various challenges is the Charter School. Movement toward this current reform exists today because of the public's dissatisfaction with public education. By definition, Charter Schools are publicly funded schools permitted to operate autonomously and free from many of the regulations other public schools must follow. This flexibility is awarded as part of a contract, or charter, with an authorizing agency that holds the school accountable for achieving its outlined charter goals, including supporting student achievement, within a certain period of time (Detrich, Phillips, & Durrett, 2002).

There are six major sections discussed in this chapter. The first section contains an overview of national school reforms. North Carolina school reforms have been reviewed in the second section. A discussion of the development of Charter Schools on the national level has been presented in section three. Section four has reviewed the progress of North Carolina Charter Schools. In the fifth section, the superintendent's role has been explored and followed by the superintendent's role as it relates to the implementing and sustaining of reforms; specifically in Charter Schools. The sixth

section has focused on the conceptual framework of the study. A summary of the literature review has been presented in the final section.

National School Reforms

This section presents an overview of the three eras of educational reforms by Bachrach (1990). The first wave, called the era of the 1960s, was identified as an intensification of the current system. Unlike the first wave, the second wave, 1970s- 80s, attempted to invent or “restructure schools.” Also, several reports were included during this wave, which brought the nation’s attention to the need for educational reforms; four of the reports ("The High School," "Action for Excellence," "A Nation at Risk," and "The Carnegie Forum") have been discussed in this section, with the third wave focusing on choice and on calls for more challenging standards for learning. School choice has been discussed, along with its benefits. This section ends with a review of state-level school reform.

The first wave of school reforms. During the 1960s, the first wave, the public emphasis was placed on making students work harder instead of changing the fundamental nature of the educational system. As a result, academic standards for students, and standards for teachers were raised. Congress also passed the *National Defense Education Act*, in 1958, which increased federal aid to education. Funds were provided for federal student-loan programs, graduate fellowships in the sciences and engineering, teacher education, capital construction, and a surge of funds for curriculum development in the sciences, math, and foreign languages (Elmore, 1997; Findell, 1996).

According to Evans (1996), during this period, questions rose about schools' structures, missions, standards and methods. However, these standards were viewed as a failure (Cuban, 1990; Fullan, 1991; Sarason, 1990; Sizer, 1985). The error made by the federal government and universities was to attempt to "fix" what was wrong inside the schools without considering the beliefs or assumptions of school personnel. Scholars like John Goodlad and Seymour Sarason questioned the adoption of certain innovations and challenged the lack of follow-through (Fullan, 1991).

The second wave of school reforms. Restructuring of schools was the focus in the second wave. During the 1970s – 1990s, efforts moved to concerns with accountability and implementation (Dufour & Eaker, 1992). During this time, emphasis was placed on how students were being taught and how to assess students and teachers (Jurich, 1996). Top-down improvement efforts including the 1975 *Public Law 94 - 142*, which called for inclusion of handicapped children, were also implemented. In addition, this period focused on teachers. It addressed issues involving teacher empowerment, improving the working conditions for staff, and site-based management.

Several reports during the 80s have greatly influenced the creating of reforms to meet societal needs. A call for the "nation's high schools to serve their students more effectively and regain public confidence and support" appeared in a study, "The High School," by Boyer (1983). As a result of the study, twelve priorities for high schools to be successful were developed. In 1983, the *Action for Excellence Report* and *A Nation at Risk* played an active role in the progress of educational reform. Each state and district was expected to develop plans for improving education in the public schools, kindergarten to twelfth grade in the *Action for Excellence Report* (Brown, 1983). As a

result of the report, *A Nation at Risk*, quality teaching, examining of college admissions requirements, identifying educational programs that promote student success in college, assessing student's achievement in high schools, and assessing the effect of major social changes on student achievement were addressed (National Commission of Excellence in Education, 1983).

The "Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy" (1986) served as a blueprint for the second wave of reform. This report included six changes: (a) restructure schools to provide a professional environment; (b) restructure the nature of the teaching force; (c) revise the recruitment, education, and induction of teachers; (e) make salaries and opportunities market-competitive; (e) relate incentives to school-wide performance; and (f) provide technology, services, and staff needed for teacher productivity.

Following the "Carnegie Forum," in 1987, the National Governors' Association demanded that states "assume larger responsibilities for setting educational goals and defining outcomes standards" (Department of Education, 1987).

The third wave. This era brought changes to the fundamental organization and management of schools. School choice consisted of a variety of options: Charter Schools, magnet schools, district and state open-enrollment plans to publicly and privately finance voucher plans, virtual schools, and dual enrollment. Two arguments about why greater school choice would result in better educational outcomes included: (a) greater school choice could allow schools to better tailor their programs to attract students with particular interests or learning styles, thus providing a better match for students' unique educational needs; and (b) greater school choice would break the public school educational monopoly and force schools to compete for students in an educational

marketplace in which “good” schools would prosper and “bad” schools would improve or be forced to shut down (Goldhaber, 1999).

In 2003, 12.5 million children attended schools other than their assigned public schools. Between 1993 and 2003, the percentage of students in grades 1–12 choosing to attend a public school other than their assigned public school increased by 4% (from 11% to 15%). The percentage of students attending private schools also increased during this period (U.S. Department of Education, 2003).

Research from the 2003-2004 school year showed that approximately 20,000 schools did not meet expectations for adequate yearly progress and more than 11,000 schools failed to meet adequate yearly progress targets for two consecutive years (*Education Week Research Center, 2005*). In addition, nationwide, 2003 results showed that only 71% of our ninth-graders graduated from high school, and a third of our high school graduates who continued to postsecondary education were required to take remedial courses (*U.S. Department of Education, 2003*). As a result of these findings, U.S. governors and policymakers became concerned that current schools had not been meeting the needs of students, and therefore there was a serious necessity to provide families and students with a greater choice in education options.

Choice programs can address state education goals in the following seven ways:

1. Improve academic achievement and increase graduation rates (Kolderie, 2004).
2. Provide options for students who attend schools identified as “in need of improvement.”

3. Encourage innovation across the system. By permitting educators to design and implement best practices, new approaches and successful innovations can be shared and utilized to educate students (Ericson, Silverman, Berman, Nelson, Debra Solomon, 2001).
4. Satisfy parental demands for options. Parents are more satisfied with a school, when they are given the opportunity to choose the best school for their children (Bielick, S. & Chapman, C., 2003).
5. Create an environment that encourages all education providers to improve.
6. Prepare students for postsecondary education.
7. Reduce segregation by race and income.

Many benefits are offered from the array of options presented by choice. For example, magnet schools offer specialized education (e.g., mathematics, science, technology, or the arts). Under the dual-enrollment program, students attend all or part of their academic program at a postsecondary institution and receive both high school and college credit. Virtual Schools use the Internet and computer technology to broaden education options for students. Such programs expand course offerings to students in rural areas, grant degrees, provide a student's entire education, and offer more advanced coursework. In addition, Charter Schools offer smaller class sizes, innovative approaches/instructional practices, and increased parental involvement.

State-level reform. In 2006, the dominant state-level strategy was standards-driven. In 2001, according to Lashway (2001), state policy makers believed that the reform package (performance standards, systematic testing, and consequences for results)

would stimulate teachers and students to focus efforts in the right direction. Because of this thinking, the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* was authorized. The new federal rules extend the state standards and assessments by requiring that “states have all students attain 100 % proficiency by 2014.” The Act also requires that states focus on challenging academic standards in reading, math, and science, and guarantee a highly qualified teacher in every classroom. Although all schools and districts are subject to "No Child Left Behind" (NCLB) goals and reporting requirements, only schools or districts receiving Title I federal funds are subject to specific requirements for corrective action (*Learning First Alliance*, 2003).

North Carolina School Reforms (A Historical "Timeline")

In a historical sort of "timeline" of North Carolina reforms, major reforms, as cited, will include the following periods: 1940s – 1960s, 1970’s – 90’s, and the early 2000s. Each reform has served as a forerunner to current reforms. They have played an active role in the shaping and influencing of school construction, student and teacher accountability, educational opportunities, empowerment for students, teachers, and parents, and the restructuring of the Department of Public Instruction.

The 1940s – 60s. Public education is a function of state and local government. North Carolina education received a boost after the Depression, as several changes took place during the 1940s. Changes included the establishing of a State Board of Education, providing textbooks free of charge to students in grades 1st through 7th, creating a retirement plan for state employees, and the General Assembly’s authorizing of the first state bond revenue for public school construction (Peek, 2000). These changes laid the

foundation for the following reforms in the 1950s and 60s. The following reforms greatly influenced the progress of education: the passage of the *National Civil Rights Act of 1964*, establishment of the community college system, the researching programs for gifted students (Governor's School) and a school for students with learning difficulties, the Learning Institute of North Carolina, increasing federal funding, and the creating of a blue ribbon study. Each of the above played a vital role in the progress of school reform.

The 70s – 90. As a result of concerns regarding school accountability during the 70s, legislation requiring statewide testing programs was implemented. One statute required that each student make a minimum score on a statewide competency test before graduating from high school, whereas another statute required that students in grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 9) be given a given a standardized test annually, selected by the State Board of Education. Two testing commissions were also appointed to advise the State Board of Education regarding the implementing of the statues (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 2001).

Also, during this time, educational opportunities for the handicapped became available. *Public Law 94-142* placed strict requirements on local boards of education with regard to the use of funds. At the state level, the *Creech Bill* required that each local Board of Education provide a free and appropriate educational opportunity to every child between the ages of 5 and 18, regardless of his or her handicap and the cost of the program. Prior to 1974, a handicapped student could be refused admittance to public school, if the school administrators determined that the child would not benefit from the programs (Peek, 2000). In 1979, the General Assembly removed supervisory authority from the State Board of Education of non-public schools. As a result of the legislation,

home schooling expanded. This ruling continued until the courts ruled, in 1985, that the North Carolina statute did not prohibit home instruction as an alternate means of complying with the Act. North Carolina could prohibit home instruction altogether, or could permit home instruction with regulations (Helder, 2001).

Educational reforms were further supported by the report, “A Nation at Risk” (1983). Many reforms that developed from this report currently exist. High school diploma requirements were raised, beginning with the class of 1987. The State Board of Education also approved the *North Carolina Scholars Program* in March 1983, which encouraged students to take a challenging curriculum of 22 units (Peek, 2000). During the mid 1980s, many school improvement efforts were implemented in North Carolina. In 1985, the General Assembly passed legislation directing the State Board of Education to adopt a basic education program. The projected \$800 million cost of *The Basic Education Program* included allocations for dropout prevention, summer school, and additional teachers, so as to lower class sizes and meet the needs of the broadened curriculum, textbooks, funds for supporting positions such as school psychologists and counselors, and other important components. However, concerns with the expense of the program surfaced due to: (a) the recession in the early 1990s, and (b) lack of the program’s accountability, and other pertinent factors. Despite the reasons supporting the ending of the BEP, the program did provide resources that are currently used (NC Department of Public Instruction, 2001).

The School Improvement and Accountability Act. As a result of national studies that supported the belief that school restructuring should be a local effort, the General

Assembly approved the *School Improvement and Accountability Act* in 1989. This Act charged local schools and school systems with creating local school improvement plans that included measurable milestones and goals (Holdzkom & Kuligowski, 1991).

The End-of-Grade tests. The first End-of-Grade Tests (EOG) were also developed by the Department of Public Instruction and given to students in grades 3 through 8, in 1993. These tests were intended to measure a student's learning in reading and math. The "North Carolina Writing Test" was given in 1983-84 to 6th and 9th grade students. In 1995-1996, the writing test grade levels shifted from testing students in grades 6 and 9 to students in grades 4 and 7. This shift in the testing level (4th and 7th graders) is still currently used. Along with the end-of-course tests for high school courses, an accountability system for grades 3-12 was also developed (Peek, 2000).

The ABCs. In 1996, the North Carolina General Assembly approved laws to give the State Board of Education authority to implement a comprehensive plan, the "ABCs," to improve public schools. The "ABC" model provides yearly information (school by school) on how successfully schools are meeting or exceeding their growth/gain goals for student achievement. Dr. Michael E. Ward, State Superintendent, and the General Assembly approved a Charter School law that authorized the creating of up to 100 Charter Schools in the state. Under Dr. Ward's administration, previous reforms were aligned. The plan was known as "The ABCs Plus: North Carolina's Strategic Plan for Excellent Schools." High student performance; safe, orderly and caring schools; quality teachers, administrators and staff; strong family, community and business support; and efficient and effective operations are the major components of the plan (Peek, 2000).

The Excellent Schools Act. The Excellent Schools Act (1997), raised teacher salaries to the national average, increased accountability, provided mentors for new teachers over a two year period, strengthened evaluations and dismissal procedures to terminate poor teachers, and encouraged teachers' pursuing of certification from the *National Board of Professional Teaching Standards* (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 2000). In 1999, North Carolinians elected James B. Hunt Jr. Governor for a third term. Governor Hunt had been directly involved with North Carolina's school reform. During his term as Lieutenant Governor from 1973 through 1977, he made kindergarten available to every North Carolina child. As Governor (1977 – 1985), he set up the primary reading program, which provided an assistant in each classroom (grades 1-3). Other benefits under Hunt's administration included a reduction of class size, creation of dropout prevention programs and the establishing of the *North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics*, a tuition-free high school for exceptionally gifted science and math students. The school is the first of its kind in the nation (*The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education*, 1998).

The early 2000s. In 2000, the Department of Public Instruction was completely restructured and reduced to 485 positions. Its budget was also cut by 40%, and funds that had supported regional education centers were directed to local school districts. This change was made to permit local school districts to build staff development and fulfill other needs specific to their area. The General Assembly also modified the duties and powers of the State Superintendent during this time. Decisions made by the State Superintendent were subject to the approval of the State Board of Education (North Carolina *Department of Public Instruction*, 2001).

Student Accountability Standards. Student Accountability Standards (2001), a statewide promotion standard, required students to perform at grade level on the EOG tests before promotion to the next grade. Students not meeting the requirements were permitted to be retested, receive interventions, and have a panel of educators, review documentation, before the principal made a final decision regarding promotion or retention. This process for promotion was also implemented in grades 3-8 in 2002 and in 2005 for high school students (Armistead, Armistead, & Breckheimer, 2001).

Another major emphasis in 2000 was the closing of the achievement gaps existing between different groups of students, and finding ways to help low-performing schools. This gap was significantly shown when students were grouped by race. African American students, American Indian students and Hispanic students did not score as well as white students did. Results from 2000 testing indicated that there was a 30-point gap between scores of minority and white students. Overall, 80% of white students have been scoring at or above grade level on *EOG* tests, whereas slightly more than only 50% of minority students have been scoring that high. In the fall of 2000, various strategies at the state level were implemented, including the forming of an "Advisory Commission in Raising Achievement and Closing the Gap," and conducting of yearly conferences (Peek, 2000).

History of United States Charter Schools

“Charter Schools are a powerful tool to provide communities, schools and teachers the maximum flexibility to give students more opportunity to reach high standards of achievement, to improve teaching and learning in our schools.” (President Clinton, *News & Observer*, 1996)

Following through on the "timeline," this chapter, Related Literature, has found it appropriate to begin a discussion of the development of Charter Schools on the national level, the term's definition, the noting of significant players, and an examination of the growth of Charter Schools, followed by accountability, and equity. Each component demonstrates the impact of Charter Schools.

Charter School concept. Charter Schools play an active role in getting parents and educators to rethink many educational issues. Ray Budde, an expert on school district organization, introduced the Charter School concept. In his book, *Education by Charter: Restructuring School Districts* (1988), Budde described the Charter School as a school-within-a-school, operated independently by teachers who sign an Educational Charter with their school board. The state or local school board grants a Charter to the school for three to five years. An educational plan for the school specifies the expected educational outcomes, contains a description of how to measure outcomes, and provides details of how the school will comply with state requirements (Amsler & Mulholland, 1992).

Although Budde created the idea in a paper written in 1974, "Education by Charter," the charter idea was not recognized until the publishing of *The Nation At Risk*. Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers' Union, furthered the charter initiative by supporting the idea of teachers setting up autonomous schools (Kolderie, 2005).

Some Charter School characteristics. According to Hill, Celio, Campbell, Herdman, and Bulkley (2001), Charter Schools are tuition-free public schools, freed from regulation in exchange for greater accountability. Charter Schools are accountable to the

authorizer granting the Charter. Charter Schools must implement their Charter and show student learning. Charter Schools are also accountable to parents and teachers for student performance, instruction, and school climate. “Beyond that, no single generalization about Charter School’s accountability is likely to apply, because of the diversity afforded in Charter Contracts that vary from state to state and Charter to Charter” (Hill, Lake, Celio, Campbell, Herdman, & Bulkley, 2001). The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (1993) provides the definition of Charter Schools as being legally independent, innovative, outcome-based, public schools with several common characteristics: (a) legislatively authorized; (b) teacher or individual initiated; (c) required to follow state guidelines; (d) tuition-free; (e) not set up as magnet schools; (f) outcome-based; (g) designed as models for change; (h) able to receive waiver from their state; and (i) able to receive revenue.

Additional characteristics. There are, however, some additional observations that can be made about Charter Schools. They tend to be smaller than traditional public schools (fewer than 200 students), are generally newly created schools rather than schools that were converted from traditional public schools, are more racially diverse, and enroll slightly fewer students with special education and limited-English-proficiency needs than the average public school in their state (Education Commission of the States, 1997).

Data from "Edsource" (2005-2006) showed that 18% of Charter Schools were conversion schools (a converted public school), and 82% were start-up schools (a school established as a Charter School). Data also showed that 87% of Charter Schools used classroom-based instruction and 13% non-classroom based instructions (including independent study and computer-based learning).

Charter School growth. During an Itasca Seminar in Minnesota on October, 1988, Shanker presented the Charter idea. Two legislators from Minnesota, State Senator Reichgott and Representative Nelson provided support for the idea by creating legislation. Although Senator Reichgott's charter provision reached the Senate in 1989 and 1990, the House did not accept it. In 1991, Senator Reichgott and Representative Nelson managed to move a compromised version of the Charter Bill through the House. Governor Carlson, of Minnesota, signed the Bill after reaching an agreement with the Senate (Kolderie, 2005). The passage of this legislation made Minnesota the first state to put the Charter idea into practice. California followed Minnesota in 1992, and by the end of 1993, six other states had passed a Charter Bill (Bierlein & Mulholland, 1994). By 1995, 19 states had passed the legislation, and by 2003, the number had increased to 40 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

In President Clinton's 1997 State of the Union Address, he expressed hope that 3,000 Charter Schools would be created by the year 2002. He persuaded Congress to increase funding for Charter Schools by \$51 million. In the 1998 fiscal budget, he included \$ 100 million to support 2,500 Charter Schools. President Bush further supported Charter Schools in 2002, by proposing \$200 million to support Charter Schools, and an additional \$100 million to be added to the budget for enhancing Charter School facilities ("Credit Enhancement for Charter Schools Facilities Program"). Since 1994, grants have been provided by the U. S. Department of Education to states, to support Charter Schools.

As of September 2006, there were approximately 4,000 Charter Schools in the United States. During the 2005-2006 academic year, there was an increase of 13% in the

number of Charter Schools. This increase represented the opening of 424 new Charter Schools (*The Center for Education Reform, 2005*). Currently, Charter Schools are located in 40 states and the District of Columbia (Appendix C). As of the beginning of this year (2006), eight states have reached the number of Charter Schools permitted (Ziebarth, 2006). The continued growth of Charter Schools will be affected, if legislation remains the same

Legislation. States vary in the granting of Charters and the length of time Charter Schools are permitted to operate. For example, in Minnesota, an unlimited number of Charter Schools can operate, and the approval authorizing agencies include: local school boards; public post-secondary institutions; private colleges and cooperatives. Districts working in conjunction with all are subject to the State Board of Education's approval. North Carolina allows 100 Charter Schools (five per school district) per year, with the State Board of Education being the ultimate authority agency. Another state, Utah, has an unlimited number of Charters authorized by local school boards—a cap of 32 for schools chartered by the State Charter Board, plus 8 new schools per year; and 6 additional Charter Schools that focus on math, science, and technology, which are not part of the cap (*The Center for Education Reform, 2005*). Although most states limit the term of a Charter School to a few years (3-5), the Utah contracts can be renewed without term-limits.

Several studies, including Buddin and Zimmer (2005), showed that there is a correlation between the success of Charter Schools and the strength of their Charter legislation. The Center for Education Reform grades states (grades A-F) according to the strength of Charter School legislation. Legislation is rated according to 10 criteria.

Criteria include: (a) the number of schools; (b) multiple chartering authorities / binding appeals process; (c) variety of applicants; (d) new starts; (e) permission for schools to start without third-party consent; (f) automatic waiver from laws and regulations; (g) legal operational autonomy; (h) guaranteed full funding; (i) fiscal autonomy; and (j) exemption from collective bargaining agreements and district work rules: (*The Center for Education Reform*, 2004, p.115). The scorecard (2006) rates states such as Arizona, California, the District of Columbia, and Minnesota with an “A” rating, whereas Iowa and Mississippi received an “F,” due to weak Charter School laws (Appendix D).

Accountability. Hoxby (2004) compared the reading and mathematics proficiency of .S. Charter School 4th grade students with students attending traditional public schools. She matched the Charter School students with the students in the school the Charter School students would have attended. Findings showed: that Charter School students were 5.2% more likely to be proficient in reading and 3.2% more likely to be proficient in math on their state’s exams, and that the longevity of Charter Schools increases the percentage (e.g., schools operating 1-4 years received a 2.5% increase, 5-8 years received a 5.2% increase, and 9-11 years received a 10.1 % increase). Findings also showed that achievement of disadvantaged students was most likely to be raised in Charter Schools and that strong Charter School laws reflected a proficiency advantage (school autonomy and funding of at least 40% of the total per-pupil funding of regular public schools were necessary). States (e.g., Arizona and Colorado) with strong Charter laws showed a larger percentage of their students performing better on state tests. Ten percent of students attending Charter School in Arizona were more likely to be proficient in reading and math than students in the matched regular public schools, and in Colorado,

the Charter School students' proficiency advantage was of 12% in reading and 14% in math.

Another study conducted by Greene, Forster, and Winters (2003) measured test scores of Charter Schools and regular public schools serving similar student populations. Test score improvements in 11 states over a period of a year were measured. Results showed that Charter Schools serving the general student population outperformed nearby regular public schools on math tests by 3 percentile points and on reading tests by 2 percentile points. Two states, Florida and Texas, showed the most improvement of the states in the study. Charter Schools in Texas achieved 7 percentile points on reading and 8 percentile points in math. Florida's Charter School's reading and math scores were 6 percentile points greater than those of nearby regular public schools, equivalent to a gain of 6 percentile points. Funnigan et al (2004) data from Colorado, Illinois, Massachusetts, North Carolina, and Texas showed that more than half of the Charter Schools in these states were meeting state performance standards in 2001-02. Although the findings were inconclusive; the researchers noted that their results "were not indicative of the impact of Charter Schools on student achievement." In California, Buddin and Zimmer (2005) found significant differences in the performance of students attending different types of Charter Schools. Researchers found that non-classroom based schools pulled down the average test scores for both startup and converted schools. This data was disturbing, because innovative programs such as distant learning, computer-based instruction, and the incorporation of think tanks are used in Charter Schools.

Earlier studies by Hanushek, Kain, and Rivkins (2002) tended to imply that Charter Schools impact achievement. In this study, findings demonstrated that students

in state-sponsored Charter Schools showed smaller test score gains than they would have shown had they remained in their district schools. However, as Charter Schools gained more operating experience, the negative effects lessened. Gronberg and Jansen (2001) found that students in Charter Schools serving mostly at-risk students, made slightly larger gains than the average student in a traditional school; and findings in the study by Solomon, Paark, and Garcia (2001) showed that students enrolled in Arizona Charter Schools for two or more consecutive years made larger gains on standardized tests in reading than students attending traditional public schools did.

Equity in financial funding. The inequity in funding continues to be a concern between Charter Schools and traditional public schools. Studies continue to show that significant disparity exists. In the study of Speakman and Hassell (2005), using data (2002-2003) the results showed that Charter Schools received less per pupil funding than did traditional public schools. The difference in the funds in New Mexico ranged from 4.8% to 39.5%. When this percentage was calculated in dollars, Charter Schools received \$414 less per pupil in North Carolina and \$3,638 less per pupil in Missouri. Minnesota was the only state that received more funding per pupil than did traditional public schools. In addition, the researchers found that funding discrepancies were even wider in most big urban school districts, the chief culprit being that Charter Schools' lack of access to local and capital funding, and quality data were often unavailable. In New York City, the difference between Charter School resources and traditional public school expenditures ranged from \$600 to close to \$8,000 per pupil, depending on the students being served. Other states also found themselves receiving lesser funds than the regular public schools in their districts. For example, state funding in San Fernando, California,

provided \$3,111 per pupil; however, Charter Schools received \$2300— a difference of \$811 per student. Idaho’s formula allowed Charter Schools to receive more state funds than district schools received; however, because Charter Schools did not receive local funds, they operated with lesser funds--60-70% of the cost of the traditional public schools.

A study conducted by the *Legislative Office of Education Oversight* (2004) used a questionnaire in 35 states, including the District of Columbia, to study funding methods and the levels of funding. Using 2002-2003 data, researchers found that no two states funded their Charter Schools the same way, and that some states used several different funding methods for different types of Charter Schools. However, in most states, 17 out of 26 used the same per-pupil funding method for both traditional and Charter Schools. Charter Schools also had access to state, federal, and private revenues. According to the levels of funding results, it was concluded (a) that Charter Schools: received lower levels of per-pupil operating revenue (\$1,300) than did traditional public schools; (b) that many Charter Schools used operating funds to acquire facilities, and (c) that Charter Schools received higher levels of federal funding than did traditional public schools. Among other factors that impacted the funding levels were whether Charter Schools received local tax revenue, the number of students requiring a higher cost (special or vocation), the amount of federal discretionary grant funds they received, and whether or not transportation was required.

North Carolina Charter Schools

Several trends including accountability, deregulation, restructuring, private school vouchers, and public school choice have laid the foundation for the Charter School movement (Buechler, 1996). This section reviews the progress of North Carolina Charter Schools by examining school choice, Charter School laws, accountability and re-assessment procedures, equity, the remedying of imbalance concerns, and innovative practices.

School choice. School choice in North Carolina is limited. Findings in Palasek's (2003) research showed that only seven school districts in the state allowed parents to choose schools under an "open enrollment" plan (a plan that permitted parents to specify their public school preference, but did not permit students to live outside the borders of their residential school district). Other choices included magnet schools in nine districts and Charter Schools in 42 counties. According to Palasek, 43% of open enrollment options were located in metropolitan areas or in the city (Asheville City, Avery, Cumberland, Forsyth, Kannapolis City, Lexington City, and Mecklenburg). Of all the 3rd to 8th grade students in North Carolina, about 67,000 or nearly 9% used the open enrollment option. The number of students attending magnet schools varied from the smallest enrollment of 104 students in Cabarrus County to 20,781 students in Forsyth County (Locke, 2006). Although Charter Schools appeared to be the most widespread option of school choice, because the schools were usually small, few seats were available.

Additional research by the North Carolina Education Alliance (2004) supports the following that Charter Schools: (1) gives parents the opportunity to choose the best school for their child, (2) provides schools with the opportunity to innovate, (3) offers

teachers the independence to customize curricula, (4) presents administrators with the freedom to make school management decisions without regulations and bureaucrats. Further research shown by Lucretia Peebles (2000) identified Charter Schools as an innovation that provides expanded opportunities for the nations' students and an educational reform that is supported by parents, the public, and policymakers.

Legislation. The *Charter School Act* of 1996 was passed on June 21, 1996 (NCSG 115C-238, 29.). Senator Web Gulley introduced this bill. It took the efforts of the house conference committee members, pro-family advocates, House Speaker Harold Brubaker, and Senate President Pro-Tempore Marc Basnight to influence its passage. During the summer session, Representative Steve Wood also played an active role in amending policies pertaining to pension benefits for teachers and admission policies.

The law has six guiding principles: (a) improve student learning; (b) increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are identified as at-risk of academic failure, or students academically gifted; (c) encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods; (d) create new professional opportunities for teachers, including the opportunities to be responsible for the learning program at the school site; (e) provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system (f) (under Part 6A) hold the schools established accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results, and provide the schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance-based accountability systems (Reg. Sess., 1996, c. 731, s. 2, 1995.).

Dated amendments. In 1998, the Charter School law was amended. At the time of this study's research (2006-07), the 1998-amended law allowed the operating of 100 Charter Schools; 5 per school district per year. Eligible applicants could be a person, group of persons, or non-profit corporation. Charter Schools could also be a new or converted public/private school.

There were five active players who determined how Charter Schools were regulated. Although the law identified several authorizers for Charter Schools (e.g., local districts, the Board of Regents of the University of North Carolina, and the State Board of Education), the State Board of Education *was* the ultimate authorizer. It approved all applications, renewals, revocations and policies. The State Board of Education created the North Carolina Charter School Advisory Committee, which reviewed new applications and charter renewals. The Committee also made recommendations to the State Board of Education for the approval or revoking of a Charter. The Department of Public Instruction handled the daily public education law, State Board of Education policies, and policy decisions regarding Charter Schools. It also administered 40% of the state's budget. The Office of Charter Schools implemented the applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

Charter Schools are situated at the intersection of where public and private education converges. Because Charter Schools have open enrollment and keep funding in the public school system, groups that oppose other types of school choice are supportive of Charter Schools. The Charter School Bill was endorsed by the State Board of Education, the North Carolina School Boards Association, and the Mecklenburg

County School Board, all of which opposed tax credits and school vouchers (Berryhill, 1996).

A Charter School was defined as a tuition-free public school created on the basis of a license or “charter” made with the State Board of Education or an institute of higher learning. Charter Schools were freed from many regulations placed upon traditional public schools, in return for a commitment to meet state standards of accountability. The General Assembly capped the number of Charter Schools statewide to 100, with an annual growth in the number of schools per district limited to 5. North Carolina legislation allowed any individual or group to apply for a Charter and did not require local district approval of a Charter application. A local district, the state university, or the State Board of Education could grant Charter Schools, but final approval for a Charter School had to come from the State Board of Education. In addition, Charter Schools received operating funding at the same level and were subject to the same testing requirements as traditional public schools. A transportation plan was also required to permit attendance of students from the school district (The Center for Education Reform, 2001).

A current report by The Center for Education Reform (“Raising the Bar: Charter School Law Ranking and Scorecard 2006”) ranked North Carolina Charter Law 15th among the nation’s 41 Charter Laws. The Center for Education Reform, a national organization that ranked states according to ten components produced a yearly in-depth analysis of each state’s Charter Law. In the year 2005, North Carolina ranked 12th. However, it was noted in the 2005 report by The Center for Education Reform that North Carolina might be marked down, due to almost reaching the cap on the number of Charter

Schools allowed by the General Assembly. North Carolina's Charter School Law was considered strong; because 100% of state and district operations funding followed students from the school district, the law granted automatic waivers from most regulations, and provided for created and converted (public/private) Charter Schools.

Amendment (2005). The Charter School Law was amended in 2005 to permit Charter Schools to acquire bonded indebtedness, a means to secure better facilities (Center for Reform, 2005).

Although North Carolina Charter Law received a "B" overall in a report, "The Report Card for Charter Authorizing," by the North Carolina League of Charter Schools (1995), the Charter Law received a "D" in support and external accountability for authorizers. Several Bills have been introduced to further the growth of Charter Schools. However, they have not been successful. Although House Bill 31 that was introduced to raise the cap on Charter Schools to 110 was passed in the House, there was no further action (Heritage Foundation, 2006). In May 2004, House Bill 1770, introduced by Representative Rex Baker, was not considered. This Bill would have matched federal funds with appropriated funds in the state reserve, to assist with facilities (General Assembly, 2003-2004).

Additional Bills presented during the 2005-2006 legislative session to expand the Charter School program were also defeated. Bill 213 introduced by Senator W. Edward Goodall would have removed the cap on Charter Schools and also permitted counties to levy property taxes to assist with operational and capital funds (General Assembly, Session 2005-2006). Senate Bill 490, the Charter Schools Managed Growth Act, sponsored by Senator Larry Shaw and Senator W. Edward Goodall, was defeated by not

being brought to the Senate floor. This Bill would have allowed 10 new Charter Schools to start up yearly (Welsh, 2005). In September 2006, the 100th Charter School was named, reaching the cap originally provided by the General Assembly. North Carolina is among seven other states (Connecticut, Hawaii, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Ohio and Rhode Island) that reached the cap in 2006 (Ziebarth, 2006). The 2006-2007 General Assembly was therefore faced with either raising the cap, such as other states had done, or preventing the growth of Charter Schools.

Nelson Smith, President of the National Alliance for Public Schools, noted that nationally, about 40% of Charter Schools have waiting lists averaging 135 students. He also stated “If we are to continue to close the achievement gap in this country and create real opportunity for children, caps on Charter Schools must be lifted—now” (Ziebarth, 2006). The Alliance for Public Schools (2006) recommended that state leaders examine authorizers and assist them in establishing rigorous procedures for the approval, funding, and renewal of Charter Schools. It also suggested that the following steps be taken to promote the growth of Charter Schools: (a) never cap quality schools and authorizers, (b) include sunset provisions, (c) make new charter laws free of limits and (d) make funding from the Federal Charter Schools Program contingent upon a cap-free state law.

Accountability. Policymakers have continued to utilize research in determining the need to increase the number of Charter Schools. To monitor the progress of the first 34 Charter Schools, the North Carolina General Assembly required a one-year assessment to be completed. As a result of the one-year report, the State Board of Education recommended that a three-year evaluation be conducted, because a year time-span was not sufficient to adequately evaluate Charter Schools (Cobb & Suarez, 2000).

Research by Norblit and Corbett (2001) was conducted and delivered to the State Legislature in January 2002. Findings from the report demonstrated: (a) that Charter Schools themselves were an innovation, (b) different schools served different types of students, (c) classes tended "to be substantially smaller than other public school classes"(the average student/teacher ratio was 15 to 1), (d) a higher percentage of minority students attended Charter Schools, (e) over half of the Charter Schools reported that 75% of parents played an active role in educating children, and (f) new educational approaches were limited, due to the accountability program. The researchers also noted that the following conditions needed to be considered as Charter Schools were assessed: (a) only a fraction of Charter Schools over a short period of time were studied; (b) Charter Schools' missions and structures were unique, which made it difficult to compare them to traditional public schools; and (c) Charter Schools were in the early stages of implementation (Simmons, 2001).

In an evaluation report by the North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research (2003), student performance on EOG tests (reading, math, and writing), the lack of racial balance, and fiscal management were the major concerns of Charter Schools. Test results of the 2000-2001 school year were used in the study and showed that Charter Schools were not performing as well as traditional public schools. Fifteen Charter Schools (19%) achieved exemplary growth; 7 Charter Schools (9%) received expected growth; 43 Charter Schools (55%) received no recognition; and 13 Charter Schools (17%) were identified as low performing. Unlike Charter Schools, traditional public schools achieved 24% exemplary growth, 36% received expected growth, and 39% obtained no recognition, and were deemed low performing. As shown in Table 1 (see below), Charter

Schools had made large gains in the area of writing. However, when compared to the state average test scores, the Charter Schools still lagged behind.

Table 1

Writing Scores (2000-2001)

Schools	4 th Grade	7 th Grade	10 th Grade
Charter	53.6 (36.2 previous year)	62.8 (55.2 previous year)	36.8 (23.4 previous year)
Traditional Public	68.8	73.3	53.9

Note: NCCPPR, 2003

In 2000-2001, however, four of the five top-performing schools on the state reading-exam were Charter Schools: Quest Academy, Raleigh Charter High School, Thomas Jefferson Classical Academy, and the Woods Charter School (America’s Charter School Finance Corporation, 2002).

An additional study, conducted by the Office of Charter Schools within the Department of Public Instruction, found that when the first year of test results of Charter Schools were excluded, Charter School students showed more academic growth than did students in traditional public schools. However, results showed that after a three- year period, students attending Charter Schools still remained behind students attending traditional public schools. Supporters of Charter Schools argued that the accountability program was inappropriate. The researchers stated that the study was limited to a small number of schools, that many Charter Schools served at-risk students, and that including test results of a Charter School’s first year's operation was unfair, due to start-up difficulties (NCCPPR, 2003).

Several studies defended individual Charter Schools or networks of Charter Schools (Andersen, 2002; Cross, Rebarber, & Wilson 2002; Brown & Roney, 2003; Fitzgerald 2003). A case study by Brown and Roney (2003) showed that The Carnegie Middle School, a public Charter School, was successful, because it had implemented the eight ingredients of a successful middle school. The ingredients included: (a) using Gardner's (1983) *Multiple Intelligences* and Holland's (1985) *Theory of Person-Environment Psychology*, when teaching curriculum and techniques; (b) ensuring success for all by using project presentations, exhibitions, demonstrations, and portfolios in addition to standardized testing; (c) empowering teachers and administrators to make decisions; (d) staffing middle grade schools with teachers who were experts at teaching young adolescents; (e) improving academic performance through fostering the health and fitness of young adolescents; (f) re-engaging families in the education of young adolescents; (g) connecting schools with communities; and (h) creating small communities for learning.

A (2003) study by the National Bureau of Economic Research noted that gains in achievement in North Carolina's traditional public schools were due specifically to the introduction and growth of the Charter School movement. The researchers (Holmes, DeSimone, & Rupp, 2003) found that traditional school performance was increased by about 1% (more than half of the average achievement gained in 1999-2000). Bifulco and Ladd (2004) compared reading and math achievement gains of nearly 6,000 students in grades (4-8) attending Charter Schools. A cohort of students over a period of 7 years (1996-2002) was used. Achievement gains of students attending Charter Schools and traditional public schools were compared. Findings showed that students in Charter

Schools were not performing as well as students attending traditional public schools. The researchers noted that one factor contributing to the low achievement gain was the high student turnover-rate. Charter School student turnover-rate on the average was twice the rate found in the traditional public schools. This result was consistent even for Charter Schools operating over a five-year period.

Although current research shows that Charter School students have not been making as much gains as students in traditional public schools did, some Charter Schools were performing well. The League of Charter Schools reported (2004-2005) that 25 Charter Schools received the title of “Honor School of Excellence” by the State Board of Education. These schools met their Adequate Yearly Progress goals and had a combined score on their North Carolina EOG reading and math tests of at least 90% of their students at or above grade level (see Appendix E). Statewide, only 22% of regular traditional schools earned this honor, whereas 29% of Charter Schools received this recognition. The North Carolina School Board also recognized 13 Charter Schools as “Schools of Distinction.” Schools receiving this honor have had at least 80% or more of their students scoring at or above grade level on their North Carolina EOG reading and math tests. The North Carolina League for Charter Schools gave an NCLB unofficial honor to three Charter Schools. These schools had 100% of their students at grade level on the EOG tests. One traditional public school also received this award.

Between 1997 and 2002, the State Board of Education has revoked 14 Charter Schools. Seven of the 14 Charter Schools voluntarily closed due to low enrollment or fiscal management (Manual, 2002). The state law required that Charter Schools reasonably reflected the racial make-up of the general population of their local school

districts; however, in the year 2000-2001, 30 of the 97 Charter Schools had student populations greater than 80% non-white. Also, 7 Charter Schools had *no* white students (NCDPI, 2002). As a result of the Centers' findings (NCCPPR, 2003), five recommendations were provided to assist policymakers regarding Charter Schools: that (a) the State cap of 100 Charter Schools be retained until five full years of data have been accumulated; (b) the State Board of Education not grant Charter Schools that have a narrow racial or ethnic population; (c) the General Assembly require Charter Schools to spend one year planning and preparing of finances before operating; and (d) the 2005 General Assembly, with adequate information, consider raising the cap and determining how much.

Equity. In North Carolina, one of the first issues regarding Charter Schools was the fear of “white-flight academies” that emerged in response to desegregation efforts of the 1970s. To prevent this possibility, North Carolina state policymakers inserted a diversity-clause that required the population of Charter Schools to reasonably reflect the racial and ethnic composition of the district or of the special population the school sought to serve within a year (Schnaiberg, L., 1998). Despite the diversity-clause, 13 of the 34 North Carolina Charter Schools that opened in 1997 were disproportionately African American when compared with their public school districts. Although about one-third of the students in North Carolina public schools were African American with almost half of the Charter School students reflecting the African American population (Schnaiberg, L., 1998).

Two North Carolina schools in particular tested the provision early: *Magellan*, located in Wake County, and *Healthy Start Academy* in Durham County (Bifulco &

Ladd, 2005). Although the North Carolina State Board approved *Magellan*, the school district's fear (which became a fact) was that the school's location would disproportionately serve Caucasian students.. In the case of *Healthy Start*, although the school's progress reflected a 98% attendance rate and significant growth in test scores on the Iowa Basic Test of Educational Skills (2nd graders moved from the 34th percentile to the 75th percentile; 1st graders moved from the 21st percentile to the 32nd percentile; and kindergartners moved from the 42nd percentile to the 99th percentile), closure was threatened for failure to meet the provision's guidelines (Murdock, 1998). With the help of the North Carolina Foundation for Individual Rights (NCFIR), a suit was filed, challenging the discriminatory practices required by the State. The charges against the school were that although educating 289 African American students, only 4 were Caucasian students (Anderson, 1998).

Additional research found in the Charter School Evaluation Report (2001) reflected that nearly two-thirds of North Carolina Charter Schools had enrollments that were racially homogeneous. Sixty-one of the 100 Charter Schools reflected a substantial racial imbalance in their enrollments: either greater than 80% white students or greater than 80% minority students. According to the 2000 Census, the city of Raleigh, North Carolina, was 56% Caucasian. However, Wake County in 2001 had 5 Charter Schools more than 80% Caucasian, and 2 other Charter Schools nearly entirely all white. Other Wake County Charter Schools had few if any Caucasian students. For example, the Charter School *SPARC Academy*, in Raleigh, had no Caucasian students enrolled in 2000-01. Table 2 (see below) shows other counties in (2001) with racial imbalance concerns similar to that of North Carolina's Wake County.

Table 2

Re-segregation of North Carolina Schools (Common Sense, 2001)

School	County	Caucasian	African American
Bethaney Middle	Rockingham	75	0
Harney Early Childhood	Harnett	0	102
Laurinburgh Charter	Scotland	1	89
Sallie B. Howard	Wilson	2	405

Bifulco and Ladd (2005) also found that race and family background played an important factor when Charter Schools were selected. Findings from their research showed that African American students attended regular schools in which: close to 70% of the students were African American; only 30% of their parents had a college education; and the average student's test score lagged behind one year. However, Caucasian students attending Charter Schools in which: we more than 80% of the students were non-black; 47% of their parents were college graduates; and the average student test scores were well above average. The researchers attributed the racial imbalance of Charter Schools to the location of the school, the school's mission of serving educationally disadvantaged students, or the providing of a specific curriculum such as the curriculum in *Haliwa Saponi Tribal School*, which emphasized Native American culture.

Findings by Brown (1999) revealed that North Carolina Charter Schools appeared to be satisfied with the racial and ethnic population of their students. As a result, it was difficult for the legislature to enforce the North Carolina Charter School statute that

required the population of Charter Schools to reasonably reflect the racial and ethnic composition of the population of the general population within the district. To remedy racial imbalance concerns, the state authorized the Charter School Advisory Committee to evaluate the racial imbalance in Charter Schools and to decide appropriate steps to be taken, if necessary. Also North Carolina State legislators introduced a Bill to amend the strict racial balance requirement of the Charter School law, replacing it with a “good faith effort” by Charter Schools to promote racial diversity (Schnaiberg, L., 1998).

Innovative practices. According to the North Carolina Office of Charter Schools, there are over 27, 000 students attending Charter Schools (2006-2007). A policy report published by the North Carolina Education Alliance, *Charter Schools in North Carolina: Innovation in Education*, cited several innovative practices used in Charter Schools, and identified obstacles that Charter Schools continued to encounter. Key highlights of success included the innovative practices used in various North Carolina Charter Schools, such as the *KIPP Gaston College Preparatory*, the *Haliwa Saponi Tribal School*, the *Sallie B. Howard School*, and the *John H. Baker School*. Each of these Charter Schools provided unique experiences for students.

The students at North Carolina Charter School *KIPP Gaston College Preparatory* spent a considerable amount of time on task. Students attended school Monday through Thursday (8am-5pm), and Fridays (8am-4pm), alternate Saturdays (9am-1pm); they attended a free drama and science camp for two weeks in July. Culture was woven into the curriculum at the North Carolina Charter School, *Haliwa Saponi Tribal School*. The construction of a Native American shirt was a prime example of how the school intertwined culture into the curriculum. Math, art, and social studies were correlated by

the construction of the Native American shirt. Math and art incorporate symmetry in design and social studies highlighted tribal uniqueness. As a result of these culturally enriching activities, a second grader could look at a shirt and determine the name of the tribe, location, and history, and then participate in a Pow-Wow at the end of the year.

The North Carolina Charter School *Sallie B. Howard School* used a project-based curriculum emphasizing research. The school also provided English classes on the weekends, for parents and community members. One third of the school's population is Hispanic. Adult students who were incarcerated could keep up with education by attending the North Carolina *John H. Baker Charter School*. They could also earn GEDs or trade, through a partnership with a community college, *Wake Technical Community College*. There were also two off-site campuses provided to serve students serving long-term suspensions. Although many researchers believed that Charter Schools promoted innovative practices, Mintrom (2000) found that Charter Schools implemented innovative practices and techniques minimally, and that many of the practices that Charter Schools utilized were similar to those used in traditional public schools.

Earlier studies by Horn and Miron (1999) and Reynolds (2000) came to similar conclusions. Results showed that innovation did occur in the organization and governance of Charter Schools. However, research on Charter School innovation suggested that parents desired a back-to-basics or "retrovention" approach, instead of innovation (Miron and Nelson, 2002). In the study by Miron and Nelson (2002), 96% of Georgia Charter School parents indicated the "school's emphasis on basic skills (reading, writing, math)" was either important or very important to them.

Leadership Role of the School Superintendent

“Schools will be led for better or for worse by school leaders. One of the major reasons why schools don’t change much is that change needs new leadership. Schools need committed intelligent leadership, an agenda, an awareness of the conditions that have to be put in place, and a grasp of the strategies that one has to use to effect change.”

Goodlad, (2000)

The historical perspective on the superintendent’s role in reform and his or her role as it relates to the implementing and sustaining of Charter Schools will be reviewed at this point in chapter II, followed by the conceptual framework, and a summary of the literature review.

Superintendent’s role. Traditionally, leaders have acted as gatekeepers for reform policies, with the implementing of policies effectively depending upon how the administrator chooses to handle mandates (Massell & Goertz, 1999). According to McLaughlin (1987), it was clear that district leaders could be “most crucial in the early stages of reform, given the resistance to change inherent in the system and the need to quickly and effectively marshal support, pressure, and resources to successfully introduce reforms.” Glass (2000) questionnaire of school superintendents found that 40% of the superintendents thought that they were hired for personal characteristics, 26% viewed themselves as a change agent, and 26% as an instructional leader.

Various studies have shown that it was essential that school superintendents were involved in the maintaining of momentum for the initial implementing and sustaining of reforms. Fuhman, Clune, and Elmore (1988) found that proactive school districts’ intervention in interpreting and implementing state policies furthered the districts’ priorities for change and improvements. Findings by Spillane (1996 and 1998) supported

the research of Furhman, Clune, and Elmore. Spillane's analysis demonstrated that school district personnel greatly influenced the kinds of instructional programs favored and the degree of confusion or coherence in guiding the implementation of reforms.

Another study, Elmore (1997), demonstrated how the district leader involvement influenced a positive force for change. Their analysis of Superintendent Anthony Alvarado's efforts to turn New York City Community School District #2 from an average school district into one of the highest-performing elementary school districts in the city demonstrated the integral role that superintendents played in the three stages of implementing reform. Senge (2001) stated, "sooner or later, executive leadership becomes crucial, especially in sustaining change that can have organizational impact. The real role of executive leadership is not in "driving people to change, but in creating organizational environments that inspire, support, and leverage the imagination and initiative that exists at all levels." Barkley and Castle (1993) found that leadership must be present, if systemic reform was to succeed. Research demonstrated the significant role that superintendents played in interpreting, implementing, and sustaining of reforms.

Research by Hassel, Fullwood, Terrell, and Schroeder (2004) showed that superintendents played significant roles in the implementing and sustaining of Charter Schools. For example, in the Chula Vista Elementary School District located between San Diego and Tijuana, Mexico, Superintendent Gil created a vision for Charter Schools as test sites for learning. As a result of her efforts, gains in student achievement have been sustained, parental involvement has increased, and data has been collected regularly to analyze and monitor patterns. Another superintendent, William Andrekopoulos, from Milwaukee, advocated the reorganization of high schools. His vision, called the New

Vision Initiative, promoted collaboration between students and teachers, encouraged the taking of rigorous courses, and the development of community partnerships. The vision initiative also strengthened the relationship between the district and Charter Schools. District-owned buildings were leased to Charter School operators, the piloting of a second campus for Chartered Schools, and the approval of Charter Schools demonstrated the efforts of the school district to assist the implementing of Charter Schools.

Conceptual framework. The researcher of this study used a conceptual framework derived from Schlechty (1990). This framework suggested that five functions must be fulfilled for change to occur. The five functions were: (a) the concept of change must be determined, (b) people who were going to be called on to support the change, but were not involved in the conceptualization process, had to be aware of the change, (c) feedback from those who were not involved in the initial conceptualization but who would be called on for support had to be solicited, and where possible and appropriate, incorporated into the change process, (d) activity to implement the change had to begin and people had to be motivated to act in directions indicated by the change, and (e) a system of ongoing support and training had to be provided for those who were being asked to support the change. In this study, the feedback component was utilized to examine superintendents' perceptions.

Summary: Research Showed the Following

The Researched History. The Charter School, an educational reform, was introduced nationally in 1991, by the Sate of Minnesota. In North Carolina, the first Charter Schools

were opened in 1996. As shown through limited research, superintendents play a vital role in interpreting, implementing, and sustaining of reforms.

As an educational reform, Charter Schools were created to meet the public, policymakers', and parents' demand for change in public schools. Because schools were small, findings in research noted that the educational environment was similar to a community. The independence provided for Charter Schools permitted them to utilize innovative practices, partner with businesses, and implement approaches and programs that supported instruction. Parents were also actively involved in many aspects of the school. They served as board members, tutored students, chaperoned field trips, and took part in various other school-related jobs. Many schools required volunteer hours from parents. Although there were numerous success stories that demonstrated public schools' effectiveness of meeting the needs of children, the personalized education that Charter Schools provided attracts parents and students. Many Charter Schools have specialized curriculum to meet the diverse needs of students—disadvantaged, academically gifted, or incarcerated.

Charter School laws that were strong provided autonomy, financial support, provisions for schools to expand, and assistance for operating schools. Research showed that the method and levels of funding were different among states. Disparities were shown in the amount of funds provided, with Charter Schools receiving less than traditional public schools. Also, expansion of Charter Schools was necessary to provide varied programs. Currently, North Carolina policymakers were faced with the challenge of either removing the cap on schools or maintaining the limit of 100 schools. Various bills have been introduced in the House and Senate without success.

Although research was mixed in regards to the impact of the Charter School on student achievement, some students were performing better in Charter Schools than they would have done had they remained at the district schools. An issue to consider was that the curriculum taught in Charter Schools might not match state-testing standards completely. As a result, students were not being tested on the objectives that they had mastered. Organizers might use additional tests, but in North Carolina, designated tests were mandated.

There were many challenges for Charter Schools. Start-up costs, finding a facility, funding issues, parental pressures, and students with learning difficulties and low achieving were some of the critical factors. However, Charter Schools could and have provided options for the public, the educators, and the policymakers.

Methodology Framework

As stated above, Schlecty's (1990) conceptual framework was to be used as a guide in the chapter that follows—chapter III, Methodology.

Chapter III

Methodology

Chapter III describes the methods and procedures used to conduct this current study. Chapter III includes the research questions, research design, population sample, instrumentation, questionnaire, data collection and analysis, all of which has been presented below.

This study examined the North Carolina School Superintendents' perceptions regarding Charter Schools. The study's purpose I was to determine (a) the extent to which North Carolina superintendents are positive towards Charter Schools and (b) whether there is a statistical relationship between the perceptions of North Carolina superintendents who have a Charter School currently operating or in the planning stages of implementing a Charter School in their district, and (b) those superintendents who have no plan for a Charter School.

The Hypothesis and Research Questions

The research questions and hypotheses that follow provided a foundation for the current research. The first question was: To what extent are North Carolina school superintendents positive towards Charter Schools? The null hypothesis was: superintendents are neutral towards Charter Schools and the alternative hypothesis was superintendents are positive towards Charter Schools. The second question was: Is there

a relationship between the perceptions of North Carolina superintendents who have a Charter School currently operating, or are in the planning stages of implementing a Charter, and those superintendents who have no plans for a Charter School? The null hypothesis was that there was no difference between the perceptions of North Carolina superintendents who had a Charter School currently operating or in the planning stages of implementing a Charter, and those superintendents who had no plans for a Charter School. The alternative hypothesis was that there was a difference between the perceptions of North Carolina's superintendents who had a Charter School currently operating or in the planning stages of implementing a Charter School and those superintendents who had no plans for a Charter School.

Research Design

The researcher used a non-experimental, descriptive research design in the current study. This type of research was appropriate, because the purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between variables without the participants having received treatment or intervention. According to Gall (1996), to carry out descriptive research, variables must be defined and measured. Statistics used in descriptive research includes the computing of central tendency (the mean, median, and mode) and variability (standard deviation, variance, and range). The researcher used similar methods similar to those used by Sperling (1999)—both descriptive and inferential methods (see Appendix F). The descriptive analyses included measures of central tendency and dispersion. Frequency distributions were used to describe superintendents and their school districts. Inferential statistics that included t-test and Mann Whitney U were used

to answer the two research questions. The statistical significance of the findings was made using an alpha level of .05.

The Questionnaire. The primary data collection tool was a questionnaire revised by Sperling (1999) in his study of the perceptions of Michigan school superintendents. to determine whether superintendents were supportive or non-supportive of Charter Schools. This current study was built on Sperling's research, focusing on North Carolina's superintendents. In this study, data were collected through self-administered questionnaires. According to Gall, Borg, and Gall (1999), the questionnaire method involves the administering of questionnaires or interviews with the purpose of collecting data from participants in a sample, the recording date, and information about their characteristics, experiences, and opinions, in order to generalize the findings to a population that the sample was intended to represent. The researcher of the current study believed this method to be appropriate in obtaining data. Data collected from the questionnaire were used to describe the population and provide answers to the two research questions (see above) in this study.

The setting and sample. North Carolina currently (2006-07) had 117 school districts. The researcher utilized the entire state population of school superintendents in North Carolina to obtain the most reliable results, limiting problems of variation in the size of school districts. These superintendents represented school districts with a student population ranging from 750 students to 98,500.

Instrumentation. As part of this research project, a questionnaire, as revised by Sperling, was administered to the participants. Data were obtained relating to (a) to what extent were North Carolina school superintendents supportive or non-supportive of

Charter Schools and (b) was there a relationship between the perceptions of North Carolina's superintendents who had a Charter School currently operating or in the planning stages of implementing a Charter School, and those superintendents who had no plans for a Charter School. In 1999, Sperling revised the original questionnaire by Ogden (1995) to reflect an updated view of Charter Schools. Participants completed the questionnaire that consisted of two parts.

Part I of the questionnaire addressed the school superintendents' perceptions and consisted of five sections with 28 questions. A description of the five subscales and the number of questions to be completed by superintendents are shown in Table 3 (see below).

Table 3
Five Subscales: Components of Charter Schools

Components of Charter Schools	# of Questions
1. Personal Reaction to Charter Schools attempts to determine how superintendents feel about Charter Schools as an alternative to traditional public education.	5
2. Intentions of Charter Schools, focuses on superintendents' perceptions of Charter Schools in meeting the public's demands for change in traditional public education.	5
3. Responsiveness of Charter Schools measures the superintendents' perceptions of Charter Schools in terms of opportunities for students to receive education in innovative ways, allowing parents to be more involved in making changes in education, and provides a means for the school to be more responsive to the community and business organizations.	5
4. Effects of Charter Schools on public education examine the superintendents' perceptions regarding parent involvement, teacher empowerment, community involvement, and curriculum innovations.	6
5. Funding issues involving Charter Schools.	7

Note. Sperling, 1999

Each of the above sections contained multiple statements (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree). The statements were rated using a 5-point Likert scale with the number 1 indicating strongly disagree and number 5 indicating strongly agree. By summing the numeric values with responses, scores for each section were obtained.

Part two of the questionnaire consisted of eight questions designed to gather demographic information. Questions numbers 1 -2 referred to the geographical location of the school district and the size of the district. Questions numbers 3-4) referred to the superintendent's school district, question number 5 related to the professional experiences of the superintendent, and the remaining 3 numbered questions related specifically to Charter Schools. In addition to the questions, space was provided for superintendents' comments that related to their personal experiences with Charter

Schools. Data from the demographic section of the questionnaire were used to provide a description of the sample. The terms forced-choice, fill-in items, and open-ended questions were used in the questionnaire.

Variables. Table 4 (see below) shows the variables used in the study. The five dependent variables in the study were the perceptions of school superintendents on the effects of Charter Schools. Five subscales were used to measure superintendents' perceptions to determine whether they were supportive or non-supportive of Charter Schools. The subscales were: Personal reaction to Charter Schools, Intentions of Charter Schools, Responsiveness of Charter Schools, Effects of Charter Schools on public education, and Funding issues involving Charter Schools. Independent variables in the study were: presence/absence of a Charter School and the location of the school district.

Table 4
Statistical Analysis

Research Questions	Variables in the Study	Statistical Analysis
When replicating a prior study in North Carolina, to what extent are public school district superintendents positive about Charter Schools?	Dependent Variable: Perceptions of the extent of school superintendents' positive responses on the five subscales	One-sample t-test will be used to determine the extent to which school superintendents mean scores differ from the neutral point.
When replicating a prior study in North Carolina, is there a significant relationship between the perceptions of superintendents who have a Charter School currently operating or being in the planning stages of implementing a Charter School versus superintendents whose districts have no plans for a Charter School?	Dependent Variable: Perceptions of the extent of school superintendents' positive responses on the five subscales Independent Variables: Superintendents in districts with a Charter School Superintendents in districts without a Charter School	Mann Whitney U Test will be used to determine if there is a difference in the perceptions of school superintendents with /without a Charter in their school district.

Note: *from Sperling, 1999

Treatment of Data. Using a replicated study of Sperling (1999), the researcher utilized procedures similar to his, in analyzing data. Sperling (1999) provided a description of the five dependent variables (perceptions of school superintendents' positive responses on the five subscales) by summarizing each participant's response, using frequency distributions. For example, the following results were obtained by superintendents' responses to the statement, "I feel that Charter Schools are part of the future of public education, as follows" -- 6 superintendents (10.9%) responded *strongly disagreed*, 4 superintendents (7.3%) responded *disagree*, 8 superintendents (14.5%) responded *neutral*, 27 superintendents (49.1%) responded *agree*, and 10 (18.2) superintendents responded *strongly agree*. To describe the sample, Sperling used

demographic information obtained from part 2 on the questionnaire. Frequency distributions were also used for questions 1, 3, 4, and 6. Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, median, and range) were used for questions 2 (district size) and 5 (administrative experience). Results of each subscale were presented in a table followed by a summary.

Sperling used t- test and the Mann Whitney U to analyze data in his study. All decisions on the results of the analyses were made using the alpha level .05. One sample t-test was utilized to determine the extent to which school superintendents' mean scores differed from the neutral point. The responses to each of the five sections were summed. Mean scores were obtained by dividing the summed score by the number of items on each particular section on the questionnaire. The mean scores on each of the items were then compared with the neutral point of 3.00, to determine the extent to which superintendents were positive towards Charter Schools. When scores were significantly at about the neutral point, the superintendents were considered positive, whereas scores below the neutral point indicated that the superintendents had a negative attitude regarding Charter Schools.

The Mann Whitney U was the statistical test used by Sperling (1999) to determine if there was a difference in the perceptions of school superintendents who had a Charter School currently operating or were in the planning stages of implementing a Charter School, as opposed to superintendents whose districts had no plans for a Charter School. The Mann Whitney U was utilized for assessing whether the medians between two samples of observations were the same. That test is described as one of the best-known non-parametric significance tests. Sperling stated that if a significant difference was

found, the Univariate F tests would be interpreted to determine which of the individual subscales were contributing to the significant differences.

Questionnaire reliability and validity. According to Gay and Arasian (2000), validity is the most important characteristic a test or measuring instrument can possess. Sperling (1999) tested the revised instrument for content validity. He used superintendents and an attorney with an interest in Charter Schools to review the instrument for relevance and completeness. Responses from participants were consistent, indicating that the instrument was relevant and would provide appropriate information to draw conclusions regarding perceptions of school superintendents on the effects of Charter Schools on public school districts. Cronback's (date) alpha was used to test internal consistency for the original instrument. The alpha coefficient of .89 obtained on this analysis supported the reliability of the questionnaire. The reliability and validity of the questionnaire instrument was completed before it was used use in this study

Procedure. The researcher mailed the questionnaire and the consent form to each North Carolina school superintendent. Superintendents returned the consent form and questionnaire, each in a different envelope. A 50% return on mailed questionnaires was considered usable to provide sufficient data to draw conclusions about the population. The researcher then used a second mailing to obtain the 50% return on the mailed questionnaires. Sperling's (1999) study had a return rate of 50.4%).

Confidentiality. A database was used to identify each North Carolina school superintendent and to generate labels. As completed consent forms were returned, the school superintendent's name was eliminated from the database.

To maintain the confidentiality of the school superintendent, the information was protected on a home computer with sole access by the researcher. The database was destroyed four weeks after the initial distribution of the questionnaires, concluding the collecting of data.

The cover letter. The cover letter consisted of the following information: an invitation for potential respondents to participate in the study; an explanation of the purpose of the study, the usefulness of the research; information regarding the completion and return of the questionnaire; information on how the results would be used, and how to make contact, if necessary, for information regarding questions (see Appendix G).

Questionnaire Approval and Delivery

The researcher of the study submitted the research design and questionnaire instrument to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Institutional Human Subjects Review Board for approval. Following approval, a questionnaire packet was developed that included: a cover letter, consent form, a copy of the questionnaire, and two stamped self-addressed envelopes for confidential return of the consent form and completed questionnaire. The cover letter included the purpose and significance of the study, assurance of confidentiality, a statement assuring that participation is voluntary, and directions for return of the completed questionnaire.

Questionnaire packets were distributed to each respondent, with a request to complete and return the questionnaire within five working days. A reminder letter was sent ten days after the initial distribution of the questionnaires. The material enclosed consisted of a statement regarding the significance of the study and an e-mail address to be used if another questionnaire packet was needed. The researcher used the 2006-2007

North Carolina Education Directory to identify and locate current North Carolina school superintendents.

Summary

The questionnaire, as described above, was deemed appropriate for the current study, because the purpose of the research method was to gain information concerning the respondents' characteristics, experiences, and opinions. The school superintendents were asked to respond to two sections on the questionnaire. Section I required respondents to complete the two-phased research question; section II included demographic information.

Because of the rapid growth of Charter Schools across the nation, and the particular interest for the study in North Carolina, the current research, as reported in this study, was needed, to extend the knowledge-base regarding Charter Schools. Research from the study was sure to be of value in assisting Charter School organizers, educators, and policymakers in making sound decisions.

The following chapter, chapter IV, has presented the findings of the questionnaire, summing up the results.

Chapter IV

Results of Data Analysis

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis used to describe the sample and answer the research questions the study posed. The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of North Carolina Superintendents regarding Charter Schools. The original two research questions are restated below:

1. To what extent are North Carolina school superintendents positive towards Charter Schools?
2. Is there a relationship between the perceptions of North Carolina superintendents who have a Charter School currently operating or in the planning stages of implementing a Charter and those superintendents who have no plans for a Charter School?

The Michigan Study Questionnaire and Collection of Data

For this current study, the researcher used a data collection instrument similar to that modified by Robert Sperling (1999), to explore perceptions of Public School Superintendents in Michigan regarding Charter Schools. Sperling based his survey on five subscales that measured perceptions in the following areas of Charter Schools: personal reactions to Charter Schools, intentions of Charter Schools, responsiveness of Charter Schools, effects of Charter Schools on public education, and funding issues

involving Charter Schools. He sent questionnaires to 111 school district superintendents, and the overall response rate for the survey was 50.4 %.

Sperling's questionnaire was divided into two sections. The first section consisted of a demographic survey to describe the characteristics of the respondents. The second section reported data regarding the perceptions of superintendents. Sperling (1999) presented the findings from the statistical analysis of each section separately.

The Current Study: Questionnaire and Data Collection

Analysis sequence. The results of the questionnaire are presented in the following sequence: First, the demographic results of the study are presented. Next, the results from the responses of superintendents are shown in two stages. The first stage addresses the first research question. Results from the one sample t-test are presented. This test compared the results to the neutral point. The second stage compares the perceptions of superintendents with Charter Schools to those without Charter Schools operating in their school district. A Mann Whitney U Test was used to determine if there were any statistically significant interactions between the groups of superintendents.

Result-reports by percentages. Of the 117 questionnaires distributed, 85 were returned, for a return rate of 72.6%. (The return rate of this study was significantly higher than those reported in the study by Sperling's return rate.) The researcher also received emails from two additional superintendents who preferred not to participate in the study. Although the returned questionnaires met the criteria for this current research, three superintendents omitted the question relating to the district's total expense budget

and fourteen superintendents did not respond to the question relating to the district’s total expense budget appropriation for Charter Schools.

Division by Characteristics of the Respondents

The researcher divided the demographic characteristics of the respondents into two groups: (a) the professional experience of superintendents, and (b) school district characteristics.

Years of experience as a superintendent. Superintendents were asked to state their number of years as a superintendent. The majority of superintendents (38.8%, n = 33) reported that they had served five years or less as a superintendent. Forty superintendents had 6 – 10 years of experience (n = 29, 34.1%) and 11- 15 years (n = 11, 12.9%) of experience as a superintendent. The remaining two classifications of years as a superintendent, which ranged from 16 years of experience to over 20 years, included twelve respondents (14.2%) as shown in Table 5 (see below).

Table 5

Frequency Distribution Number of Years Serving as a Superintendent

Number of Years	Number of Superintendents	Percentage
0 – 5	33	38.8
6 – 10	29	34.1
11 – 15	11	12.9
16 – 20	6	7.1
over 20	6	7.1
Total	85	100.0

Characteristics of the school district. Descriptors included the district’s location, size, percentage of students in the school district who receive free/reduced cost lunch, percentage of minority population in the school district, the number of Charter Schools

operating in the school district, the school district's (2006-2007) total current expense budget, and the district's (2006-2007) total expense budget appropriation for Charter Schools.

Superintendents were asked to state the location of their school district and indicate the number of students who were enrolled during the current school year. Sixty-two superintendents (72.9 %) reported their school district as rural, 27.1% (n=23) Student population ranged from 750 to over 20,000 students. Table 6 (see below) presents the summary of responses relating to student enrollment.

Table 6

Frequency Distribution Number of Students Enrolled in School District

Range of Student Enrollment	Number of Superintendents	Percentage
750 - 2,999	19	22.4
3,000 - 4,999	16	18.8
5,000 - 9,999	18	21.2
10,000 - 19,000	15	17.6
over 20,000	17	20.0
Total	85	100.0

The largest number of responses (n = 19, 22.4%) represented superintendents of school districts with (750-2999 students). Eighteen superintendents (21.2%) reported student enrollment of 5,000 – 9,999 students. Two classifications of student enrollment (10,000 – 19,000 and over 20,000) represented 37.6% of the superintendents' responses (n = 32).

Superintendents were also asked to indicate the percentage of students in their school district who received free/reduced lunch cost. Of the participating superintendents, 58.8% (n = 50) of the superintendents reported that 41 to 60% of students

in their school district received free/reduced lunch cost. Eighteen superintendents (21.2%) stated that 40% or less of their students received free or reduced lunch cost. The smallest group, (n = 5, 5.9%) had over 70% of students receiving free/reduced lunch cost. A frequency distribution that summarizes the percentage of students who received free/reduced lunch cost appears in Table 7 (see below).

Table 7

Frequency Distribution Percentage of Students Receiving Free/Reduced Lunch Cost

Students Receiving Free/Reduced Lunch Cost	Number of Superintendents	Percentage
1% – 40%	18	21.2
41% – 50%	25	29.4
51% - 60%	25	29.4
61% - 70%	12	14.1
Over 70%	5	5.9
Total	85	100.0

Superintendents were asked to report the percentage of minority population in their school district. Responses appear in Table 8 (see below).

Table 8

Frequency Distribution Percentage of Minority Population in the School District

Percentage of Minority Students	Number of Superintendents	Percentage
1 – 40	50	58.8
41 – 50	13	15.4
51 - 60	11	12.9
61 - 70	8	9.4
Over 70	3	3.5
Total	85	100.0

The majority of the superintendents (58.8%, n = 50) reported that the minority population in their district ranged from one to forty percent. Twenty-one superintendents (25.8%) have school districts with minority population over forty percent.

The superintendents were asked to respond to a question regarding the number of Charter Schools operating in their school districts. Forty-five superintendents (52.9%) stated that they did not have an operating Charter School in their district. The remaining superintendents (n = 40, 47.1%) reported having at least one or more Charter Schools. As shown in the category (9 – 10 Charter Schools), superintendents did not have over eight Charter Schools in their district. Responses are summarized in Table 9 (see below).

Table 9

Frequency Distribution Charter Schools Operating in School District

Number of Charter Schools	Number of Superintendents	Percentage
None	45	52.9
1 - 2	32	37.6
3 - 4	2	2.4
5 - 6	5	5.9
7 - 8	1	1.2
9 -10	0	0
Total	85	100.0

The two final demographic questions related to the school district’s total current expense budget and the total expense budget appropriation for Charter Schools.

Superintendent responses regarding the total expense budget ranged from \$2 million to \$1.5 billion. Three superintendents omitted the question relating to the district’s budget.

Sixty percent (n = 51) had total expense budgets that ranged from \$ 1 million to \$ 50 million. Seventeen superintendents had budgets over \$ 100 million. Table 10

(see below) contains the summarized responses.

Table 10

Frequency Distribution School District Total Expense Budget

Total Expense Budget	Number of Superintendents	Percentage
\$1 million - \$50 million	51	60.0
\$51 million – \$100 million	13	15.3
\$101 million - \$500 million	17	20.0
Over \$500 million	1	1.2
Missing	3	3.5
Total	85	100.0

Appropriation of funds for Charter Schools ranged from approximately \$5 thousand to 1 million. The difference in the amount of funding is reflected in the number of students attending a Charter School in the school district or neighboring LEA. One superintendent reported that only two students from the school district attended a Charter School in another county. Another respondent stated that there would be an increase in the appropriation of funds next year, because of the opening of a new Charter School in the district. In the responses from superintendents, the largest group (n = 25, 29.4%) reported that funding was not appropriated, because they did not have an operating Charter School in the district. Nineteen respondents (22.4 %) had a total expense budget appropriation of between \$91 thousand and \$800 thousand. Fourteen superintendents omitted the question that related to the amount of funding appropriated for Charter Schools. Summarized responses are shown in Table 11 (see below).

Table 11

Frequency Distribution Total Expense Budget Appropriation for Charter Schools

Charter School - Dollars	Number of Superintendents	Percentage
0	25	29.4
1 – 10 thousand	10	11.8
10,001 – 90 thousand	9	10.6
91 thousand – 800 thousand	19	22.4
Over 800 thousand	8	9.4
Missing	14	16.4
Total	85	100.0

Superintendents' Comments

This section includes superintendents' comments. Space was provided in the questionnaire for superintendents to make comments regarding Charter Schools and their effect on public education. Their unedited comments (and punctuation) are presented below:

Schools funded by public dollars should be bound by the same rules and regulations.

My responses are based on 40 plus years of experience in the field of education. After serving as a superintendent, I served as the director of the North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching for 8 years. During my time as a superintendent and as director I served on many committees that studied the effect of Charter Schools and heard many discussions related to the issue. I cannot endorse a program that I believe will broaden the gap between the "have and have-nots" in our state.

I think you should have asked questions about the effectiveness of Charter Schools on student achievement. To date, their record is not impressive. That's my major concern.

Charter Schools provide a way for the "haves" in society to attend school with other "haves", not the have-nots.

I feel that Charter Schools provide options for parents and students desiring another choice to public education. I do not feel that it will greatly impact public education in NC given current regulations. While it is a choice, data indicate mixed results w/ regards to student achievement. This may suggest that Charter School may serve other purposes.

It is difficult to respond to your survey because many of the questions should be answered "some do and some don't. It really depends on the specific Charter School.

Charter Schools are private schools that get public funding.

Charter Schools are a detriment to public education. It is obvious from the data they are not working.

I am totally opposed to Charter Schools. I believe they are a precursor of establishing the voucher system. "I also know that the Charter School in my area, which would not exist if students weren't pulled from adjacent counties, was established by a small group that was newly arrived citizens in my county." I believe their motive was self-serving and not for the good of the general population.

Summary

From the superintendents' comments above, a presence of distrust and opposition is apparent. Distrust is shown as Charter Schools are compared to a voucher system, private schools, and created for serving other purposes. Although one superintendent recognized Charter Schools as providing educational options for parents and students, the impact of Charter Schools on public education is questionable. The negative view of Charter Schools is furthered shown by statements alluding to student achievement, data showing the ineffectiveness, and the separating of the "haves" from the "have-nots". Most of the comments do not promote or support the concept of Charter Schools.

Research Questions Overview

Two research questions developed for the study pertained to the superintendents' perceptions regarding Charter Schools. Sperling (1999) used frequency distributions to describe the dependent variables. Results of each subscale were presented in a table followed by a summary. He also used t- test and the Mann Whitney U to analyze data in his study. All decisions on the results of the analyses were made using the alpha level .05. As a replicated study of Sperling (1999), the researcher followed his procedures to analyze results. A statistical program, SPSS version 15, was used to calculate measures

of central tendency and dispersion, t-tests, and the Mann Whitney U Test. Each question is presented separately (see below).

Research Question 1: (This is a restatement of restatement of the first research question this study addressed.

To what extent are North Carolina school superintendents positive towards Charter Schools?

Description of the Dependent Variables

The current study questionnaire consisted of five subscales. Superintendents were asked to complete twenty-eight questions that measured perceptions regarding the five subscales: personal reactions to Charter Schools, intentions of Charter Schools, responsiveness of Charter Schools, effects of Charter Schools on public education, and funding issues pertaining to Charter Schools. Each of the five sections listed below were independent subscales that measured a different focus

Section 1, which measured personal reactions to Charter Schools, was an attempt to determine how superintendents felt about Charter Schools as an alternative to traditional public schools.

Section 2 focused on superintendents' perceptions of the intentions of Charter Schools in meeting the public's demands for change in traditional public schools.

Section 3 measured the superintendents' perceptions of the responsiveness of Charter Schools in terms of opportunities for: students to receive education in innovative ways; allow parents to be more involved in innovative ways; allow parents to be more involved in making changes in education; and provide a means for the school to be more responsive to the community and business organizations.

Section 4 examined the superintendents' perceptions of the effects of Charter

Schools on public education regarding parent involvement, teacher empowerment, community involvement, and curriculum innovations.

Section 5 was concerned with the superintendents' perceptions of funding issues involving Charter Schools in terms of the negative impacts of these schools on public education.

Frequency distributions were completed for each of the above subscales, by summing the responses of each item. Results have been presented in Table 12 (see below).

Table 12

Frequency Distributions Reactions to Charter Schools

Section 1: Personal Reactions to Charter Schools.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1.1: I feel that Charter Schools are part of the future of public education	8	9.4	45	52.9	12	14.9	15	17.6	5	5.9
1.2: I am skeptical about Charter Schools' ability to provide quality educational outcomes for students.	29	34.1	35	41.2	9	10.6	8	9.4	4	4.7
1.3: I am pleased to have the opportunity to try new academic strategies such as Charter Schools.	3	3.5	24	28.2	23	27.1	22	25.9	13	15.3
1.4: I think that Charter Schools do not promote equal education for all children.	23	27.1	38	44.7	12	14.1	9	10.6	2	2.4
1.5: I feel that Charter Schools are politically motivated.	48	56.5	26	30.6	6	7.1	2	2.4	3	3.5

The majority of respondents either agreed (n = 45, 52.9%) or strongly agreed (n = 8, 9.4%) that Charter Schools are part of the future of public education. Although (14.9 %, n = 12) remained neutral, the remaining superintendents either reported that they disagreed with the statement (n = 15, 17.6%) or strongly disagreed (n = 5, 5.9%).

Most superintendents (n = 35, 41.2%) agreed or strongly agreed (n = 21, 34.1%) that they were skeptical about Charter Schools' ability to provide quality educational outcomes for students. Four superintendents (4.7%) strongly disagreed with the statement, whereas eight (9.4%) disagreed.

A high number of respondents (n = 23, 27.1%) remained neutral in answering the question regarding the opportunity to try new academic strategies such as Charter Schools. The remaining superintendents presented mixed perceptions. Three (3.5%) reported strongly agreed, twenty-four (28.2%) agreed, twenty-two (25.9%) disagreed, and thirteen (15.3%) strongly disagreed.

Only two superintendents (2.4%) strongly disagreed that Charter Schools do not promote equal education for all children. Nine superintendents (10.6%) reported that they disagreed. The other superintendents either stated that they agreed (n = 38, 44.7%) or strongly agreed (n = 23, 27.1%). Twelve (14.1%) remained neutral.

Two categories strongly agreed (n = 48, 56.5%) and agreed (n = 26, 30.6%), representing the majority of superintendents who feel that Charter Schools are politically motivated. With six respondents (7.1%) remaining neutral, only five superintendents either disagreed (n = 2, 2.4%) or strongly disagreed (n = 3, 3.5%).

Table 13 (see below) presents the results of the perceptions of superintendents regarding the intentions of Charter Schools.

Table 13

Frequency Distributions Intentions of Charter Schools

Section 2: Intentions of Charter Schools	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2.1 The intent is to restructure public education.	13	15.3	40	47.1	9	10.6	18	21.2	5	5.9
2.2 The intent is to increase student success.	1	1.2	31	36.5	19	22.4	28	32.9	6	7.1
2.3 The intent is to enhance teacher involvement in decision-making.	3	3.5	10	11.8	24	28.2	34	40.0	14	16.5
2.4 The intent is to present a viable public school alternative.	8	9.4	42	49.4	10	11.8	20	23.5	5	5.9
2.5 The intent is to stimulate competition to improve all schools.	3	3.5	22	25.9	14	16.5	32	37.6	14	16.5

Most superintendents agreed (n=40, 47.1%) that the intent of Charter Schools is to restructure public education. However, eighteen superintendents (21.2%) disagreed. Nine respondents (10.6%) remained neutral, whereas only five superintendents (5.9%) strongly disagreed.

Superintendents presented mixed perceptions that the intent of Charter Schools is to increase student success. Thirty-one (36.5%) agreed, twenty-eight (32.9%) disagreed, nineteen (22.4) remained neutral, and only one (1.2%) stated strongly agreed.

Forty-eight percent of the superintendents either disagreed (n = 34, 40.0%) or strongly disagreed (n = 14, 16.5%) that the intent is to enhance teacher involvement in decision- making. Only thirteen superintendents agreed (n = 10, 11.8%) and ?? strongly agreed (n = 3, 3.5%). Twenty-four respondents remained neutral regarding the statement.

The largest number of superintendents agreed (n = 42, 49.4%) that the intent of Charter Schools is to present a viable public school alternative. Whereas 10 superintendents (11.8%) remained neutral, twenty-five disagreed (n = 20, 23.5%) or strongly disagreed (n = 5, 5.9%).

Fourteen superintendents (16.5%) remained neutral regarding the intent of Charter Schools to stimulate competition to improve all schools. The majority of superintendents responded to the statement as disagreed (n = 32, 37.6%). Twenty-two superintendents (25.9%) agreed and 16.5% (n = 14) strongly disagreed.

Responses regarding the responsiveness of Charter Schools to the community, parents, students, and school choice are summarized in Table 14 (see below).

Table 14

Frequency Distributions Responsiveness of Charter Schools

Section 3: Responsiveness of Charter Schools	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
3.1 Charter Schools respond to the business community demand for change in education.	1	1.2	21	24.7	12	14.1	40	47.1	11	12.9
3.2 Charter Schools respond to parents' demands for change in education.	4	4.7	33	38.8	12	14.1	28	32.9	8	9.4
3.3 Charter Schools are an educational idea that provides choice.	4	4.7	60	70.6	6	7.1	13	15.3	2	2.4
3.4. Charter Schools do not substantially reduce funding to public school districts.	2	2.4	8	9.4	4	4.7	46	54.1	25	29.4
3.5 Charter Schools provide innovative educational opportunities for at-risk students.	1	1.2	4	4.7	17	20.0	34	40.0	29	34.1

The disagreed category (n = 40, 47.1%) obtained the most responses to the statement regarding Charter Schools' response to the business community's demand for change in education. Eleven superintendents (12.9%) strongly disagreed. Twenty-two respondents either agreed (n = 21, 24.7%) or strongly agreed (n = 1, 1.2%). The remaining category, neutral had twelve responses ((14.1%).

An almost even split in noted on the perception, Charter Schools respond to parents' demands for change in education. Thirty-four superintendents either agreed (n = 33, 38,8%) or strongly agreed (n = 4, 4.7) whereas thirty-two superintendents either

disagreed (n= 28, 32.9%) or strongly disagree (n = 8, 9.4%). Twelve respondents selected the neutral category regarding the statement.

Sixty superintendents (70.6%) agreed that Charter Schools are an educational idea that provides choice. Fourteen either disagreed (n = 13, 15.3%) or strongly agreed (n = 2, 2.4%). The neutral category received six responses (7.1%).

More than seventy percent of the superintendents either disagreed (n = 46, 54.1%) or strongly disagreed (n = 25, 29.4%) that Charter Schools do not substantially reduce funding to public school districts. Only eight respondents (9.4%) agreed, whereas four (4.7%) remained neutral.

Only five superintendents either agreed (n = 4, 4.7%) or strongly agreed (n = 1, 1.2%) that Charter Schools provide innovative educational opportunities for at – risk students. One superintendent (1.2%) strongly agreed, whereas thirty-four superintendents (40.0%) disagreed with the statement. Twenty-nine (34.1%) strongly disagreed, and twenty percent (n = 17) remained neutral.

Superintendents were asked to respond to six items relating to the effects of Charter Schools on public education. Responses are summarized in Table 15 (see below).

Table 15

Frequency Distributions Responsiveness of Charter Schools

Section 4: Effects of Charter Schools on public education.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
4.1 Charter Schools will increase parental involvement.	3	3.5	17	20.0	22	25.9	31	36.5	12	14.1
4.2 Charter Schools will provide greater parental choice for their children.	5	5.9	50	58.8	12	14.1	16	18.8	2	2.4
4.3 Charter Schools will decrease teacher decision making in instructional programming in all schools.	1	1.2	7	8.2	30	35.3	42	49.4	5	5.9
4.4 Charter Schools will decrease teacher, parent, and administrator collaboration in decision-making.	1	1.2	12	14.1	28	32.9	40	47.1	4	4.7
4.5 Charter Schools will provide diverse ways of organizing or grouping students for learning.	5	5.9	16	18.8	19	22.4	35	41.2	10	11.8
4.6 Charter Schools will segregate certain groups of students.	33	38.8	32	37.6	15	17.6	5	5.9	0	0

Only twenty superintendents agreed ($n = 17, 20\%$) or strongly agreed ($n = 3, 3.5\%$) that Charter Schools will increase parental involvement. Most of the respondents either disagreed ($n = 31, 35.5\%$) or strongly disagreed ($n = 12, 14.1\%$). Twenty-two superintendents (25.9%) elected to remain neutral.

The majority of superintendents ($n = 50, 58.8\%$) agreed that Charter Schools would provide greater parental choice for their children. Eighteen respondents either

disagreed (n = 16, 18.8%) or strongly disagreed (n = 2, 2.4%). Twelve (14.1) were neutral on the statement.

Thirty respondents (35.3%) remained neutral regarding the statement that Charter Schools will decrease teacher decision-making in instructional programming in all schools. Forty-two superintendents (49.9%) disagreed and five (5.9%) strongly disagreed. Only eight either agreed (n = 7, 8.2%) or strongly agreed (n = 1, 1.2%).

A high number of superintendents (n = 28, 32.9%) were noted in the neutral category in response to the statement that Charter Schools will decrease teacher, parent, and administrator collaboration in decision-making. Forty respondents (47.1%) disagreed and four (4.7%) strongly disagreed. Thirteen superintendents either agreed (n = 12, 14.1%) or strongly agreed (n = 1, 1.2%)

Thirty-five of the responding superintendents (41.2%) disagreed that Charter Schools will provide diverse ways of organizing or grouping students for learning. Ten (11.8%) strongly disagreed. Nineteen superintendents (22.4%) responded in the neutral category. Twenty-one either agreed (n = 16, 18.8%) or strongly agreed (n = 5, 5.9%).

A preponderance of superintendents either strongly agreed (n = 33, 38.8%) or agreed (n = 32, 37.6%) that Charter Schools will segregate groups of students. Only five superintendents (5.9%) disagreed with the statement. Fifteen respondents (17.6%) remained neutral. There were no strongly disagreed responses.

Seven items are utilized in this section to show superintendent perceptions regarding funding issues that relate to Charter Schools. Responses appear in Table 16 (see below).

Table 16

Frequency Distributions Funding Issues Involving Charter Schools

Section 5: Funding issues involving Charter Schools.	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5.1 Funding for Charter Schools are not equitable with funding for public schools.	14	16.5	27	31.8	19	22.4	19	22.4	6	7.1
5.2 Charter Schools should have to provide essential services (i.e., transportation, lunch programs, etc.)	37	43.5	31	36.5	6	7.1	8	9.4	3	3.5
5.3 Charter Schools should have to pay teacher's salaries at the same rate as public schools.	32	37.6	27	31.8	7	8.2	17	20.0	2	2.4
5.4 Charter School funding will reduce the available dollars for public schools.	51	60	26	30.6	4	4.7	3	3.5	1	1.2
5.5 Charter Schools are another name for North Carolina inspired voucher system.	35	41.2	28	32.9	11	12.9	11	12.9	0	0.0
5.6 Charter Schools should have to provide enrichment programs (art, music, PE) for all students.	33	38.8	27	31.8	11	12.9	13	15.3	1	1.2
5.7 Charter Schools will reduce funding from at-risk programming in traditional public schools.	29	34.1	36	42.4	8	9.4	11	12.9	1	1.2

Responses relating to funding for Charter Schools were the same for the neutral and disagreed category (n = 19, 22.4%). Forty-one superintendents either agreed (n = 27, 31.8%) or strongly agreed (n = 14, 16.5%) that funding for Charter Schools are not equitable with funding for public schools. The remaining respondents (n = 6, 7.1%) strongly disagreed.

Over sixty superintendents either strongly agreed (37, 43.5%) or agreed (n = 31, 36.5%) that Charter Schools should have to provide essential services. Only six (7.1%) remained neutral. Eight superintendents (9.4%) disagreed with the statement, and three (3.5%) strongly disagreed.

The majority of superintendents (n = 32, 37.6%) strongly agreed that Charter Schools should have to pay teachers' salaries at the same rate as public schools. Twenty-seven superintendents (31.8%) agreed and nineteen either disagreed (n = 17, 20%) or strongly disagreed (n = 2, 2.4%). Seven (8.2%) remained neutral.

There were a substantial number of responses in the strongly agreed (n = 51, 60%) and agreed (n = 26, 30.6 %) categories that Charter School funding will reduce the available dollars for public schools. Four respondents (4.7%) remained neutral. Only three superintendents (3.5%) disagreed and one (1.2%) strongly disagreed.

Thirty-five superintendents strongly agreed (n = 35, 41.2) with the statement that Charter Schools are another name for North Carolina inspired voucher system. Twenty-eight (32.9%) also agreed. Two categories, disagreed, and remaining neutral received the same number of responses (n = 11, 12.9%). There was no strongly disagreed.

The statement that Charter Schools should have to provide enrichment programs resulted in thirty-three superintendents (38.8%) responding strongly agreed and twenty-

seven (31.8) agreed. Eleven (12.9%) remained neutral while the remaining respondents either disagreed (n = 13, 15.3%) or strongly disagreed (n = 1, 1.2%).

A majority of superintendents (n = 36, 42.4) agreed or strongly agreed (n = 29, 34.1%) that Charter Schools will reduce funding from at-risk programming in traditional public schools. Eleven superintendents disagreed (n = 11, 12.9%), whereas one strongly disagreed (1.2%). Among the remaining respondents, eight (9.4%) remained neutral.

Analysis of Data.

Sperling (1999) used the t- test and the Mann Whitney U to analyze data in his study. All decisions on the results of the analyses were made using the alpha level .05. One sample t-test was utilized to determine the extent to which school superintendents' mean scores differed from the neutral point. The responses to each of the five sections were summed. Mean scores were obtained by dividing the summed score by the number of items on each particular section on the questionnaire. The mean scores on each of the items were then compared with the neutral point of 3.00 to determine the extent to which superintendents were positive towards Charter Schools. When scores were significantly above the neutral point, the superintendents were considered positive, whereas scores below the neutral point indicated that the superintendents had a negative attitude regarding Charter Schools. Table 17 presents the results of the t-test analyses (see below).

Table 17

The t-Test for one Sample Perceptions of Superintendents Regarding Charter Schools

One-Sample Statistics

Subscales	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Personal Reactions	85	3.6606	.52270	.05670
Intentions	85	2.9553	.66000	.07159
Responsiveness	85	2.6212	.55465	.060616
Effects	85	2.9902	.41096	.04457
Funding Issues	85	3.9311	.72596	.07874

The t-Test for one Sample

Subscales			Test Value = 3		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Differenc e	Lower	Higher
Personal Reactions	11.652	84	.000	.66059	.5478	.7733
Intentions	-.624	84	.534	-.04471	-.1871	.0977
Responsiveness	-6.297	84	.000	-.37882	-.4985	-.2592
Effects	-.220	84	.826	-.00980	-.0984	.0788
Funding Issues	11.825	84	.000	.93109	.7745	1.0877

Three of the five subscales differed significantly from the neutral point. Mean scores for personal reactions to Charter Schools and funding issues involving Charter Schools were significantly above the neutral point, whereas responsiveness of Charter Schools was below the neutral point. Mean scores for the remaining two categories—

intentions of Charter Schools and the effects of Charter Schools— did not differ significantly from the neutral point.

The obtained t-value of 11.652 from the comparison of the mean scores for personal reactions to Charter Schools ($m = 3.6606$, $sd = .52270$) with the neutral point of 3.00 was statistically significant at the alpha level of .05. Results revealed that superintendents were generally in agreement with the statements measuring their personal reactions to Charter Schools.

The comparison of the mean for responsiveness of Charter Schools ($m = 2.6212$, $sd = .55465$) with the neutral point of 3.00 resulted in a t-value of -6.297. This result was statistically significant and indicated that superintendents generally disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statements pertaining to responsiveness.

The obtained t-value of 11.825 from the comparison of the mean scores for funding issues involving Charter Schools ($m = 3.9311$, $sd = .72596$) was statistically significant at the alpha level of .05. This finding indicated that superintendents were generally in agreement with the statements measuring funding issues.

Summary of Tables Related to Research Question 1

When considering the subscales, superintendents' ratings were significantly higher compared to the neutral point in two categories and lower in one category. These findings provided evidence that North Carolina superintendents do have concerns related to Charter Schools.

Research question 2. A restatement of the second research question this study addressed is:

Is there a relationship between the perceptions of North Carolina superintendents who have a Charter School currently operating or in the planning stages of implementing a Charter and those superintendents who have no plans for a Charter School?

The Mann Whitney U T was utilized to analyze data. Mean scores on the five subscales were used as dependent variables. Superintendents in districts with a Charter School and superintendents in districts without a Charter School were used as independent variables. Summarized results appear in Table 18 (see below).

Table 18

Mann-Whitney Test for Independent Samples Perceptions of Charter Schools

Subscales	Number	Mean Rank	Z scores
Personal Reactions	45	47.40	-1.751 (NS)
	40	38.05	
Intentions	45	46.30	-1.317 (NS)
	40	39.29	
Responsiveness	45	40.81	-.877 (NS)
	40	45.46	
Effects	45	41.71	-.512 (NS)
	45	44.45	
Funding Issues	40	44.49	-.552 (NS)
	40	41.33	

Results showed that there was not a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of superintendents with or without a Charter School operating in their school district.

Summary of Subscales

The five subscales used to measure the perceptions of superintendents regarding Charter Schools provided evidence that superintendents are concerned with Charter Schools. For two subscales, the superintendents appeared to be more positive regarding their perceptions of Charter Schools. One subscale reflected a less positive attitude towards Charter Schools, and the remaining two categories (intentions and effects of Charter Schools) provided no difference in their perceptions. Findings also revealed that there is no difference between the perceptions of superintendents with an operating Charter School in the school district and those without Charter Schools.

Chapter IV Summary

Chapter IV has presented results of this study's questionnaire. Statistical analyses were utilized to answer the two research questions. A summary of the research, conclusions, and recommendations based on these findings has been presented in chapter V, Discussion, which follows.

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

This chapter summarizes and discusses the purpose of the study, data collection procedures, and data analysis methods. Research questions and statistical data were restated, with a summary of findings based on statistical results. Conclusions and implications of the data were surmised, and recommendations for further research suggested.

The primary concern that guided this study was the examination of superintendents' perceptions regarding Charter Schools. Various studies have shown that superintendents play an integral role in the implementing and the sustaining of reforms such as Charter Schools. Superintendents' involvement can vary from supportive to obstructive. Supportive superintendents have provided avenues for the Charter Schools concept to be promoted, whereas; less supportive superintendents have implemented obstacles making it difficult for Charter Schools to be successful. This potential problem has led to the researcher's interest in the subject of superintendents' perceptions of Charter Schools and served as the basis for this research study.

A non-experimental, descriptive research design formed the basis of this study. This type of research was deemed appropriate, because the independent variables were not manipulated, and the participants experienced no treatment or intervention. In this

study, public school superintendents were surveyed to analyze their perceptions regarding Charter School. Two research questions were investigated:

1. To what extent are superintendents in the state of North Carolina positive toward Charter Schools?
2. Is there a relationship between the perceptions of North Carolina superintendents who have a Charter School currently operating or in the planning stages of implementing a Charter School and those superintendents who have no plans for a Charter School?

Data were collected using a questionnaire revised by Sperling (1999). In this study, the entire population of public school superintendents, 117, was surveyed to limit research problems regarding the variation in the size of the school district.

Analyses. A Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 15, was utilized to analyze data collected from the self-administered questionnaire. The analysis was divided into two sections: descriptive and inferential. The descriptive analyses provided a profile of the respondents, including professional and school district characteristics. Inferential statistics were used to answer the two research questions. All decisions on the results of the analyses were made using the alpha level .05.

To answer research question 1, a one-sample t-test was utilized to test the superintendents' scores on the five subscales. Mean scores on each subscale were compared with the neutral point of 3.00, to determine the extent to which superintendents were positive towards Charter Schools. When scores were significantly about the neutral point, the superintendents were considered positive, whereas scores below the neutral point indicated that the superintendents had a negative attitude regarding Charter Schools.

Mixed results were obtained from the analyses. Three of the five subscales were statistically significant. Mean scores on two sections of the questionnaire—personal reactions and funding—were significantly higher than the mean, indicating that superintendents were in agreement with the statements in the categories. One section—responsiveness of Charter Schools—was significantly below the mean. This finding indicated that superintendents generally disagreed with the statements in the category. The mean scores of the remaining categories—intentions of Charter Schools and effects of Charter Schools—did not differ from the neutral point.

Findings. Findings showed that superintendents' areas of concerns appeared to be in three areas: personal reaction, responsiveness, and funding issues. Although they felt that Charter Schools are part of public education's future, they questioned the quality of education provided by Charter Schools and reported that Charter School are politically motivated. They also felt that Charter Schools did not promote equal education for all students. Overall, superintendents did not view Charter Schools as responding to the business community's and parental demand for change in education. However, superintendents agreed that Charter Schools provide choice. Superintendents also agreed that Charter Schools segregate certain groups of students, the privileged from underprivileged. Another concern of superintendents was the financial impact upon their school districts. It appeared that superintendents believed that Charter Schools reduced funds from at-risk programs and traditional public schools.

Resemblance to Sterling's (1999) Michigan study. The results of this North Carolina study resembled those in the Michigan study (Sperling, 1999). In both studies, scores were significantly higher than the neutral point in the categories of personal

reactions and funding issues of Charter Schools. Scores were also significantly lower than the neutral point in the category of responsiveness of Charter Schools. In the category, intention of Charter School, a statistically significant difference was not found. These findings suggest that superintendents in the two states have similar concerns regarding Charter Schools.

Answer to research question #2. To answer question research question 2, the Mann Whitney U was used as an inferential method. It tested whether if there was a difference in the perceptions of school superintendents who had a Charter School currently operating/being implemented in the school district and those superintendents whose districts had no plans for a Charter School. Results revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of superintendents with or without a Charter School operating in their school district. Similar results had been found in the Michigan study (Sperling, 1999).

Demographics characteristics findings. The final set of findings addressed a description of the school district characteristics. Frequency distributions were utilized to obtain the results. Sperling's (1999) demographics differed in two aspects when compared to this study. First, in Sperling's study, of the 56 participating superintendents, 47 (83.9%) stated that they did not have an operating Charter School in their school district. The remaining 9 superintendents (16.1%) had at least one or two operating Charter Schools. In the current study of 85 participating respondents, 45 (52.9%) did not have a Charter School in their school district. Most of the remaining superintendents 40 (47.1%) had one or two operating Charter Schools in their school district. The largest

number of Charter Schools noted in a district was eight. As a result of the findings, this study had a larger representation of superintendents working in school districts with Charter Schools.

Second, to describe the school district, components such as free/reduced lunch cost, minority population of the school district, the current school's district budget, and the current appropriation for Charter School were included. These elements provided the researcher with additional information such as the wealth of the district, ethnic population, and economic level of the district.

Additional findings that supported the school districts' characteristics are included below:

The largest number of respondents (38.8%) had spent a year to five years as a superintendent. Only six superintendents reported in two categories that they had served either six to fifteen years or over twenty years in the superintendent position.

Over 70% of the superintendents (72.9%) reported that their school district was identified as rural. Student population ranged from 750 pupils to over 98,000 students. Most of the superintendents represented school districts with student enrollment of 750 – 2,999 pupils.

Of the participating superintendents, thirty-seven (58.8%) reported that 40%-60% of students in their school district received free/reduced lunch cost. Five superintendents stated that they represented school districts where 70% of the students' meal prices are adjusted.

Minority population varied among the school districts. However, 50% of the superintendents reported that minority population in their district consisted of one percent to 40%. Eight superintendents reported that the minority population reflected over 60%.

Total expense budgets from school districts ranged from two million dollars to 1.5 billion dollars. Of the responding superintendents, three did not respond to the question relating to their district's budget. Fifty-one respondents had budgets that ranged over fifty million dollars and seventeen superintendents had budgets over one hundred million dollars.

Fourteen superintendents omitted the question that related to the amount of funding appropriated for Charter Schools. Most of the superintendents (45) did not have an operating Charter School in their district, therefore funding was not appropriated. Those superintendents with Charter Schools (40) reported that five thousand to one million dollars was appropriated. The determining factor in the amount of funding relies on the number of students attending a Charter School in the district or neighboring LEA. Nineteen respondents (22.4 %) had a total expense budget appropriation of between ninety-one thousand and eight hundred thousand dollars. Eight superintendents stated that over eight hundred thousand dollars was appropriated for Charter Schools.

Discussion

The majority of the superintendents in this sample had had one to five years of experience as a superintendent with their district's location identified as rural. A substantial concern was raised regarding the accountability of Charter Schools. Many superintendents were skeptical about Charter Schools' ability to provide quality instruction and innovative practices to meet the needs of all students. This supports research by the North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research (2003) that Charter Schools were not performing as well as traditional public schools. Brown & Roney

(2003), however, found that individual Charter Schools or networks of Charter Schools were performing well. One superintendent indicated that “Charter Schools were a detriment to public education, because it was obvious from data that they were not working.” Results from 2005-2006) North Carolina Testing Program reflected the continued concern that Charter Schools were not performing as well as traditional public schools (Appendix I).

Although studies by Sperling (1999) and Ogden (1995) found that Charter Schools met the needs of some students, they found that Charter Schools did not offer a variety of instructional strategies. Mintron (2000) found that innovative techniques and strategies were incorporated minimally in Charter Schools. Further research by Reynolds (2000) reported that inventive techniques and strategies in Charter Schools are not varied. Superintendents, in this study, also agreed (74.1%) that Charter Schools were not providing innovative educational opportunities for students, especially for at-risk students. Of the ninety-nine Charter Schools, less than half (46) are making expected growth on the North Carolina Testing Program.

Superintendents’ comments, in this study, also indicated that they are skeptical about the quality of education provided by Charter Schools. For example, one superintendent stated that “Charter Schools are a detriment to public education, because it is obvious from data that they are not working” and “I feel that Charter Schools provide options for parents and students desiring another choice to public education. I do not feel that it will greatly impact public education in NC given current regulations. While it is a choice, data indicate mixed results w/ regards to student achievement. This may suggest that Charter School may serve other purposes.”

Approximately 32% of the superintendents, in this study, reported that they were not pleased to have the opportunity to try new academic strategies such as Charter Schools. This large percentage demonstrated superintendents' concerns regarding Charter Schools' ability to provide quality educational outcomes for students.

Superintendents also agreed that Charter Schools should (a) provide essential services such as special education, transportation, lunch programs, etc; (b) provide and enrichment programs such as art, music, and physical education for all students; (c) pay teacher salaries at the same rate as the traditional public school. Similar results were also found in research by Sperling (1999) and Odgen (1995). In both studies, superintendents felt that Charter Schools must be responsible for providing essential services. One superintendent's comment in this study stated that "Schools funded by public dollars should be bound by the same rules and regulations."

Many superintendents considered Charter Schools as an education reform that provides choice. Charter Schools are perceived by parents, teachers, students, community, and policy makers as an opportunity for effective education. This supports research by the North Carolina Education Alliance (2004) that Charter Schools: (a) gives parents the opportunity to choose the best school for their child; (b) provides schools with the opportunity to innovate; (c) offers teachers the independence to customize curricula; and (d) presents administrators with the freedom to make school management decisions without regulations and bureaucrats. Further research shown by Lucretia Peebles (2000) identified Charter Schools as an innovation that provides expanded opportunities for the nations' students and an educational reform that is supported by parents, the public, and policymakers.

Although superintendents did not consider Charter Schools as competitive with traditional public schools, they did recognize them as a viable public school alternative. As a result, administrators in traditional public schools can no longer assume that they are the sole vehicle for educating students. As legislators address Bill 30 (Raise Cap on Charter Schools) and make their ultimate decision of maintaining or increasing the number of Charter Schools this year, it is still apparent that choice within school districts has been established and continues to gain momentum (General Assembly 2007-2008 session).

The issue surrounding equity of financial disparity funding was another concern of superintendents. Superintendents recognized that Charter School funds were not equitable with traditional public schools funds. However, several superintendents stated that they are expecting an increase in the budget for Charter Schools next year due to new schools being added to their school district or an increase in the number of students attending a Charter School. Research by Speakman and Hassell (2005) revealed that funding for Charter Schools is less than traditional public schools.

Another study conducted by the Legislative Office of Education Oversight (2004) also found that according to the levels of funding, Charter Schools received lower levels of per-pupil operating revenue than traditional public schools (see Appendix J). In addition, findings in the report indicated that many Charter Schools used operating funds to acquire facilities. Although superintendents recognized the disparity in funding, they are still concerned that dollars provided for Charter Schools reduce their school budgets substantially.

A suspicion that Charter Schools are politically motivated and not educational was also revealed in this study. Superintendents felt that Charter Schools could be another name for a voucher system in a North Carolina. However, Berryhill

(1996) found that groups such as the State Board of Education, the North Carolina Board of Education, the North Carolina School Boards Association, and the Mecklenburg County School Board endorsed the Charter School Bill, because (1) they oppose tax credits and school vouchers, and (2) Charter Schools have open enrollment and funding is kept in the public school system.

One superintendent's comment stated, "I am totally opposed to Charter Schools." I believe they are a precursor of establishing the voucher system. I also know that the Charter School in my area, which would not exist if students weren't pulled from adjacent counties, was established by a small group that was newly arrived citizens in my county. I believe their motive was self-serving and not for the good of the general population." Sperling (1999) results supported the superintendents' distrust of Charter Schools.

In the open-ended and questionnaire, superintendents agreed that Charter Schools segregate certain groups of students, the privileged from underprivileged. Research by Schnaiberg (1998) found that the first concern of Charter Schools in North Carolina was the fear of "white-flight academies" of the 1970's. Although North Carolina policymakers inserted a diversity-clause in the Charter School legislation that required the population of Charter Schools to resemble the racial and ethnic composition of the district within a year, a substantial number of Charter Schools that opened in 1997 were disproportionately African American.

Additional research found in the Charter School Evaluation Report (2001) reflected that nearly two-thirds of North Carolina Charter Schools had enrollments that were racially homogeneous. Sixty-one of the 100 Charter Schools reflected a substantial

racial imbalance in their enrollments: either greater than 80% white students or greater than 80% minority students.

Findings from Bifulco and Ladd (2005) showed that African American students attended Charter Schools with enrollment close to 70% of African American students; only 30% of their parents had a college education; and the average student's test score lagged behind one year. However, Caucasian students attending Charter Schools with enrollments more than 80% of non-black; 47% of their parents were college graduates; and the average student test scores were well above average. The researchers attributed the racial imbalance of Charter Schools to the location of the school, the school's mission of serving educationally disadvantaged students, or the providing of a specific curriculum such as the curriculum in *Haliwa Saponi Tribal School*, which emphasized Native American culture.

One superintendent's comment clearly supported that Charter Schools segregate students, "My responses are based on 40 plus years of experience in the field of education. After serving as a superintendent, I served as the director of the North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching for 8 years. During my time as a superintendent and as director I served on many committees that studied the effect of Charter Schools and heard many discussions related to the issue. I cannot endorse a program that I believe will broaden the gap between the "have and have-nots" in our state". Another superintendent also stated that "Charter Schools provide a way for the "haves" in society to attend school with other "haves", not the have-nots."

One superintendent's comment stated, "I am totally opposed to Charter Schools." I believe they are a precursor of establishing the voucher system. I also know that the Charter

School in my area, which would not exist if students weren't pulled from adjacent counties, was established by a small group that was newly arrived citizens in my county. I believe their motive was self-serving and not for the good of the general population." Sperling (1999) results support the superintendents' distrust of Charter Schools.

In the open-ended and questionnaire, superintendents agreed that Charter Schools segregate certain groups of students, the privileged from underprivileged. Research by Schnaiberg (1998) found that the first concern of Charter Schools in North Carolina was the fear of "white-flight academies" of the 1970's. Although North Carolina policymakers inserted a diversity-clause in the Charter School legislation that required the population of Charter Schools to resemble the racial and ethnic composition of the district within a year, a substantial number of Charter Schools that opened in 1997 were disproportionately African American.

Additional research found in the Charter School Evaluation Report (2001) reflected that nearly two-thirds of North Carolina Charter Schools had enrollments that were racially homogeneous. Sixty-one of the 100 Charter Schools reflected a substantial racial imbalance in their enrollments: either greater than 80% white students or greater than 80% minority students.

Findings from Bifulco and Ladd (2005) showed that African American students attended Charter Schools with enrollment close to 70% of African American students; only 30% of their parents had a college education; and the average student's test score lagged behind one year. However, Caucasian students attending Charter Schools with enrollments more than 80% of non-black; 47% of their parents were college graduates; and the average student test scores were well above average. The researchers attributed

the racial imbalance of Charter Schools to the location of the school, the school's mission of serving educationally disadvantaged students, or the providing of a specific curriculum such as the curriculum in *Haliwa Saponi Tribal School*, which emphasized Native American culture.

Superintendents' comments also support that Charter Schools segregate students, "My responses are based on 40 plus years of experience in the field of education. After serving as a superintendent, I served as the director of the North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching for 8 years. During my time as a superintendent and as director I served on many committees that studied the effect of Charter Schools and heard many discussions related to the issue. I cannot endorse a program that I believe will broaden the gap between the "have and have-nots" in our state" and Charter Schools provide a way for the "haves" in society to attend school with other "haves", not the have-nots.

Implications

The findings resulting from this study implied for policymakers that North Carolina Superintendents recognized Charter Schools as a part of education's future and an educational reform that promotes choice. Implementing of Charter Schools has served as an approach to meet parental and societal demands for a better educational system. Although research has shown that Charter Schools were not performing as well as traditional public schools, they are meeting the needs of some children.

For parents, results showed that Charter Schools provide an avenue for them to choose a particular program that supports the unique educational needs of their child/children. In North Carolina, school choice is limited to open enrollment, magnet schools, and Charter

Schools. Since the inception of Charter Schools, the legislature has been asked to remove the cap or increase the number of Charter Schools. The increasing demand for additional Charter Schools reflects that they are valued and will remain as an entity in educational system.

Results also revealed that superintendents viewed Charter Schools with a degree of skepticism. Issues surrounding accountability, the implementing of essential and enrichment services, and the financial burden placed on school districts reflect substantial concerns regarding Charter Schools. As Charter Schools continue to operate under a separate entity from the traditional public schools, it may be beneficial for Charter Schools to develop a working relationship with the district superintendent. This relationship may be critical in determining the future success of Charter School-superintendent exchange within the school district. Results indicated that a collaborative relationship between superintendents and Charter School administrators is necessary.

Conclusions

According to Schlechty (1990) five functions must be implemented for change to occur successfully: (a) the concept of change must be determined, (b) people who were going to be called on to support the change, but were not involved in the conceptualization process, have to be aware of the change, (c) feedback from those who were not involved in the initial conceptualization but who would be called on for support have to be solicited, and where possible and appropriate, incorporated into the change process, (d) activity to implement the change have to begin and people have to be motivated to act in directions indicated by the change, and (e) a system of ongoing

support and training have to be provided for those who were being asked to support the change.

Feedback, a component of Schlechty's model, plays an integral role in implementing change effectively. It is important that Charter Schools, a form of change, solicit feedback from those who were not involved in the initial conceptualization and appropriately integrate it into the change process (Schlechty, 1990). Superintendents' feedback in this study may serve as a valuable tool as Charter Schools monitor, evaluate, adjust, and reflect on their missions.

Given the demands of parents, policymakers, and society, it is essential that the educational system provide avenues to support the exceptional needs of students. Charter Schools, an educational reform, serves as a vehicle for improving student achievement; enhancing parental involvement; increasing collaboration between administration, teachers, parents, and the community; and addressing other school deficiencies. Through the development of a working relationship with school district superintendents, Charter Schools may obtain the trust and develop a dialogue that strengthens communication between the two groups. This dialogue may serve to decrease or lessen the skepticism of superintendents.

It could be argued that in order for Charter Schools to meet the challenges of the educational system, they must remain as an educational delivery system parallel to traditional public schools. As Charter Schools and superintendents move to address educational concerns, it is apparent that they must have a shared interest that bonds the two educational delivery systems into one unit, working for the betterment of students in the school district. A collaborative relationship may be beneficial to both Charter Schools and school district

superintendents. In states, such as Illinois, Colorado, California, Minnesota, and Hawaii, Charter Schools have developed a relationship with school district leaders. As a result of this relationship, Charter Schools have negotiated and received a variety of in-kind services. In-kind services include: transportation, special education support, administrative assistance, food services, facilities, etc. (AFT, 2002). These services play an integral role in the operation of Charter Schools. For example, one school district includes transportation for Charter School students and in another school district a neighboring school prepares meals (breakfast and lunch) for a Charter School.

Utilizing Charter Schools to demonstrate district reform efforts may be beneficial to school superintendents. Milwaukee and California are among states that have successfully utilized Charter Schools as testing sites for learning and experimental labs. One superintendent (Chula Vista Elementary School District) found that by using Charter as test sites for learning the following has occurred: (a) gains in student achievement have been sustained, (b) parental involvement has increased, and (c) data has been collected regularly to analyze and monitor patterns (Hassel, Fullwood, Terrell, and Schroeder, 2004).

Recommendations for Further Research

In completing this research, several issues were examined to determine the extent to which superintendents are positive towards Charter Schools. Charter Schools have been operating in North Carolina for ten years and it is hoped that the results of this investigation will encourage future exploration to measure their impact from many viewpoints. Therefore the researcher recommends a study to:

1. examine the impact of Charter Schools through a comparison of traditional public and Charter School principals, using the same questionnaire as in the current study.
2. examine the impact of Charter Schools through a comparison of traditional public and Charter School board members using the same questionnaire as in the current study.
3. examine the impact of Charter Schools using demographics such as (large or small school districts, low wealth or high wealth school districts).
4. re-examine the perceptions of public school superintendents regarding Charter Schools after a five-year period to determine if their perceptions have changed.
5. conduct a study similar to Norblitt and Corbett (2001) to examine issues surrounding accountability, disparities in funding, parental satisfaction, racial concerns, and other components of Charter Schools.

The demands for improvement in the educational system have provided North Carolina Charter Schools a permanent position in the educational arena. Current legislation (Senate Bill 490) will play an integral role in determining the growth of Charter Schools; the ultimate decision of removing or retaining the cap on North Carolina Charter Schools (see Appendix K). Research reveals that superintendents can be supportive or obstructive towards Charter Schools. The foregoing research has yielded an important set of superintendents' perceptions – some distributing, some encouraging.

As future decisions are made, it is hoped that the addition of both data and superintendents' comments from this research will be useful to educational leaders, Charter School organizers, and lawmakers.

Appendix A

North Carolina Charter Law (Bill 955)

North Carolina Charter Law

Combined Text of House Bill 955 ratified on June 21, 1996 and subsequent Charter School amendments ratified on August 13, 1997 and October 28, 1998.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA

1995 SESSION

RATIFIED BILL

CHAPTER 731

BILL 955

AN ACT TO INCREASE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY BY AUTHORIZING THE
CREATION AND FUNDING OF CHARTER SCHOOLS, WHICH ARE DEREGULATED
SCHOOLS UNDER PUBLIC CONTROL

and

1997 SESSION

S.L. 1997-430

SENATE BILL 297

AN ACT TO AMEND THE LAWS GOVERNING CHARTER SCHOOLS.

And

1998 SESSION

S.L. 1998-212

SB 1366

SPECIAL PROVISION IN THE BUDGET BILL

SECTION 9.14

Part 6A. Charter Schools

§ 115C-238.29A. Purpose.

The purpose of this Part is to authorize a system of Charter Schools to provide opportunities for teachers, parents, pupils, and community members to establish and maintain schools that operate independently of existing schools, as a method to accomplish all of the following:

- (1) Improve student learning;
- (2) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are identified as at risk of academic failure or academically gifted;
- (3) Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- (4) Create new professional opportunities for teachers, including the opportunities to be responsible for the learning program at the school site;
- (5) Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system; and
- (6) Hold the schools established under this Part accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results, and provide the schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance-based accountability systems. (1995 (Reg. Sess., 1996), c. 731, s. 2

§ 115C-238.29B. Eligible applicants; contents of applications; submission of applications for approval.

(a) Any person, group of persons, or nonprofit corporation seeking to establish a Charter School may apply to establish a Charter School. If the applicant seeks to convert a public school to a Charter School, the application shall include a statement signed by a majority of the teachers and instructional support personnel currently employed at the school indicating that they favor the conversion and evidence that a significant number of parents of children enrolled in the school favor conversion.

(b) The application shall contain at least the following information:

- (1) A description of a program that implements one or more of the purposes in G.S. 115C-238.29A.
- (2) A description of student achievement goals for the school's educational program and the method of demonstrating that students have attained the skills and knowledge specified for those student achievement goals.
- (3) The governance structure of the school including the names of the proposed initial members of the board of directors of the nonprofit, tax-exempt corporation and the process to be followed by the school to ensure parental involvement.
- (3a) The local school administrative unit in which the school will be located.
- (4) Admission policies and procedures.
- (5) A proposed budget for the school and evidence that the financial plan for the school is

economically sound.

(6) Requirements and procedures for program and financial audits.

(7) A description of how the school will comply with G.S. 115C-238.29F.

(8) Types and amounts of insurance coverage, including bonding insurance for the principal officers of the school, to be obtained by the Charter School.

(9) The term of the charter.

(10) The qualifications required for individuals employed by the school.

(11) The procedures by which students can be excluded from the Charter School and returned to a public school. Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, any local board may refuse to admit any student who is suspended or expelled from a Charter School due to actions that would lead to suspension or expulsion from a public school under G.S. 115C-391 until the period of suspension or expulsion has expired.

(12) The number of students to be served, which number shall be at least 65, and the minimum number of teachers to be employed at the school, which number shall be at least three. However, the Charter School may serve fewer than 65 students or employ fewer than three teachers if the application contains a compelling reason, such as the school would serve a geographically remote and small student population.

(13) Information regarding the facilities to be used by the school and the manner in which administrative services of the school are to be provided.

(14) Repealed by Session Laws 1997, c. 430, s. 1, effective August 22, 1997.

I An applicant shall submit the application to a chartering entity for preliminary approval. A chartering entity may be:

(1) The local board of education of the local school administrative unit in which the Charter School will be located;

(2) The board of trustees of a constituent institution of The University of North Carolina, so long as the constituent institution is involved in the planning, operation, or evaluation of the Charter School; and (3) The State Board of Education.

Regardless of which chartering entity receives the application for preliminary approval, the State Board of Education shall have final approval of the Charter School.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, if the State Board of Education finds that an applicant (i) submitted an application to a local board of education and received final approval from the State Board of Education, but (ii) is unable to find a suitable location within that local school administrative unit to operate, the State Board of Education may authorize the Charter School to operate within an adjacent local school administrative unit for one year only. The Charter School cannot operate for more than one year unless it reapplies, in accordance with subdivision (1), (2), or

(3) of this subsection, and receives final approval from the State Board of Education.

(c1) Unless an applicant submits its application under subsection I of this section to the local board of education of the local school administrative unit in which the Charter School will be located, the applicant shall submit a copy of its application to that local board within seven days of its submission under subsection I of this section. The local board may offer any information or comment concerning the application it considers appropriate to the chartering entity. The local board shall deliver this information to the chartering entity no later than January 1 of the next calendar year. The applicant shall not be required to obtain or deliver this information to the chartering entity on behalf of the local board. The State Board shall consider any information or comment it receives from a local board and shall consider the impact on the local school administrative unit's ability to provide a sound basic education to its students when determining whether to grant preliminary and final approval of the Charter School. (1995 (Reg. Sess., 1996), c. 731, s. 2; 1997-430, s. 1)

§ 115C-238.29C. Preliminary approval of applications for Charter Schools.

(a) The chartering entity that receives a request for preliminary approval of a Charter School shall act on each request received prior to November 1 of a calendar year by February 1 of the next calendar year. (b) The chartering entity shall give preliminary approval to the application if the chartering entity determines that (i) information contained in the application meets the requirements set out in this Part or adopted by the State Board of Education, (ii) the applicant has the ability to operate the school and would be likely to operate the school in an educationally and economically sound manner, and (iii) granting the application would improve student learning and would achieve one of the other purposes set out in G.S. 115C-238.29A. In reviewing applications for the establishment of Charter Schools within a local school administrative unit, the chartering entity is encouraged to give preference to applications that demonstrate the capability to provide comprehensive learning experiences to students identified by the applicants as at risk of academic failure. If the chartering entity approves more than one application for Charter Schools located in a local school administrative unit, the chartering entity may state its order of preference among the applications that it approves.

If a chartering entity other than the State Board disapproves an application, the applicant may appeal to the State Board of Education prior to February 15. The State Board shall consider the appeal at the same time it is considering final approval in accordance with G.S. 115C-238.29D. The State Board shall give preliminary approval of the application if it finds that the chartering entity acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner in disapproving the application, failed to consider appropriately the application, or failed to act within the time set out in G.S. 115C-238.29C.

If the chartering entity, the State Board of Education, or both, disapprove an application, the applicant may modify the application and reapply subject to the application deadline contained in subsection (a) of this section. (1995 (Reg. Sess., 1996), c. 731, s. 2.)₂

§ 115C-238.29D. Final approval of applications for Charter Schools.

(a) The State Board shall grant final approval of an application if it finds that the application meets the requirements set out in this Part or adopted by the State Board of Education and that granting the application would achieve one or more of the purposes set out in G.S. 115C-238.29A. The State Board shall act by March 15 of a calendar year on all applications and appeals it receives prior to February 15 of that calendar year. (b) The State Board shall authorize no more than five Charter Schools per year in one local school administrative unit. The State Board shall authorize no more than 100 Charter Schools statewide. If more than five Charter Schools in one local school administrative

unit or more than 100 schools statewide meet the standards for final approval, the State Board shall give priority to applicants that are most likely to further State education policies and to strengthen the educational program offered in the local school administrative units in which they are located. (c) The State Board of Education may authorize a school before the applicant has secured its space, equipment, facilities, and personnel if the applicant indicates the authority is necessary for it to raise working capital. The State Board shall not allocate funds to the school until the school has obtained space. (d) The State Board of Education may grant the initial charter for a period not to exceed five years and may renew the charter upon the request of the chartering entity for subsequent periods not to exceed five years each. A material revision of the provisions of a charter application shall be made only upon the approval of the State Board of Education. Beginning with the Charter School's second year of operation and annually thereafter, the State Board shall allow a Charter School to increase its enrollment by ten percent (10%) of the school's previous year's enrollment or as is otherwise provided in the charter. This enrollment growth shall not be considered a material revision of the charter application and shall not require the prior approval of the State Board. (1995 (Reg. Sess., 1996), c. 731, s. 2; 1997-430, s. 3.

§ 115C-238.29E. Charter School operation.

(a) A Charter School that is approved by the State shall be a public school within the local school administrative unit in which it is located. It shall be accountable to the local board of education if it applied for and received preliminary approval from that local board for purposes of ensuring compliance with applicable laws and provisions of its charter. All other Charter Schools shall be accountable to the State Board for ensuring compliance with applicable laws and the provisions of their charters, except that any of these Charter Schools may agree to be accountable to the local board of the school administrative unit in which the Charter School is located rather than to the State Board.

(b) A Charter School shall be operated by a private nonprofit corporation that shall have received federal tax-exempt status no later than 24 months following final approval of the application.

I A Charter School shall operate under the written charter signed by the entity to which it is accountable under subsection (a) of this section and the applicant. A Charter School is not required to enter into any other contract. The charter shall incorporate the information provided in the application, as modified during the charter approval process, and any terms and conditions imposed on the Charter School by the State Board of Education. No other terms may be imposed on the Charter School as a condition for receipt of local funds.

(d) The board of directors of the Charter School shall decide matters related to the operation of the school, including budgeting, curriculum, and operating procedures.

(e) A Charter School's specific location shall not be prescribed or limited by a local board or other authority except a zoning authority. The school may lease space from a local board of education or as is otherwise lawful in the local school administrative unit in which the Charter School is located. If a Charter School leases space from a sectarian organization, the Charter School classes and students shall be physically separated from any parochial students, and there shall be no religious artifacts, symbols, iconography, or materials on display in the Charter School's entrance, classrooms, or hallways. Furthermore, if a Charter School leases space from a sectarian organization, the Charter School shall not use the name of that organization in the name of the Charter School.

At the request of the Charter School, the local board of education of the local school administrative unit in which the Charter School will be located shall lease any available building or land to the

Charter School unless the board demonstrates that the lease is not economically or practically feasible or that the local board does not have adequate classroom space to meet its enrollment needs. Notwithstanding any other law, a local board of education may provide a school facility to a Charter School free of charge; however, the Charter School is responsible for the maintenance of and insurance for the school facility.

(f) Except as provided in this Part and pursuant to the provisions of its charter, a Charter School is exempt from statutes and rules applicable to a local board of education or local school administrative unit. (1995 (Reg. Sess., 1996), c. 731, s. 2; 1997-430, s. 4.)

§ 115C-238.29F. General requirements.

(a) Health and Safety Standards. – A Charter School shall meet the same health and safety requirements required of a local school administrative unit.

(b) School Nonsectarian. – A Charter School shall be nonsectarian in its programs, admission policies, employment practices, and all other operations and shall not charge tuition or fees. A Charter School shall not be affiliated with a nonpublic sectarian school or a religious institution.

I Civil Liability and Insurance. –

(1) The board of directors of a Charter School may sue and be sued. The State Board of Education shall adopt rules to establish reasonable amounts and types of liability insurance that the board of directors shall be required by the charter to obtain. The board of directors shall obtain at least the amount of and types of insurance required by these rules to be included in the charter. Any sovereign immunity of the Charter School, of the organization that operates the Charter School, or its members, officers, or directors, or of the employees of the Charter School or the organization that operates the Charter School, is waived to the extent of indemnification by insurance.

(2) No civil liability shall attach to any chartering entity, to the State Board of Education, or to any of their members or employees, individually or collectively, for any acts or omissions of the Charter School.

(d) Instructional Program. –

(1) The school shall provide instruction each year for at least 180 days.

(2) The school shall design its programs to at least meet the student performance standards adopted by the State Board of Education and the student performance standards contained in the charter.

(3) A Charter School shall conduct the student assessments required for Charter Schools by the State Board of Education.

(4) The school shall comply with policies adopted by the State Board of Education for Charter Schools relating to the education of children with special needs.

(5) The school is subject to and shall comply with Article 27 of Chapter 115C of the General Statutes, except that a Charter School may also exclude a student from the Charter School and return that student to another school in the local school administrative unit in accordance with the terms of its

charter.

(e) Employees. –

(1) An employee of a Charter School is not an employee of the local school administrative unit in which the Charter School is located. The Charter School's board of directors shall employ and contract with necessary teachers to perform the particular service for which they are employed in the school; at least seventy-five percent (75%) of these teachers in grades kindergarten through five, at least fifty percent (50%) of these teachers in grades six through eight, and at least fifty percent (50%) of these teachers in grades nine through 12 shall hold teacher certificates. The board also may employ necessary employees who are not required to hold teacher certificates to perform duties other than teaching and may contract for other services. The board may discharge teachers and noncertified employees.

(2) No local board of education shall require any employee of the local school administrative unit to be employed in a Charter School.

(3) If a teacher employed by a local school administrative unit makes a written request for an extended leave of absence to teach at a Charter School, the local school administrative unit shall grant the leave. The local school administrative unit shall grant a leave for any number of years requested by the teacher, shall extend the leave for any number of years requested by the teacher, and shall extend the leave at the teacher's request. For the initial year of a Charter School's operation, the local school administrative unit may require that the request for a leave or extension of leave be made up to 45 days before the teacher would otherwise have to report for duty. For subsequent years, the local school administrative unit may require that the request for a leave or extension of leave be made up to 90 days before the teacher would otherwise have to report for duty. A teacher who has career status under G.S. 115C-325 prior to receiving an extended leave of absence to teach at a Charter School may return to a public school in the local school administrative unit with career status at the end of the leave of absence or upon the end of employment at the Charter School if an appropriate position is available. If an appropriate position is unavailable, the teacher's name shall be placed on a list of available teachers and that teacher shall have priority on all positions for which that teacher is qualified in accordance with G.S. 115C-325(e)(2).

(4) The employees of the Charter School will be deemed employees of the local school administrative unit for purposes of providing certain State-funded employee benefits, including membership in the Teachers' and State Employees' Retirement System and the Teachers' and State Employees' Comprehensive Major Medical Plan. The State Board of Education provides funds to Charter Schools, approves the original members of the boards of directors of the Charter Schools, has the authority to grant, supervise, and revoke charters, and demands full accountability from Charter Schools for school finances and student performance. Accordingly, it is the determination of the General Assembly that Charter Schools are public schools and that the employees of Charter Schools are public school employees. Employees of a Charter School whose board of directors elects to become a participating employer under G.S. 135-5.3 are "teachers" for the purpose of membership in the North Carolina Teachers' and State Employees' Retirement System. In no event shall anything contained in this Part require the North Carolina Teachers' and State Employees' Retirement System to accept employees of a private employer as members or participants of the System.

(f) Accountability. –

(1) The school is subject to the financial audits, the audit procedures, and the audit requirements

adopted by the State Board of Education for Charter Schools. These audit requirements may include the requirements of the School Budget and Fiscal Control Act.

(2) The school shall comply with the reporting requirements established by the State Board of Education in the Uniform Education reporting System.

(3) The school shall report at least annually to the chartering entity and the State Board of Education the information required by the chartering entity or the State Board.

(g) Admission Requirements. –

(1) Any child who is qualified under the laws of this State for admission to a public school is qualified for admission to a Charter School.

(2) No local board of education shall require any student enrolled in the local school administrative unit to attend a Charter School.

(3) Admission to a Charter School shall not be determined according to the school attendance area in which a student resides, except that any local school administrative unit in which a public school converts to a Charter School shall give admission preference to students who reside within the former attendance area of that school.

(4) Admission to a Charter School shall not be determined according to the local school administrative unit in which a student resides.

(5) A Charter School shall not discriminate against any student on the basis of ethnicity, national origin, gender, or disability. Except as otherwise provided by law or the mission of the school as set out in the charter, the school shall not limit admission to students on the basis of intellectual ability, measures of achievement or aptitude, athletic ability, disability, race, creed, gender, national origin, religion, or ancestry. The Charter School may give enrollment priority to siblings of currently enrolled students who were admitted to the Charter School in a previous year and to children of the school's principal, teachers, and teacher assistants. In addition, and only for its first year of operation, the Charter School may give enrollment priority to children of the initial members of the Charter School's board of directors, so long as (i) these children are limited to no more than ten percent (10%) of the school's total enrollment or to 20 students, whichever is less, and (ii) the Charter School is not a former public or private school.

Within one year after the Charter School begins operation, the population of the school shall reasonably reflect the racial and ethnic composition of the general population residing within the local school administrative unit in which the school is located or the racial and ethnic composition of the special population that the school seeks to serve residing within the local school administrative unit in which the school is located. The school shall be subject to any court-ordered desegregation plan in effect for the local school administrative unit.

(6) During each period of enrollment, the Charter School shall enroll an eligible student who submits a timely application, unless the number of applicants exceeds the capacity of a program, class, grade level, or building. In this case, students shall be accepted by lot. Once enrolled, students are not required to reapply in subsequent enrollment periods.

(7) Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, a Charter School may refuse admission to any student who has been expelled or suspended from a public school under G.S. 115C-391 until the period of suspension or expulsion has expired.

(h) Transportation. – The charter may provide transportation for students enrolled at the school. The Charter School shall develop a transportation plan so that transportation is not a barrier to any student who resides in the local school administrative unit in which the school is located. The Charter School is not required to provide transportation to any student who lives within one and one-half miles of the school. At the request of the Charter School and if the local board of the local school administrative unit in which the Charter School is located operates a school bus system, then that local board may contract with the Charter School to provide transportation in accordance with the Charter School’s transportation plan to students who reside in the local school administrative unit and who

reside at least one and one-half miles of the Charter School. A local board may charge the Charter School a reasonable charge that is sufficient to cover the cost of providing this transportation. Furthermore, a local board may refuse to provide transportation under this subsection if it demonstrates there is no available space on buses it intends to operate during the term of the contract or it would not be practically feasible to provide this transportation.

(g) Assets. – Upon dissolution of the Charter School or upon the nonrenewal of the charter, all net assets of the Charter School purchased with public funds shall be deemed the property of the local school administrative unit in which the Charter School is located. (1995 (Reg. Sess., 1996), c. 731, s. 2; 1997-430, s. 5; 1997-443, s. 8.19(a); 1998-212, s. 9.14A(a).)

§ 115C-238.29G. Causes for nonrenewal or termination; disputes.

(a) The State Board of Education, or a chartering entity subject to the approval of the State Board of Education, may terminate or not renew a charter upon any of the following grounds:

- (1) Failure to meet the requirements for student performance contained in the charter;
- (2) Failure to meet generally accepted standards of fiscal management;
- (3) Violations of law;
- (4) Material violation of any of the conditions, standards, or procedures set forth in the charter;
- (5) Two-thirds of the faculty and instructional support personnel at the school request that the charter be terminated or not renewed; or
- (6) Other good cause identified.

(b) The State Board of Education shall develop and implement a process to address contractual and other grievances between a Charter School and its chartering entity or the local board of education during the time of its charter.

I The State Board and the Charter School are encouraged to make a good-faith attempt to resolve the differences that may arise between them. They may agree to jointly select a mediator. The mediator shall act as a neutral facilitator of disclosures of factual information, statements of positions and

contentions, and efforts to negotiate an agreement settling the differences. The mediator shall, at the request of either the State Board or a Charter School, commence mediation immediately or within a reasonable period of time. The mediation shall be held in accordance with rules and standards of conduct adopted under Chapter 7A of the General Statutes governing mediated settlement conferences but modified as appropriate and suitable to the resolution of the particular issues in disagreement.

Notwithstanding Article 33C of Chapter 143 of the General Statutes, the mediation proceedings shall be conducted in private. Evidence of statements made and conduct occurring in mediation is not subject to discovery and is inadmissible in any court action. However, no evidence otherwise discoverable is inadmissible merely because it is presented or discussed in mediation. The mediator shall not be compelled to testify or produce evidence concerning statements made and conduct occurring in mediation in any civil proceeding for any purpose, except disciplinary hearings before the State Bar or any agency established to enforce standards of conduct for mediators. The mediator may determine that an impasse exists and discontinue the mediation at any time. The mediator shall not make any recommendations or public statement of findings or conclusions. The State Board and the Charter School shall share equally the mediator's compensation and expenses. The mediator's compensation shall be determined according to rules adopted under Chapter 7A of the General Statutes. (1995 (Reg. Sess., 1996), c. 731, s. 2; 1997-430, s. 6.)

§ 115C-238.29H. State and local funds for a Charter School.

(a) The State Board of Education shall allocate to each Charter School:

(1) An amount equal to the average per pupil allocation for average daily membership from the local school administrative unit allotments in which the Charter School is located for each child attending the Charter School except for the allocation for children with special needs and for the allocation for children with limited English proficiency;

(2) An additional amount for each child attending the Charter School who is a child with special needs; and

(3) An additional amount for children with limited English proficiency attending the Charter School, based on a formula adopted by the State Board.

In accordance with G.S. 115C-238.29D (d), the State Board shall allow for annual adjustments to the amount allocated to a Charter School based on its enrollment growth in school years subsequent to the initial year of operation.

In the event a child with special needs leaves the Charter School and enrolls in a public school during the first 60 school days in the school year, the Charter School shall return a pro rata amount of funds allocated for that child to the State Board, and the State Board shall reallocate those funds to the local school administrative unit in which the public school is located. In the event a child with special needs enrolls in a Charter School during the first 60 school days in the school year, the State Board shall allocate to the Charter School the pro rata amount of additional funds for children with special needs.

(a1) Funds allocated by the State Board of Education may be used to enter into operational and financing leases for real property or mobile classroom units for use as school facilities for Charter Schools and may be used for payments on loans made to Charter Schools for facilities or equipment.

However, State funds shall not be used to obtain any other interest in real property or mobile classroom units. No indebtedness of any kind incurred or created by the Charter School shall constitute an indebtedness of the State or its political subdivisions, and no indebtedness of the Charter School shall involve or be secured by the faith, credit, or taxing power of the State or its political subdivisions. Every contract or lease into which a Charter School enters shall include the previous sentence. The school may own land and buildings it obtains through non-State sources.

(b) If a student attends a Charter School, the local school administrative unit in which the child resides shall transfer to the Charter School an amount equal to the per pupil local current expense appropriation to the local school administrative unit for the fiscal year. (1995 (Reg. Sess., 1996), c. 731, s. 2; 1997-430, s. 7; 1998-212, s. 9.20(f).)

§ 115C-238.29I. Notice of the Charter School process; review of Charter Schools; Charter School Advisory Committee. [effective until July 1, 1999.]

(a) The State Board of Education shall distribute information announcing the availability of the Charter School process described in this Part to each local school administrative unit and public postsecondary educational institution and, through press releases, to each major newspaper in the State.

(b) The State Board of Education shall report annually to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee and the Joint Legislative Commission on Governmental Operations the following information:

(1) The current and projected impact of Charter Schools on the delivery of services by the public schools;

(2) Student academic progress in the Charter Schools as measured, where available, against the academic year immediately preceding the first academic year of the Charter Schools' operation; and

(3) Best practices resulting from Charter School operations.

The State Board of Education shall base its report in part upon the annual reports submitted by the Charter Schools under G.S. 115C-238.29F (f)(3). To the extent possible, the State Board of Education shall present the information in disaggregated form relative to the race, gender, grade level, and economic condition of the students.

I The State Board of Education shall review the educational effectiveness of the Charter School approach authorized under this Part and the effect of Charter Schools on the public schools in the local school administrative unit in which the Charter Schools are located and, not later than January 1, 1999, shall report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee with recommendations to modify, expand, or terminate that approach. Analysis of the reports submitted under subsection (b) of this section shall be the predominant factor in determining whether the number of Charter Schools shall be increased and the conditions under which any increase or continued operation shall be allowed. If the analysis indicates demonstrable, substantial success, the General Assembly shall consider expanding the number of Charter Schools that may be established.

(d) The State Board of Education may establish a Charter School Advisory Committee to assist with the implementation of this Part. The Charter School Advisory Committee may (i) provide technical assistance to chartering entities or to potential applicants, (ii) review applications for preliminary

approval, (iii) make recommendations as to whether the State Board should approve applications for Charter Schools, (iv) make recommendations as to whether the State Board should terminate or not renew a charter, (v) make recommendations concerning grievances between a Charter School and its chartering entity, the State Board, or a local board, (vi) assist with the review under subsection I of the section, and (vii) provide any other assistance as may be required by the State Board.

(e) Notwithstanding the dates set forth in this Part, the State Board of Education may establish an alternative time line for the submission of applications, preliminary approvals, criminal record checks, appeals, and final approvals so long as the Board grants final approval by March 15 of each calendar year. (1995 (Reg. Sess., 1996), c. 731, s. 2; 1997-430, ss. 8, 9.)

§ 115C-238.29I. Notice of the Charter School process; review of Charter Schools; Charter School Advisory Committee. [effective July 1, 1999.]

(a) The State Board of Education shall distribute information announcing the availability of the Charter School process described in this Part to each local school administrative unit and public postsecondary educational institution and, through press releases, to each major newspaper in the State.

(b) Repealed effective July 1, 1999 by Session Laws 1997-18, s. 15(i).

I The State Board of Education shall review the educational effectiveness of the Charter School approach authorized under this Part and the effect of Charter Schools on the public schools in the local school administrative unit in which the Charter Schools are located.

(d) The State Board of Education may establish a Charter School Advisory Committee to assist with the implementation of this Part. The Charter School Advisory Committee may (i) provide technical assistance to chartering entities or to potential applicants, (ii) review applications for preliminary approval, (iii) make recommendations as to whether the State Board should approve applications for Charter Schools, (iv) make recommendations as to whether the State Board should terminate or not renew a charter, (v) make recommendations concerning grievances between a Charter School and its chartering entity, the State Board, or a local board, (vi) assist with the review under subsection I of the section, and (vii) provide any other assistance as may be required by the State Board.

(e) Notwithstanding the dates set forth in this Part, the State Board of Education may establish an alternative time line for the submission of applications, preliminary approvals, criminal record checks, appeals, and final approvals so long as the Board grants final approval by March 15 of each calendar year. (1995 (Reg. Sess., 1996), c. 731, s. 2; 1997-18, s. 15(i); 1997-430, ss. 8, 9.)

§ 115C-238.29J. Public and private assistance to Charter Schools.

(a) Local boards of education are authorized and encouraged to provide administrative and evaluative support to Charter Schools located within their local school administrative units.

(b) Private persons and organizations are encouraged to provide funding and other assistance to the establishment or operation of Charter Schools.

I The State Board of Education shall direct the Department of Public Instruction to provide guidance and technical assistance, upon request, to applicants and potential applicants for charters. (1995 (Reg.

Sess., 1996), c. 731, s. 2; 1997-430, s. 10.)

§ 115C-238.29K. Criminal history checks.

(a) As used in this section:

(1) “Criminal history” means a county, state, or federal criminal history of conviction of a crime, whether a misdemeanor or a felony, that indicates an individual (i) poses a threat to the physical safety of students or personnel, or (ii) has demonstrated that he or she does not have the integrity or honesty to fulfill his or her duties as school personnel. These crimes include the following North Carolina crimes contained in any of the following Articles of Chapter 14 of the General Statutes: Article 5A, Endangering Executive and Legislative Officers; Article 6, Homicide; Article 7A, Rape and Kindred Offenses; Article 8, Assaults; Article 10, Kidnapping and Abduction; Article 13, Malicious Injury or Damage by Use of Explosive or Incendiary Device or Material; Article 14, Burglary and Other Housebreakings; Article 15, Arson and Other Burnings; Article 16, Larceny; Article 17, Robbery; Article 18, Embezzlement; Article 19, False Pretense and Cheats; Article 19A, Obtaining Property or Services by False or Fraudulent Use of Credit Device or Other Means; Article 20, Frauds; Article 21, Forgery; Article 26, Offenses Against Public Morality and Decency; Article 26A, Adult Establishments; Article 27, Prostitution; Article 28, Perjury; Article 29, Bribery; Article 31, Misconduct in Public Office; Article 35, Offenses Against the Public Peace; Article 36A, Riots and Civil Disorders; Article 39, Protection of Minors; and Article 60, Computer-Related Crime. These crimes also include possession or sale of drugs in violation of the North Carolina Controlled Substances Act, Article 5 of Chapter 90 of the General Statutes, and alcohol-related offenses such as sale to underage persons in violation of G.S. 18B-302 or driving while impaired in violation of G.S. 20-138.1 through G.S. 20-138.5. In addition to the North Carolina crimes listed in this subdivision, such crimes also include similar crimes under federal law or under the laws of other states.

(2) “School personnel” means any:

a. Member of the board of directors of a Charter School,

b. Employee of a Charter School, or

c. Independent contractor or employee of an independent contractor of a Charter School if the independent contractor carries out duties customarily performed by school personnel,

whether paid with federal, State, local, or other funds, who has significant access to students or who has responsibility for the fiscal management of a Charter School.

(b) The State Board of Education shall adopt a policy on whether and under what circumstances school personnel shall be required to be checked for a criminal history. The policy shall not require school personnel to be checked for a criminal history check before preliminary approval is granted under G.S. 115C-238.29B. The Board shall apply its policy uniformly in requiring school personnel to be checked for a criminal history. The Board may grant conditional approval of an application while the Board is checking a person’s criminal history and making a decision based on the results of the check.

The State Board shall not require members of boards of directors of Charter Schools or employees of

Charter Schools to pay for the criminal history check authorized under this section.

I The Board of Education shall require the person to be checked by the Department of Justice to (i) be fingerprinted and to provide any additional information required by the Department of Justice to a person designated by the State Board, or to the local sheriff or the municipal police, whichever is more convenient for the person, and (ii) sign a form consenting to the check of the criminal record and to the use of fingerprints and other identifying information required by the repositories. The State Board shall consider refusal to consent when deciding whether to grant final approval of an application under G.S. 115C-238.29D and when making an employment recommendation. The fingerprints of the individual shall be forwarded to the State Bureau of Investigation for a search of the State criminal history record file, and the State Bureau of Investigation shall forward a set of fingerprints to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a national criminal history record check. The Department of Justice shall provide to the State Board of Education the criminal history from the State and National Repositories of Criminal Histories of any school personnel for which the Board requires a criminal history check.

The State Board shall not require members of boards of directors of Charter Schools or employees of Charter Schools to pay for the fingerprints authorized under this section.

(d) The State Board shall review the criminal history it receives on an individual. The State Board shall determine whether the results of the review indicate that the individual (i) poses a threat to the physical safety of students or personnel, or (ii) has demonstrated that he or she does not have the integrity or honesty to fulfill his or her duties as school personnel and shall use the information when deciding whether to grant final approval of an application for a Charter School under G.S. 115C-238.29D and for making an employment recommendation to the board of directors of a Charter School. The State Board shall make written findings with regard to how it used the information when deciding whether to grant final approval under G.S. 115C-238.29D and when making an employment recommendation.

(e) The State Board shall notify in writing the board of directors of the Charter School of the determination by the State Board as to whether the school personnel is qualified to operate or be employed by a Charter School based on the school personnel's criminal history. At the same time, the State Board shall provide to the Charter School's board of directors the written findings the Board makes in subsection (d) of this section and its employment recommendation. If the State Board recommends dismissal or nonemployment of any person, the board of directors of the Charter School shall dismiss or refuse to employ that person. In accordance with the law regulating the dissemination of the contents of the criminal history file furnished by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the State Board shall not release nor disclose any portion of the school personnel's criminal history to the Charter School's board of directors or employees. The State Board also shall notify the school personnel of the procedure for completing or challenging the accuracy of the criminal history and the personnel's right to contest the State Board's determination in court.

(f) All the information received by the State Board of Education or the Charter School in accordance with subsection (e) of this section through the checking of the criminal history is privileged information and is not a public record but is for the exclusive use of the State Board of Education or the board of directors of the Charter School. The State Board of Education or the board of directors of the Charter School may destroy the information after it is used for the purposes authorized by this section after one calendar year.

(g) There shall be no liability for negligence on the part of the State Board of Education or the board

of directors of the Charter School, or their employees, arising from any act taken or omission by any of them in carrying out the provisions of this section. The immunity established by this subsection shall not extend to gross negligence, wanton conduct, or intentional wrongdoing that would otherwise be actionable. The immunity established by this subsection shall be deemed to have been waived to the extent of indemnification by insurance, indemnification under Articles 31A and 31B of Chapter 143 of the General Statutes, and to the extent sovereign immunity is waived under the Tort Claims Act, as set forth in Article 31 of Chapter 143 of the General Statutes. (1997-430, s. 2.)

Appendix B

SUPERINTENDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Directions: Please rate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statement by placing a check mark (v) in the appropriate column at the right of each statement.	1	2	3	4	5
SECTION 1: PERSONAL REACTIONS TO CHARTER SCHOOLS					
1.1 I feel that Charter Schools are part of the future of public education.					
1.2 I am skeptical about Charter Schools' ability to provide quality educational outcomes for students.					
1.3 I am pleased to have the opportunity to try new academic strategies such as Charter Schools.					
1.4 I think that Charter Schools do not promote equal education for all children.					
1.5 I feel that Charter Schools are politically motivated.					
SECTION 2: INTENTIONS OF CHARTER SCHOOLS					
2.1 The intent is to restructure public education.					
2.2 The intent is to increase student success.					
2.3 The intent is to enhance teacher involvement indecision-making,					
2.4 The intent is to present a viable public school alternative.					
2.5 The intent is to stimulate competition to improve all schools.					
SECTION 3: RESPONSIVENESS OF CHARTER SCHOOLS					
3.1 Charter Schools respond to the business community's demand for change in education.					
3.2 Charter Schools respond to parents' demands for change in education.					
3.3 Charter Schools are an educational idea that provides choice.					
3.4 Charter Schools do not substantially reduce funding to public school districts.					
3.5 Charter Schools provide innovative educational opportunities for at-risk students.					
SECTION 4: EFFECTS OF CHARTER SCHOOL ON PUBLIC EDUCATION					
4.1 Charter Schools will increase parental involvement.					
4.2 Charter Schools will provide greater parental choice for their children.					
4.3 Charter Schools will decrease teacher decision making in instructional programming in all schools.					
4.4 Charter Schools will decrease teacher, parent, and administrator collaboration in decision-making.					
4.5 Charter Schools will provide diverse ways of organizing or grouping students for learning.					
4.6 Charter Schools will segregate certain groups of students.					
SECTION 5: FUNDING ISSUES INVOLVING CHARTER SCHOOLS					
5.1 Funding for Charter Schools are not equitable with funding for public					

5. Number of years as an superintendent:
0 – 5___ 6 – 10___ 11 – 15___ 16 – 20___ over 20___
6. Have many Charter Schools do you have operating in your school district?
None___ 1 – 2___ 3 – 4___ 5 – 6___ 7 – 8___ 9 – 10___
more than 10___
7. Your school district (2006-2007) total current expense budget: \$ _____
8. Your school district (2006-2007) total expense budget appropriation for
Charter Schools: \$ _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!

Appendix C

North Carolina School Superintendents

TITLE	FIRST_NAME	LAST_NAME	ENTITY_NAME
Dr	Randy	Bridges	Alamance-Burlington
Mr	Jack	Hoke	Alexander County
Dr	Jeffrey	Cox	Alleghany County
Dr	George	Truman	Anson County
Mr	Donnie	Johnson	Ashe County
Mrs	Grace	Calhoun	Avery County
Dr	Jeffrey	Moss	Beaufort County
Dr	Nettie	Hart	Bertie County
Dr	H.	Dinkins	Bladen County
Dr	Katie	McGee	Brunswick County
Mr	Clifton	Dodson	Buncombe County
Mr	Robert	Logan	Asheville City
Mr	David	Burleson	Burke County
Dr	Harold	Winkler	Cabarrus County
Dr	Jo Anne	Byerly	Kannapolis City
Dr	Steve	Stone	Caldwell County
Mr	Ronald	Melchiorre	Camden County
Dr	David	Lenker	Carteret County
Dr	Douglas	Barker	Caswell County
Dr	Tim	Markley	Catawba County
Dr	Ric	Vandett	Hickory City
Dr	Barry	Redmond	Newton-Conover
Dr	Ann	Hart	Chatham County
Dr	Jeanette	Hedrick	Cherokee County
Mr	VACANT		Cherokee Central Sch
Dr	Allan	Smith	Edenton/Chowan
Mr	D	Penland	Clay County
Mr		VACANT	Cleveland County
Dr	Dan	Strickland	Columbus County
Dr	Danny	McPherson	Whiteville City
Mr	William	Rivenbark	Craven County
Dr	William	Harrison	Cumberland County
Dr	Tom	Hager	Fort Brg/Camp Lejeun
Mr	C	Warren	Currituck County
Dr	Sue	Burgess	Dare County
Dr	Fred	Mock	Davidson County
Dr	Rebecca	Bloxam	Lexington City
Dr	Daniel	Cockman	Thomasville City
Dr	Steve	Lane	Davie County
Dr	Wiley	Doby	Duplin County
Dr	Carl	Harris	Durham County

TITLE	FIRST_NAME	LAST_NAME	ENTITY_NAME
Dr	Craig	Witherspoon	Edgecombe County
Dr	Donald	Martin	Forsyth County
Dr	Bert	L'Homme	Franklin County
Mr	L.	McGlohon	Gaston County
Dr	Zenobia	Smallwood	Gates County
Mr	Rick	Davis	Graham County
Mr	Thomas	Williams	Granville County
Dr	L.	Mazingo	Greene County
Dr	Terry	Grier	Guilford County
Mrs	Carolyn	Johnson	Halifax County
Mr	Dennis	Sawyer	Roanoke Rapids City
Dr	Elie	Bracy	Weldon City
Mr	Dan	Honeycutt	Harnett County
Dr	Anne	Garrett	Haywood County
Dr	Stephen	Page	Henderson County
Dr	Mary	Allen	Hertford County
Dr	Freddie	Williamson	Hoke County
Mr	Gregory	Todd	Hyde County
Dr	Terry	Holliday	Iredell-Statesville
Dr	Bruce	Boyles	Mooresville City
Mrs	Sue	Nations	Jackson County
Dr	Anthony	Parker	Johnston County
Dr	Ethan	Lenker	Jones County
Dr	James	McCormick	Lee County
Dr	John	Frossard	Lenoir County
Dr	Jim	Watson	Lincoln County
Dr	Frank	Yeager	Macon County
Dr	Ronald	Wilcox	Madison County
Dr	Thomas	Daly	Martin County
Dr	Ira	Trollinger	McDowell County
Dr	Peter	Gorman	Mecklenburg County
Dr	M. Brock	Womble	Mitchell County
Dr	Donna	Peters	Montgomery County
Dr	Susan	Purser	Moore County
Mr	Richard	McMahon	Nash-Rocky Mount
Dr	D	Morris	New Hanover County
Dr	Kathi	Gibson	Northampton County
Mrs	Freddie	Canady	Onslow County
Dr	Shirley	Carraway	Orange County
Dr	Neil	Pedersen	Chapel Hill-Carrboro
Mr	Rick	Sherrill	Pamlico County
Dr	Tony	Stewart	Pasquotank County
Dr	Theodore	Kaniuka	Pender County
Dr	Kenneth	Wells	Perquimans County
Mr	Ronnie	Bugnar	Person County

TITLE	FIRST_NAME	LAST_NAME	ENTITY_NAME
Dr	Beverly	Reep	Pitt County
Mr	William	Miller	Polk County
Mr	Donald	Andrews	Randolph County
Dr	Diane	Frost	Asheboro City
Dr	Larry	Weatherly	Richmond County
Mr	Johnny	Hunt	Robeson County
Dr	Rodney	Shotwell	Rockingham County
Dr	Judy	Grissom	Rowan-Salisbury
Dr	John	Kinlaw	Rutherford County
Dr	Leslie	Hobbs	Sampson County
Dr	R	Hales	Clinton City
Dr	Shirley	Prince	Scotland County
Dr	Samuel	DePaul	Stanly County
Dr	Larry	Cartner	Stokes County
Dr	Ashley	Hinson, Jr	Surry County
Dr	Barry	Shepherd	Elkin City
Dr	Timothy	Farley	Mount Airy City
Mr	Robert	White	Swain County
Dr	Sonna	Lyda	Transylvania County
Mr	Nelson	Smith	Tyrrell County
Dr	Ed	Davis	Union County
Dr	Norman	Shearin	Vance County
Dr	Del	Burns	Wake County
Dr	Ray	Spain	Warren County
Mr	Julius	Walker	Washington County
Dr	Bobbie	Short	Watauga County
Dr	Steven	Taylor	Wayne County
Dr	Stephen	Laws	Wilkes County
Dr	Larry	Price	Wilson County
Dr	Barbara	Todd	Yadkin County
Dr	Barbara	Tipton	Yancey County

Appendix D

State Profile of Charter Schools (www.uscharterschools.org)

State	Year Law Passed	Number of Charter Schools	Number of Students Enrolled
Alaska	1995	23	4,384
Arizona	1994	499	86,409
Arkansas	1995	17	3,825
California	1992	574	190,000
Colorado	1993	113	36,658
Connecticut	1996	16	2,526
Delaware	1995	13	5,262
District of Columbia	1995	52	19,484
Florida	1996	338	82,000
Georgia	1993	56	20,000
Hawaii	1994	27	5,297
Idaho	1998	24	7,000
Illinois	1996	35	13,000
Indiana	2001	17	4,250
Iowa	2002	10	165
Kansas	1994	31	2,568
Louisiana	1995	16	4,631
Maryland	2003	15	3,000
Massachusetts	1993	50	20,250
Michigan	1993	216	82,000
Minnesota	1991	102	17,500
Mississippi	1997	1	334
Missouri	1998	27	12,130
Nevada	1997	20	4,500
New York	1998	61	18,575
North Carolina	1996	97	28,030
Ohio	1997	268	62,883
Oklahoma	1999	12	2,197
Oregon	1999	65	5,700

<u>State</u>	Year Law Passed	Number of Charter Schools	Number of Students Enrolled
<u>Pennsylvania</u>	1997	114	55,000
<u>Puerto Rico</u>	NA	NA	NA
<u>Rhode Island</u>	1995	11	2,203
<u>South Carolina</u>	1996	27	4,500
<u>Tennessee</u>	2002	7	1,140
<u>Texas</u>	1995	241	80,000
<u>Utah</u>	1998	29	6,808
<u>Virginia</u>	1998	5	1,440
<u>Wisconsin</u>	1993	160	28,073
<u>Wyoming</u>	1995	3	110
Total		3486	948553

Appendix E

The Laws At a Glance Current Ranking from First to Worst (League of Charter Schools, 2006)

The “A” Laws (Honor Roll)

1. District of Columbia
2. Minnesota
3. Delaware
4. Arizona
5. Michigan
6. Indiana

The “C” Laws” (Needs Improvement)

21. Oklahoma
22. Texas
23. Idaho
24. South Carolina
25. Utah
26. Louisiana
27. Nevada
28. Illinois
29. New Hampshire
30. Arkansas
31. Connecticut

The “B” Laws (High Achievers)

7. California
8. Colorado
9. Florida
10. Massachusetts
11. Pennsylvania
12. Ohio
13. New York
14. Missouri
15. North Carolina
16. Georgia
17. New Mexico
18. Oregon
19. Wisconsin
20. New Jersey

The “D” Laws (Barely Making It)

32. Tennessee
33. Wyoming
34. Alaska
35. Hawaii
36. Maryland
37. Kansas
38. Virginia
39. Rhode Island

The “F” Laws (Flunked)

41. Iowa
42. Mississippi

Appendix F

Profiles of Growth & Achievement (North Carolina Charter Schools) (North Carolina Public Charter Schools Annual Report, 2004-2005)

The Honor Schools of Excellence
Arapahoe Charter School
Bethel Hill Charter
Charter Day School
Children's Community School
Exploris
Franklin Academy
Gaston College Preparatory
Gray Stone Day
Greensboro Academy
Lake Norman Charter
Magellan Charter
Metrolina Reg Scholars Academy
Millennium Charter Academy
Orange charter
Piedmont Community charter
Queen's Grant Community
Quest Academy
Raleigh Charter High
River Mill Academy
Sterling Montessori Academy
Summit Charter
The Mountain Community School
Thomas Jefferson Class Academy'
Tiller School
Vance Charter retool ,,
Woods Charter

NCLB School of Perfection
Metrolina Reg Scholars Academy
Magellan Charter
Quest Academy

Top 25
Charter Day School

The Schools of Distinction
American Renaissance Charter
American Renaissance Middle
Art Space Charter
Brevard Academy
Chatham Charter
Children's Village Academy
Clover Garden
Downtown Middle
Forsyth Academies
Francine Delaney New School

Lincoln Charter

Appendix G

Example of Descriptive Statistics Used by Sperling

t-Test for One Sample

Perceptions of Charter Schools

Perceptions of Charter Schools	Number	Mean	SD	t-value
Personal reactions to Charter Schools	56	3.37	.36	7.82
Intentions of Charter Schools	56	3.03	.53	.40
Responsiveness of Charter Schools	55	2.73	.27	-7.32
Effects of Charter Schools on public education	55	2.70	.30	-7.53
Funding issues involving Charter Schools	55	3.61	.64	7.19

Note: from Sperling (1999)

Appendix H

SUPERINTENDENT'S LETTER
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT
CHAPEL HILL

School of Education
CB #3500 Peabody Hall
Chapel Hill, NC 27599 – 3500

Phone: 919-966-7000
Fax: 919-962-1533

Dear Superintendent«Last»:

The purpose of this letter is to request your participation in a research project. I am a graduate student at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill working on my dissertation, A Study to Examine the Perceptions of North Carolina Superintendents Regarding Charter Schools. The information that you provide will be used to assess superintendents' attitudes towards Charter Schools.

Under a separate cover, you will find a consent form, paper version of the questionnaire, and two stamped envelopes. The questionnaire is designed to be completed in 10 minutes or less. For your convenience, the questionnaire can be completed on line at: <https://www.empliant.com/survey/FD623BAC7-9764-A530-497B/>. To ensure confidentiality, if you are completing the questionnaire online, please return the consent form in the small white envelope by February 2, 2007.

Completing of the questionnaire is voluntary. Established standards, privacy, and confidentiality will be maintained in the managing of information. I will have sole access to information and data will be stored in a locked cabinet. All materials will be destroyed after data is collected and analyzed. The results of this study will be reported for the state as a whole; no individual identities will be attached to the data. Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 919-966-3113 or by email to [IRB subjects@unc.edu](mailto:IRB_subjects@unc.edu). Again, thanks for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Carolyn M. Penny
Carolyn M. Penny
Ed.D Candidate in Educational Leadership
UNC at Chapel Hill

William Malloy, Chair
School of Education
UNC at Chapel Hill

Appendix I

Charter Schools (2005-2006 ABC Results)

LEA Code	LEA Name	School Name	Grade Span	Expected Growth
01A	Lakeside School	Lakeside School	6-12	No
01B	River Mill Academy	River Mill Academy	K-12	No
01C	Clover Garden New Century Charter High	Clover Garden New Century Charter High	K-12	No
01D	Grandfather Academy	Grandfather Academy	9-12	Yes
06A	Crossnore Academy	Crossnore Academy	1-11	Yes
06B	Washington Academy	Crossnore Academy Washington	K-12	Yes
07A	Montessori Charter Day School	Montessori	K-8	No
10A	Evergreen Community Charter	Charter Day School	K-7	Yes
11A	Art Space Charter	Evergreen Community Charter	K-8	Yes
11B	Francine Delany New School	Art Space Charter	K-8	Yes
11K	The New Dimensions School	Francine Delany New School	K-8	No
12A	Carolina International School	The New Dimensions School	K-5	Yes
13A	Cape Lookout Marine Science High	Carolina International School	K-8	Yes
16A	Tiller School	Cape Lookout Marine Science High	9-12	Yes
16B	Visions Charter School	Tiller School	K-8	No
18B	Chatham Charter	Visions Charter School	K-6	Yes
19A	Woods Charter	Chatham Charter	K-8	Yes
19B		Woods Charter	1-12	Yes

20A	The Learning Center	The Learning Center	K-6	Yes
26B	Alpha Academy	Alpha Academy	K-8	Yes
32A	Maureen Joy Charter	Maureen Joy Charter	K-7	No
32B	Healthy Start Academy	Healthy Start Academy	K-8	No
32C	Carter Community Charter	Carter Community Charter	K-8	Yes
32D	Kestrel Heights Sch	Kestrel Heights Sch	6-10	No
32G	Omuteko Gwamaziima Research	Omuteko Gwamaziima	K-8	No
32H	Triangle Charter	Research Triangle Charter	K-8	Yes
32J	Ann Atwater Community	Ann Atwater Community	6-10	N/A
32K	Central Park School For Child	Central Park School For Child	K-4	No
34B	Quality Education Academy	Quality Education Academy	3-8	No
34C	Downtown Middle	Downtown Middle	5-8	No
34D	C G Woodson Sch of Challenge	C G Woodson Sch of Challenge	K-12	No
34E	The East Winston Primary	The East Winston Primary	K-6	N/A
34F	Forsyth Academies	Forsyth Academies	K-8	Yes
34G	Arts Based Elementary	Arts Based Elementary	K-5	No
35A	Crosscreek Charter School	Crosscreek Charter School	K-8	No
36A	Highland Charter	Highland Charter	K-2	N/A
36B	Piedmont Community Charter	Piedmont Community Charter	K-10	Yes

41A	Imani Institute Charter Greensboro	Imani Institute Charter	6-8	No
41B	Academy Guilford	Greensboro Academy	K-8	Yes
41C	Preparatory Phoenix	Guilford Preparatory Phoenix Academy	K-9	Yes
41D	Academy Inc	Inc	K-8	No
45A	The Mountain Community Sch American	The Mountain Community Sch	K-8	No
49A	Renaissance Charter American	American Renaissance Charter	K-5	No
49B	Renaissance Middle	American Renaissance Middle	6-8	No
49D	Success Institute Charter	Success Institute Charter	K-8	No
50A	Summit Charter Provisions	Summit Charter	K-8	Yes
53A	Academy Children's Village	Provisions Academy	6-12	Yes
54A	Academy	Children's Village Academy	K-6	Yes
54B	Kinston Charter Academy	Kinston Charter Academy	K-8	Yes
55A	Lincoln Charter	Lincoln Charter	K-12	Yes
60A	Community Charter School Sugar Creek	Community Charter School	K-5	No
60B	Charter Kennedy	Sugar Creek Charter	K-8	No
60C	Charter Lake Norman	Kennedy Charter	6-12	Yes
60D	Charter Metrolina Reg Scholars	Lake Norman Charter	5-8	Yes
60F	Academy	Metrolina Reg Scholars Academy	K-8	Yes
60G	Queen's Grant Community Crossroads	Queen's Grant Community Crossroads Charter	K-8	Yes
60H	Charter High	High	9-12	No

60I	Children's Community School Socrates	Children's Community School	K-4	Yes
60J	Academy The Academy of Moore	Socrates Academy	K-5	N/A
63A	County Sandhills	The Academy of Moore County	K-8	No
63B	Theatre Arts Renaiss Rocky Mount	Sandhills Theatre Arts Renaiss Rocky Mount	K-8	No
64A	Preparatory Cape Fear	Preparatory	K-12	No
65A	Center for Inquiry	Cape Fear Center for Inquiry	K-8	No
66A	Gaston College Preparatory	Gaston College Preparatory	5-9	Yes
68A	Orange Charter PACE	Orange Charter	K-8	Yes
68N	Academy	PACE Academy	9-12	Yes
69A	Arapahoe Charter School Bethel Hill	Arapahoe Charter School	K-8	Yes
73A	Charter	Bethel Hill Charter	K-6	No
78A	CIS Academy Bethany	CIS Academy	6-8	No
79A	Community Middle Rowan	Bethany Community Middle	6-8	No
80A	Academy	Rowan Academy	K-5	N/A
81A	Thomas Jefferson Class Academy	Thomas Jefferson Class Academy	6-12	No
83A	Laurinburg Charter	Laurinburg Charter	9-12	No
83B	The Laurinburg Homework Center	The Laurinburg Homework Center	8-12	Yes
84B	Gray Stone Day Millennium Charter	Gray Stone Day	9-12	No
86A	Academy	Millennium Charter Academy	K-7	Yes

87A	Mountain Discovery Charter Brevard	Mountain Discovery Charter	K-8	No
88A	Academy	Brevard Academy	K-8	No
90A	Union Academy	Union Academy	K-9	Yes
91A	Vance Charter School	Vance Charter School	K-8	Yes
92B	Exploris Baker Charter	Exploris	6-8	Yes
92C	High	Baker Charter High	9-12	No
92D	Magellan Charter Sterling	Magellan Charter	4-8	Yes
92E	Montessori Academy Franklin	Sterling Montessori Academy	K-8	Yes
92F	Academy	Franklin Academy	K-12	Yes
92G	East Wake Academy SPARC	East Wake Academy	K-12	No
92I	Academy Raleigh Charter	SPARC Academy	K-8	Yes
92K	High Torchlight	Raleigh Charter High	9-12	Yes
92L	Academy PreEminent	Torchlight Academy	K-6	No
92M	Charter	PreEminent Charter	K-8	No
92N	Quest Academy Community	Quest Academy	K-8	Yes
92P	Partners Charter HS Hope	Community Partners Charter HS	9-12	No
92Q	Elementary	Hope Elementary	K-5	No
92R	Casa Esperanza Montessori	Casa Esperanza Montessori	PK-6	Yes
93A	Haliwa-Saponi Tribal School	Haliwa-Saponi Tribal School	K-10	No
95A	Two Rivers Community School Dillard	Two Rivers Community School	K-12	No
96C	Academy	Dillard Academy	K-4	No

97D	Bridges Charter School	Bridges Charter School	K-8	No
98A	Sallie B Howard School	Sallie B Howard School	K-8	No

Appendix J

Per Pupil Expenditure

Per Pupil And Current Expenditures, Fy1980 To Most Recent Fy
FISCAL YEAR 2005

CUR EXP. \$ ADM	STATE PPE	FEDERAL PPE	LOCAL PPE	ALL SOURCES PPE	FINAL ADM
LEA ID					
Alamance-					
Burlington	4364.77	681.13	1618.64	6664.54	21435
Burlington City	0	0	0	0	0
Alexander County	4554.08	595.31	1270.39	6419.78	5650
Alleghany County	6841.02	889.09	1383.24	9113.35	1489
Anson County	5421.15	1467.81	1066.19	7955.15	4305
Ashe County	5840.68	1110.62	1474.44	8425.74	3176
Avery County	6328.58	1227.82	1855.34	9411.74	2258
Beaufort County	5117.52	1174.14	1384.86	7676.52	7127
Washington City	0	0	0	0	0
Bertie County	6040.38	1235.56	1695.52	8971.46	3307
Bladen County	5317.75	1729.37	1296.24	8343.36	5636
Brunswick County	4866.37	809.07	2278.79	7954.23	10788
Buncombe County	4626.54	650.3	1876.63	7153.47	24942
Asheville City	5042.31	1037.73	4130.16	10210.2	3789
Burke County	4712.29	777.9	1137.45	6627.64	14392
Cabarrus County	4370.45	510.21	1734.17	6614.83	22279
Concord City	0	0	0	0	0
Kannapolis City	4577.96	950.93	1597.3	7126.19	4593
Caldwell County	4680.76	639.3	1377.38	6697.44	12850
Camden County	6422.81	453.38	834.52	7710.71	1662
Carteret County	4894.19	769.97	2468.95	8133.11	8103
Caswell County	6050.1	875.37	973.29	7898.76	3281
Catawba County	4527.09	540.44	1525.09	6592.62	16803
Hickory City	4729.87	802.89	1717.88	7250.64	4372
Newton-Conover	4981.53	1183.82	1985.23	8150.58	2790
Chatham County	4659.38	659.3	2468.38	7787.06	7374
Cherokee County	5635.35	1137.76	1333.4	8106.51	3606
Edenton/Chowan	6051.04	984.86	1754.71	8790.61	2432
Clay County	6664.07	709	1412	8785.07	1266
Cleveland County	4894.91	725.37	1566.85	7187.13	17035
Kings Mountain	0	0	0	0	0
Shelby City	0	0	0	0	0
Columbus County	5279.5	1253.31	1071.16	7603.97	6830
Whiteville City	5302.22	1069.44	1018.24	7389.9	2662
Craven County	4739.66	1105.39	1218.84	7063.89	14377

New Bern	0	0	0	0	0
Cumberland					
County	4580.45	1056.17	1402.77	7039.39	51663
Fayetteville City	0	0	0	0	0
Currituck County	5037.21	474.6	2131.41	7643.22	3854
Dare County	4811.25	471.88	3869.24	9152.37	4830
Davidson County	4339.08	446	1354.13	6139.21	19520
Lexington City	5526.95	1373.07	1991.82	8891.84	2998
Thomasville City	5097.32	1705.52	1866.15	8668.99	2522
Davie County	4611.1	489.15	1508.64	6608.89	6234
Duplin County	4913.13	1169.77	1170.97	7253.87	8759
Durham County	4797.44	776.88	2840.74	8415.06	30307
Durham City	0	0	0	0	0
Edgecombe					
County	5268.1	1277.46	1234.1	7779.66	7495
Tarboro City	0	0	0	0	0
Forsyth County	4620.53	615.21	2276.43	7512.17	47800
Franklin County	4708.27	944.04	1552.05	7204.36	7870
Franklinton City	0	0	0	0	0
Gaston County	4374.64	698.53	1472.22	6545.39	31289
Gates County	6422.27	738.42	1574.74	8735.43	1959
Graham County	6908.78	1402.39	947.16	9258.33	1196
Granville County	4732.12	630.13	1443.36	6805.61	8580
Greene County	5907.56	1450.73	1232.35	8590.64	3139
Guilford County	4471.39	683.76	2378.92	7534.07	66367
Greensboro City	0	0	0	0	0
High Point	0	0	0	0	0
Halifax County	5695.26	2059.41	922.08	8676.75	5053
Roanoke Rapids					
City	4983.64	770.23	1925.7	7679.57	2948
Weldon City	6115.13	2283.99	2277.35	10676.47	1038
Harnett County	4640.78	764.25	1284.38	6689.41	16783
Haywood County	4934.38	780.5	1999.2	7714.08	7746
Henderson County	4776.93	764.5	1632.76	7174.19	12292
Hendersonville					
City	0	0	0	0	0
Hertford County	6123.57	1528.2	1155.37	8807.14	3500
Hoke County	5122.34	1293.7	928.57	7344.61	6708
Hyde County	10424.58	1741.76	2809.53	14975.87	640
Iredell-Statesville	4394.01	553	1542.8	6489.81	19291
Mooresville City	4341.71	409.25	1771.8	6522.76	4476
Statesville City	0	0	0	0	0
Jackson County	5176.99	871.49	2127.44	8175.92	3569
Johnston County	4600.11	598.04	1918.17	7116.32	26075
Jones County	7315.96	1433.39	1039.71	9789.06	1349
Lee County	4757.93	842.91	1362.66	6963.5	9056

Lenoir County	4955.52	1013.71	1110.73	7079.96	9788
Kinston City	0	0	0	0	0
Lincoln County	4569.04	588.91	1425.78	6583.73	11441
Macon County	5090.86	734.79	1880.85	7706.5	4120
Madison County	6038.78	889.99	1225.23	8154	2597
Martin County	5305.15	1632.79	1545.71	8483.65	4400
McDowell County	5007.71	838.12	1205.39	7051.22	6364
Mecklenburg County	4400.89	697.55	2422.15	7520.59	117179
Mitchell County	6170.09	900.81	994.29	8065.19	2252
Montgomery County	5322.42	1361.51	1593.26	8277.19	4459
Moore County	4734.28	740.9	1940.89	7416.07	11598
Nash-Rocky Mount	4784.5	987.92	1288.23	7060.65	17932
Rocky Mount	0	0	0	0	0
New Hannover County	4481.06	894.26	2570.38	7945.7	23020
Northampton County	6051.11	1643.47	1407.1	9101.68	3158
Onslow County	4631.19	711.01	1393.28	6735.48	21947
Orange County Chapel Hill-	4700.9	556.46	3089.85	8347.21	6619
Carrboro	4618.66	459.8	4092.03	9170.49	10705
Pamlico County	6921.69	1070.41	1436.6	9428.7	1626
Pasquotank County	5140.84	1063.99	1767.53	7972.36	5884
Pender County	4708.89	841.64	1532.35	7082.88	7065
Perquimans County	6412.76	1807.45	1320.99	9541.2	1706
Person County	4612.44	708.44	1314.07	6634.95	5759
Pitt County	4777.14	921.9	1573.88	7272.92	21374
Greenville City	0	0	0	0	0
Polk County	5765.67	636.23	1942.89	8344.79	2396
Tryon City	0	0	0	0	0
Randolph County	4402.8	579.93	1218.64	6201.37	18073
Asheboro City	4877.82	879.6	1695.85	7453.27	4477
Richmond County	5087	987.13	1031.78	7105.91	8146
Robeson County	5069.76	1271.43	880.88	7222.07	23843
Fairmont City	0	0	0	0	0
Lumberton City	0	0	0	0	0
Red Spring	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Pauls	0	0	0	0	0
Rockingham County	4950.06	764	1577.62	7291.68	14392
Eden	0	0	0	0	0

Madison-Mayodan	0	0	0	0	0
Reidsville City	0	0	0	0	0
Rowan-Salisbury	4567.76	666.88	1591.03	6825.67	20531
Salisbury City	0	0	0	0	0
Rutherford County	4891.01	876.28	1285.95	7053.24	9882
Sampson County	4984.8	1004.59	921.77	6911.16	8138
Clinton City	5189.99	1012.12	1486.52	7688.63	2789
Scotland County	5355.87	1617.55	1544.72	8518.14	6732
Stanly County	4807.01	662.25	1453.64	6922.9	9601
Albemarle City	0	0	0	0	0
Stokes County	5109.97	831.2	1581.96	7523.13	7236
Surry County	4880.28	787.04	1258.04	6925.36	8622
Elkin City	5441.56	530.94	2028.03	8000.53	1205
Mount Airy City	5091.83	809.29	2105.27	8006.39	1809
Swain County	6563.81	1520.93	1321.63	9406.37	1762
Transylvania County	5059.27	752.69	1970.95	7782.91	3752
Tyrrell County	9847.58	1369.99	1315.86	12533.43	615
Union County	4306.48	538.35	1710.02	6554.85	28535
Monroe City	0	0	0	0	0
Vance County	5128.09	1316.03	1408.88	7853	7972
Wake County	4410.93	508.82	2320.12	7239.87	113547
Warren County	5925.49	1492.91	1167.86	8586.26	3035
Washington County	6798.07	2057.05	1325.51	10180.63	2104
Watauga County	4921.8	586.89	2333.87	7842.56	4537
Wayne County	4874.48	905.29	1215	6994.77	18994
Goldsboro City	0	0	0	0	0
Wilkes County	4900.18	819.22	1524.35	7243.75	9898
Wilson County	4666.69	953.37	1447.52	7067.58	12344
Yadkin County	4658.85	596.44	1363.54	6618.83	6020
Yancey County	5877.35	998.89	1253.01	8129.25	2514
STATE TOTAL	4726.64	789.3	1811.66	7327.6	1332009

Appendix K

North Carolina Charter Schools

Charter Name	DPI Consultant	Lead Administrator	Address	City	State & Zip Code	County
Alpha Academy	Jean Krufft	Eugene Slocum	907 Hay St.	Fayetteville	NC 28305	Cumberland
American Renaissance Charter School	Joel Medley	Sharon Molleur	111 Cooper St.	Statesville	NC 28677	Iredell
American Renaissance Middle School	Joel Medley	Stephen Gay	217 South Center Street	Statesville	NC 28677	Iredell
Arapahoe Charter School	Carl Pridgen	Grady Simpson	9005 NC Hwy 306S	Arapahoe	NC 28510	Pamlico
Arts Based Elementary	Joel Medley	Robin Hollis	1380 N Martin Luther King Jr. Dr	Winston Salem	NC 27101	Forsyth/W S
ArtSpace Charter School	Jackie Jenkins	Dr. Tony Horning	2030 US Hwy 70	Swannanoa	NC 28778-8211	Buncombe
Bethany Community Middle School	Joel Medley	Ed Mise	181 Bethany Rd	Reidsville	NC 27320	Rockingham
Bethel Hill Charter School	Joel Medley	John Betterton	401 Bethel Hill School Rd	Roxboro	NC 27573	Person
Brevard Academy	Jackie Jenkins	Dr. Tom Mahan; Al Evans	PO Box 2375	Brevard	NC 28712	Transylvania
Bridges	Joel Medley	Paul Welborn	2587 Pleasant Ridge Rd	State Road	NC 28676	Wilkes
Cape Fear Center for Inquiry	Jean Krufft	Dr. Lisa Griffin	3131B Randall Parkway	Wilmington	NC 28403	New Hanover
Cape Lookout Marine Science High School	Carl Pridgen	Susan Smith	1108 Bridges St	Morehead City	NC 28577	Carteret

Charter Name	DPI Consultant	Lead Administrator	Address	City	State & Zip Code	County
Carolina International School	Jackie Jenkins	Dr. Richard Beall	8810 Hickory Ridge Rd	Harrisburg	NC 28075	Cabarrus
Carter Community School	Carl Pridgen	Gail Taylor	1305 West Club Blvd	Durham	NC 27705	Durham
Casa Esperanza Montessori	Jean Krufft	Janice Bonham West	2600 Sumner Blvd #130	Raleigh	NC 27616	Wake
Charter Day School	Jean Krufft	Mark Cramer	7055 Bacon's Way	Leland	NC 28451	Brunswick
Chatham Charter School	Jean Krufft	Ronnie Joyce; Janet Walters	PO Box 245	Siler City	NC 27344	Chatham
Children's Community School	Jackie Jenkins	Joy K. Warner	565 Griffith S	Davidson	NC 28036	Mecklenburg /Charlotte
CIS Academy	Jean Krufft	Ronald Bryant	PO Box 706	Lumberton	NC 28359	Robeson
Clover Garden	Joel Medley	Dr. David Pugh, Jr.	2454 Altamaha w-Union Ridge Rd.	Burlington	NC 27217	Alamance/ Burlington
Community Partners High	Jean Krufft	Carroll Reed	PO Box 100	Holly Springs	NC 27540-0100	Wake
Crosscreek Charter	Carl Pridgen	Robin Jackson	P O Box 1075	Louisburg	NC 27549	Franklin
Crossnore Academy	Joel Medley	Sharon Smith Wise	PO Box 309	Crossnore	NC 28616-0249	Avery
Crossroads Charter High	Jackie Jenkins	Ken Simmons	5500 N. Tryon St.	Charlotte	NC 28213-7918	Mecklenburg /Charlotte
Dillard Academy	Carl Pridgen	Hilda Hicks	504 West Elm St	Goldsboro	NC 27530	Wayne
East Wake Academy	Carl Pridgen	Brandon Smith	400 NMC Dr.	Zebulon	NC 27597	Wake
Evergreen Community Charter School	Jackie Jenkins	Dr. Jackie Williams	50 Bell Road	Asheville	NC 28805	Buncombe

Charter Name	DPI Consultant	Lead Administrator	Address	City	State & Zip Code	County
Exploris Middle School	Jean Kruft	Kevin Piacenza	207 E Hargett St	Raleigh	NC 27601	Wake
Forsyth Academies	Joel Medley	Dorothy Heath	5426 Shattalon Dr.	Winston Salem	NC 27106	Forsyth/W S
Francine Delany New School for Children	Jackie Jenkins	Buffy Fowler	PO Box 16161	Asheville	NC 28816	Buncombe /A'ville City
Gaston College Preparatory	Carl Pridgen	Caleb Dolan; Tammi Sutton	320 Pleasant Hill Road	Gaston	NC 27832	Northampton
Grandfather Academy	Joel Medley	Doug Herman	PO Box 2260	Banner Elk	NC 28604	Avery
Gray Stone Day School	Joel Medley	Helen Nance	c/o Pfeiffer Univ. POB 960	Misenheimer	NC 28109	Stanly
Greensboro Academy	Joel Medley	Rudy Swofford	4049 Battleground Ave	Greensboro	NC 27410	Guilford
Guilford Prep Academy	Joel Medley	Robin Buckrham	2207A E. Cone Blvd	Greensboro	NC 27405	Guilford
Haliwa-Saponi Tribal	Carl Pridgen	Walter Goode; Susan Silver	130 Haliwa Saponi Trail	Hollister	NC 27844	Warren
Healthy Start Academy Charter Elementary School	Carl Pridgen	Dietrich Danner	807 W. Chapel Hill St.	Durham	NC 27701	Durham
Highland Charter Public School	Jackie Jenkins	Joseph Dixon; Sherida Stevens	324 N Highland Street P O Box 1653	Gastonia	NC 28053-1653	Gaston
Hope Elementary School	Jean Kruft	Robbie Graham	1116 N Blount St.	Raleigh	NC 27604	Wake
John H. Baker, Jr., High School	Jean Kruft	Marti Wilson	PO Box 2415	Raleigh	NC 27602-2415	Wake
Kennedy School	Jackie Jenkins	Stacey Rose	1717 Sharon Rd. West	Charlotte	NC 28210	Mecklenburg /Charlotte

Charter Name	DPI Consultant	Lead Administrator	Address	City	State & Zip Code	County
Kestrel Heights School	Carl Pridgen	Tim Dugan	2119 Chapel Hill Rd	Durham	NC 27707	Durham
Kinston Charter Acad	Carl Pridgen	W. D. Anderson	2000 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd	Kinston	NC 28501	Lenoir
Lake Norman Charter School	Jackie Jenkins	Ben Putnam	12820 S. Church St	Huntersville	NC 28078	Mecklenburg /Charlotte
Learning Center	Jackie Jenkins	Mary Jo Dyer	945 Conaheeta St.	Murphy	NC 28906	Cherokee
Lincoln Charter School	Jackie Jenkins	Keith Hain (Lincolnton); Dave Machado (Denver)	133 Eagle Nest Rd	Lincolnton	NC 28092-7383	Lincoln
Magellan Charter School	Jean Krufft	Mary Griffin	9400 Forum Dr.	Raleigh	NC 27615	Wake
Maureen Joy Charter School	Carl Pridgen	Les Stein	1955 W. Corwallis Rd	Durham	NC 27705	Durham
Metrolina Regional Scholars' Academy	Jackie Jenkins	Dr. Marie Peine	7000 Endhaven Lane	Charlotte	NC 28277	Mecklenburg /Charlotte
Millennium Charter Academy	Joel Medley	Kirby R. McCrary	500 Old Springs Rd.	Mount Airy	NC 27030	Surry/Mt. Airy City
Mountain Discovery Charter	Jackie Jenkins	Chantelle Carroll; Carter Petty	P O Box 1879	Bryson City	NC 28713	Swain
New Century School	Joel Medley	Dr. Marcia Huth	P.O. Box 162	Saxapahaw	NC 27340	Alamance
Omuteko Gwamaziima	Carl Pridgen	Bernitha Jenkins	P O Box 52072	Durham	NC 27717-2072	Durham
Orange Charter School	Jean Krufft	David Christenbury	920 Corporate Drive	Hillsborough	NC 27278	Orange

Charter Name	DPI Consultant	Lead Administrator	Address	City	State & Zip Code	County
PACE Academy	Jean Krufft	Rhonda R. Franklin	1713 Legion Rd	Chapel Hill	NC 27517	Orange/Ch. Hill-Carrboro
Phoenix Academy	Joel Medley	Kim Norcross	4020 Meeting Way	High Point	NC 27265	Guilford
Piedmont Community School	Jackie Jenkins	Courtney Madden	PO Box 3706	Gastonia	NC 28054	Gaston
PreEminent Charter School	Jean Krufft	Kenya Wallace	3815 Rock Quarry Rd.	Raleigh	NC 27610-5123	Wake
Provisions Academy	Jean Krufft	Sadie Jordan	P O Box 5437	Sanford	NC 27331-5437	Lee
Quality Education Academy	Joel Medley	Simon Johnson	5012-D Lansing Dr	Winston Salem	NC 27105	Forsyth/WS
Queen's Grant Community Schools	Jackie Jenkins	Christy Morrin	6400 Matthews-Mint Hill Rd.	Mint Hill	NC 28227	Mecklenburg /Charlotte
Quest Academy	Jean Krufft	Dr. Charles Watson	9650 Strickland Rd Ste 175	Raleigh	NC 27615	Wake
Raleigh Charter High School	Jean Krufft	Dr. Tom Humble	1111 Haynes St.	Raleigh	NC 27604	Wake
Research Triangle Charter Academy	Carl Pridgen	Terry Gullick	2013 Ellis Rd	Durham	NC 27703-6127	Durham
River Mill Academy	Joel Medley	Kristen R. Shattuck	PO Box 1450	Graham	NC 27253	Alamance/Burlington
Rocky Mount Prep. School	Carl Pridgen	Michael Pratt	3334 Bishop Rd	Battleboro	NC 27809-9039	Nash /Rocky Mount
Roxboro Community School	Joel Medley	Sam Kennington	115 Lake Drive	Roxboro	NC 27573	Person

Charter Name	DPI Consultant	Lead Administrator	Address	City	State & Zip Code	County
Sallie B. Howard School	Carl Pridgen	Dr. JoAnne Woodard	1004 Herring Ave.	Wilson	Wilson, NC 27893	Wilson
Sandhills Theatre Arts Renaissance School (STARS)	Jean Krufft	David Jackson	140 Southern Dunes Dr.	Vass	NC 28394	Moore
Socrates Academy	Jackie Jenkins	Janis Dellinger-Holton	8310 McAlpine Park Drive	Charlotte	NC 28211	Mecklenburg /Charlotte
SPARC Academy	Carl Pridgen	Bobbie Little	P.O. Box 37518	Raleigh	NC 27627	Wake
Sterling Montessori Academy	Jean Krufft	Jeine Gomez	202 Treybrooke Dr.	Morrisville	NC 27560	Wake
Success Institute	Joel Medley	Tenna Williams	1424 Rickert St	Statesville	NC 28677	Iredell
Sugar Creek Charter School	Jackie Jenkins	Cheryl Ellis	4101 N Tryon St	Charlotte	NC 28206	Mecklenburg /Charlotte
Summit Charter School	Jackie Jenkins	Dr. Pat Ingraham	PO Box 1339	Cashiers	NC 28717	Jackson
The Academy of Moore County	Jean Krufft	Bill Moore	105 Turner Street	Southern Pines	NC 28387	Moore
The Carter G. Woodson School of Challenge	Joel Medley	Ruth Hopkins	437 Gold Floss St	Winston Salem	NC 27127	Forsyth/WS
The Central Park School for Children	Carl Pridgen	Carolyn Kirkland	724 Foster St.	Durham	NC 27701	Durham
The Children's Village Academy	Carl Pridgen	Gloria Battle	PO Box 2206	Kinston	NC 28502	Lenoir
The Community Charter School	Jackie Jenkins	Dennis LaCaria	510 S. Torrence St.	Charlotte	NC 28204	Mecklenburg /Charlotte
The Downtown Middle School	Joel Medley	Amanda Gane	280 S. Liberty St.	Winston Salem	NC 27101	Forsyth/WS
The Franklin Academy	Carl Pridgen	Denise Kent K-5; David Mahaley 6-12	604 Franklin St	Wake Forest	NC 27587	Wake
The Laurinburg Homework Center Charter School	Jean Krufft	Annie Cureton	PO Box 929	Laurinburg	NC 28353	Scotland

Charter Name	DPI Consultant	Lead Administrator	Address	City	State & Zip Code	County
The Mountain Community School	Jackie Jenkins	Chad Hamby	613 Glover Street	Hendersonville	NC 28792	Henderson
The New Dimensions School	Joel Medley	Pam Shue	PO Box 2248	Morganton	NC 28680	Burke
The Woods Charter School	Jean Krufft	Simon King	PO Box 5008	Chapel Hill	NC 27517	Chatham
Thomas Jefferson Classical Academy	Jackie Jenkins	Joseph A. Maimone	Hwy 221-A	Mooresboro	NC 28114-7698	Rutherford
Tiller School	Carl Pridgen	Rita Bowman	1950 Hwy.70 E	Beaufort	NC 28516	Carteret
Torchlight Academy	Jean Krufft	Cynthia McQueen	3211 Bramer Drive	Raleigh	NC 27604	Wake
Two Rivers Community School	Joel Medley	Steve Oates	1018 Archie Carroll Rd	Boone	NC 28607	Watuaga
Union Academy	Jackie Jenkins	Ken Templeton; Katie Holmberg	675 N. M.L. King Jr. Blvd	Monroe	NC 28110	Union
Vance Charter School	Carl Pridgen	Dr. John von Rohr	1227 Dabney Drive	Henderson	NC 27536-0019	Vance
Washington Montessori	Carl Pridgen	Stacey Sheppard	500 Avon Centre	Washington	NC 27889	Beaufort

Appendix L

Sperling's Permission Letter

12/05/2006 15:41

2196505320

MERRILLVILLE SCHOOLS

PAGE 02/02



**MERRILLVILLE COMMUNITY
SCHOOL CORPORATION**
6701 Delaware Street, Merrillville, IN 46410-3586
(219) 650-5300 FAX (219) 650-5320

ADMINISTRATION

- ANTHONY M. LUX, Ph.D.
Superintendent
- MARK B. SPERLING, Ed.D.
Asst Superintendent
- KIMBERLY J. FOX
Ass't To The Superintendent
Business Affairs
- JAMES C. KURTH
Director Personnel
- KELLY P. MURPHY
Director
Information Technology
Services
- JANELLE BOWEN
Director
Media Services
- MARY McVADE
Coordinator
Student Data Services
- RAY HAMILTON
Director
Technology Instruction
and Training
- LARRY JUZWICKI
Director Security
- GREG PIERSON
Director
Maintenance Services
- PAM SCHILLING
Director
Adult
Education/Community
Services
- COLLEEN HOSTETLER
Director Food Services
- CAROL BENNETT
Public Information Officer

**BOARD
OF
SCHOOL TRUSTEES**

- THOMAS G. BAINBRIDGE
President
- MARK S. LUCAS
Vice-President
- MARK D. GREGOLINE
Secretary
- JAMES DONOHUE
Member
- DONNA R. STATH
Member

December 5, 2006

TO: Carolyn Penny
RE: Charter School Instruction

Dear Ms. Penny,

Please feel free to use the survey questionnaire that I developed for use in my dissertation on Superintendent's Perceptions of Charter Schools.

I understand that some adaptations have to be made to update the items and reflect recent changes in Charter School law. You can make any changes that you feel are appropriate and necessary to meet the needs of your study.

Good luck on completing your dissertation.

Sincerely,

Mark Sperling, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent

"We Strive For Excellence"

Reference List

- American Federation of Teachers (2002). Do charter schools measure up? The charter school experiment after ten years. Retrieved September 15, 2006 from http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/downloads_/teachers/charterreport02.pdf
- Amsler, M. & Mulholland, L. (1992). The search for choice in public education. San Francisco, California: West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, (ERIC document ED354583).
- Armistead, L, Armistead, R., & Breckheimer, S. (2001). Grading the north carolina student accountability standards. Student accountability standards and high-stakes testing in north carolina. A Position Statement and Supporting Paper. North Carolina: North Carolina School Psychology Association.
- Bauchrach, S. (1990). Education reform. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bielick, S. & Chapman, C. (2003). Trends in the use of school choice: 1993-1999. U. S. Department of Education. Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Bierlein, L. & Mulholland, L. (1994). The promise of Charter Schools. *Educational Leader*, p. 146-159.
- Bierlein, L. & Mulholland, L. (1994). Charter School update: expansion of a viable reform initiative. Arizona: Morrison Institute for Public Policy.
- Boyer, E. (1983). HIGH school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper and Row.
- Brown, A. (1983). Action for Excellence. A comprehensive plan to improve our nation's schools. Denver: Education Commission of the States.
- Brown, F. (1999). North Carolina Charter School law: Flexibility versus Accountability. *Education and Urban Society*. (31) 4, p. 465-488.
- Brown, K. & Roney, K. (2003). Turning point. *Middle School Journal*, 34 (3), p. 38-46.
- Buddin, R. & Zimmer, R. (2005). Student achievement in charter schools: A complex picture. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Vol. 23, No. 2005a. Online at <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/10993405/PDFSTART>.
- Buechler, M. (1996). Charter schools: Legislation and results after four years. Policy Report. PR – 813, Eric Document: ED. 3921155.
- Bulkley, K. & Fislser, J. (2002). A decade of Charter Schools: From theory to

- practice. Consortium for Policy Research, University of Pennsylvania, 1-12.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a profession. ED 268 120.
- Cash, J. & Cash, F. (2003) Infusion: Measuring up. *Educational Leadership*, 33 (1).
- Cobb, C. & Suarez, T. (2000). Charter schools in north Carolina: Evaluation context and year one overview. *The High School Journal*, 83 (5), p. 3-9.
- Cobb, C. & Suarez, T. (2000) Charter Schools in north Carolina: an evaluation context and year-one overview. *The High School Journal*, 83 (4), p.3-9.
- Cremin, L. (1961). The genius of american education. New York: Vintage.
- Cuban, L. (1990). How schools change reforms: Redefining reform success and failure. *Teachers College Record*, 90(3), 453-477.
- Daniels, S. (2002). Evaluating charter schools: Assessing the charter school evaluation report. North Carolina Family Policy Council, 1-4.
- Department of Education (1987, March). Remarks to the national governors' association. Conference in Columbia, Missouri.
- Detrich, R., Phillips, R. & Durrett, D. (2002). Critical issue: Dynamic debate determining the evolving impact of charter schools. North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved October 1, 2004, from <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/envrnmnt/go/go800.htm>.
- Dufour, R. & Eaker, R. (1992). Creating the new american school: A principal's guide to school improvement. Bloomington, Indiana: National Educational Service.
- Easley, Mike. Governor Easley. Briefs legislators on 2006 agenda. Retrieved September 29, 2006 from www.governor.state.nc.us/Reform.
- Eberts, R. & Hollenbeck, K. (2001). An examination of student's achievement in michigan charter schools. W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research Staff Working Papers, p. 1-68.
- Education Commission of the States (1997). *Charter schools: Laws as of 10/97*. Denver, Co.: Researcher. Retrieved October 7, 2002, from <http://www.ecs.org/ecsmain>.

- Educational Research Service. Supporting school improvement: lessons from districts successfully meeting the challenge. Retrieved October 2, 2006 from www.ers.org.
- Education Week (2005). Adequately yearly progress. Retrieved September 2, 2006 from <http://www2.edweek.org/rc/issues/adequate-yearly-progress/>.
- Elmore, R. F. (1997). The politics of education reform. *Issues in Science and Technology*, 14, 41-49.
- Ericson J., Silverman D., Berman, P., Nelson B. & Solomon, D. (2001) Challenge and opportunity: The impact of charter schools on school districts: A report of the national study of charter schools. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.
- Evans, R. (1996). The human side of school change: Reform, resistance, and the real life problems of innovation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Findell, C. (1996). Mathematics education then and now: The need for reform. *Journal of Education*, 178, 3-13.
- Forsyth, J. (2004). Does district leadership really matter? *School Administrator* 61 (11), p.6.
- Fullan, M. (1991). The meaning of educational change (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College.
- Gall, M, Borg, W. & Gall, J. (1996). Educational research: An introduction. New York, Longman Publishing Company.
- Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. New York: Basic.
- Goldhaber, D. (1999). School choice as education reform: What do we know? Washington DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 165).
- Greene, J., Foster, G., & Winters, M. (2003). Apples to apples: an evaluation of charter schools serving general student populations, 1 Manhattan Institute of Policy Research.
- Gronbreg, T. & Jansen, D. (2001) Navigating newly chartered waters: an analysis of texas charter school performance. Texas Public Policy Foundation.

- Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. Disruption versus timeout improvement: The cost and benefits of switching schools. NBER Working Paper. 8479. 2002.
- Hadderman, M. (1998). Charter Schools. ERIC Digest. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (EJ422600). Retrieved November 13, 2002, from ERIC <http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED422600>
- Hassel, B., Fullwood, V., Terrell, M., & Schroeder, J. (2004). How district leaders can support the new schools strategy, Retrieved October 16, 2005, from <http://educationevolving.org/pdf/Districtleaders.pdf>
- Helder, R. (2001). Home schools in North Carolina. North Carolina: NC Division of Non-Public Education.
- Hill, P., Lake, R., Celio, M. B., Campbell, C., Herdman, P., & Bulkley, K. (2001). A study of charter school accountability. *Washington, DC: Center on Reinventing Public Education*, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs. Retrieved October 7, 2002, from http://www.ed.gov/pubs/chartacct/chartacct_toc_summ.doc
- Holdzkom, D. & Kuligowski, B. (1991). North carolina's school improvement and accountability act: A description of local district proposals. (ERIC document ED333023).
- Holland, J. (1985). Making vocational choices: a theory of vocational personalities and work environment. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hoxby, C. (2001). How school choice affects the achievement of public school students. Prepared for Koret task Force Meeting on September 20-21, 2001, Hoover Institution, Stanford, CA.
- House, E. R. (1981). Three perspectives on innovation. In R. Lehming and M. Kane (Eds.), *Improving schools: using what we know*. p. 17-41. Beverly Hills: CA: Sage Publishing.
- Hoxby, C. (2004). Achievement in charter schools and regular public schools in the US: Understanding the differences. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Holmes G. , DeSimone J., & Rupp. N. (2003). Does school choice increase school quality? National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 99683, May 2003, p. 12.
- Jurich, D. (1996). School restructuring: More than the "third wave" of school change? Unpublished manuscript.

- Kolderie, T. (2004). Creating the capacity for change: How and why governors and legislatures are opening a new-schools sector in public education. Bethesda, Md.: Education Week Press, 2004.
- Kolderie, T. (1990). Beyond choice to new public schools: *Withdrawing the exclusive franchise in public education* (8). Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.
- Kolderie, T. (2005). Ray Budde and the origins of the 'charter concept'. New York Times.
- Lashway, L. (2001). Educational indicators. University of Oregon: Clearinghouse on Educational Policy and Management. (ERIC Digest 150).
- Learning First Alliance (2003). The no child left behind act: Key provisions and timelines. Washington, DC.
- Lewin, K. (1936). Principles of topological psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lieber. (1997). What's to fear about charters? *The School Administrator*.
- Louis, K. (1989). *The role of the school district in school improvement. Educational policy for Effective Schools* (pp. 145-167). Toronto, ON: OISE Press.
- Louis, K., Rosenblum, S., & Molitor, J. (1981). *Strategies for knowledge use and school improvement. Final report to National Institute of Education. Cambridge, Mass.: ABT Associates.*
- Manno, B. (2003). Yellow flag: the charter school movement will need to overcome a raft of political obstacles and high-profile scandals. *Education Next*, Winter, 2003.
- Mintrom, M. (2000). Leveraging local innovation: The case of michigan's charter schools. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Manuel, J. (2002). The good, the great, and the struggling: an up close look at charter schools across North Carolina. *North Carolina Insight*, 20, 21-55.
- Massel, D. & Goertz, M. (1999). Local strategies for building capacity: The district role in supporting instructional reform. CPRE: University of Michigan and University of Pennsylvania. Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Educational Research.
- McCully, D., Malin, P., & Newman, H. (2003). What parents think of new york's charter schools. Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute, No. 37, June, 2003.

- Miron, G. (2005). Evaluating charter schools: Issues and obstacles. *Urban Education*, p. 23-25.
- Miron, G. & Nelson, C. (2002). *What's public about charter schools? Lessons learned about choice and accountability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Miron, G. & Nelson, C. (2000). *Autonomy in exchange for accountability: An initial study of pennsylvania charter schools*. Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University, Evaluation Center.
- Miron, G. and Nelson, C., & Risley, J. (2002). *Strengthening pennsylvania's charter school reform: Findings from the statewide evaluation and discussion of relevant policy issues*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, Evaluation Center.
- Murdock, D. (1998). "Excessively-black" charter schools face extinction in north carolina," National Federation of Republican Assemblies at www.nfra.org.
- National Commission of Excellence in Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nelson, H. F., Rosenberg, B., & Van Meter, N. (2004). *Charter school achievement on the 2003 national assessment of educational progress*. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers. Accessed August, 29 2005, from <http://www.aft.org/pubs/reports/downloads/teachers/NAEPCharterSchoolReport.pdf>.
- Noblit George and Corbett Dickson (2001). *North carolina charter school evaluation report*. Evaluation Section, Division of Accountability Services, Instruction and Accountability Services, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Submitted to the State Board of Education, p. II-8.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (2006). *North Carolina Public Schools*. Retrieved January 10, 2006, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/fbs/factsfigs.html>.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (2001). *History of education in North Carolina: An addendum*. Retrieved December 15, 2006, from http://www.ncpublicschools.org/students/History_Ed_Addendum.pdf
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (2000). *The excellent schools act of 1997*. Retrieved March 15, 2006, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/esareports/esa.html>

- North Carolina General Assembly. (1995-96). House Bill #955, charter school education opportunity act 1996. Retrieved January 10, 2002, from <http://www.ncga.state.nc.us/>).
- North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research (2003). Policy center says state should wait before increasing number of Charter Schools.
- Peek, W. (2000). History of north carolina. North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Retrieved May 23, 2004, from www.ncpublicschools.org/students/edhistory.html
- Ogden, E. (1995). A study to explore perceptions of public school superintendents in Michigan regarding Charter Schools. Unpublished Dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit.
- Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research (1998). Policy directions, study finds charter school teachers are stakeholders.
- Public School Review. Retrieved October 15, 2006 from http://www.Publicschoolreview.com/state_magnets/stateid/NC.
- Ravitch, D. 1983. The troubled crusade: American education 1945-1980. New York: Basic.
- RPP International (2000). The state of charter schools 2000: A fourth year report. US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from <http://www.ed.gov/PDFDocs/4yrrpt.pdf>
- Sarason, S. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sashkin, M. & Egermeirere, J. (1992). School change models and processes: A review of research and practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association , San Francisco, CA.
- Schlechty, Phillip C. (1990). Schools for the twenty-first century: leadership for educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schnaiberg, Lynn (1998, August). "Predominantly black charters focus of debate in N.C.," *Education Week*.
- Senate discussions (North Carolina General Assembly, 2003-2004 Session, H.B. 1770) at www.ncga.state.nc.us/html2003/bills/currentversion/house/hbil1770.full.html
- Simmons, Tim (2001). Charter schools not innovation, study finds most parents happy with choice, it says. Winston-Salem Journal. October 31, 2001.

- Sizer, T. (1985). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the american high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Solmon, L, Paark, K, & Garcia, D (2004). *Does charter school attendance improve test scores? The Arizona Results* The Goldwater Institute, Phoenix.
- Snell, L. (2003). *Charter schools improve achievement, despite resistance*. School Reform News. Retrieved January 7, 2006, from http://www.reason.org/commentaries/snell_20031101.shtml
- Sperling, M. (1999). *A study to explore perceptions of michigan public school superintendents regarding charter schools*. (Doctoral Dissertation, Wayne State University, 1999). Dissertation Abstract, Digital Commons@ Wayne State University.
- Tanner, D. & L. Tanner. 1990. *History of the school curriculum*. New York MacMillan Publishing Company
- The Center for Education Reform. *All about charter schools*. Retrieved October 9, 2006 from www.edreform.com.
- The Center for Education Reform (2006). *Charter dchools: Part 2: Raising the bar on charter school laws 2006 ranking & scorecard*, Washington, D. C.
- The Center for Education Reform (2004). *Charter school laws across the states: 2004 r ranking scorecard and legislative profiles*, Washington, DC.
- The Center for Education Reform (2001). *Charter school legislation: profile of north carolina's charter school law*. Retrieved November 15, 2006 from http://edreform.com/charter_schools/laws/NorthCarolina.htm
- The Center for Education Reform. (2004) *North Carolina charter law*. Retrieved November 19, 2006 from <http://edreform.com/index>.
- The Center for Education Reform. (2005) *All about Charter Schools*. Retrieved November 18, 2006 from <http://edreform.com/index>
- The League of Charter Schools. (2002) *How Charter Schools are regulated in North Carolina*. Available: <http://charterleague.org/regulators.htm>.
- The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (1998). *Governor Hunt*. National Center Board of Directors. Retrieved December 3, 2005, from http://www.highereducation.org/about/board_hunt.shtml
- The No Child Left Behind Act: Key provisions and timelines • www.learningfirst.org
 Child Left Behind Act: Key provisions and timelines • www.learningfirst.org

- The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (1993). Charter schools: A new breed of public schools. NCREL's Policy Briefs, Report 2.
- The School District of Philadelphia. Transportation fact sheet at <http://webgui.phila.k12.pa.us/offices/t/transportation/fact-sheet-2004/2005>.
- Thomas Fordham Institute. (2003). North carolina charter law overview. Retrieved September 17, 2005, from <http://www.asu.edu/copp/morrison/northcarolina.pdf>
- Travers, J.F., E., S.N., & Kratochwill, T.R. (1993). Educational psychology: Effective teaching, and effective learning. Madison: Brown and Benchmark Publishers.
- U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1997). A study of charter schools first-year report. RPP International and the University of Minnesota.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2003). Remedial education at degree-granting postsecondary institutions in fall 2000. Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics.
- United States Charter Schools. State by state profile. Retrieved February 5, 2005 from, www.uscharterschools.org/cs/sp/query/q/1995
- U.S. Secretary of Education Rod Paige, A time for choice: remarks of Secretary Paige at the Heritage Foundation, Washington, DC, and January 28, 2004.
- United States Department of Education. Innovation in education: successful charter schools. www.ed.gov/admins/comm/choice/charter Department of Education.
- Vanourek. G. (2006). State of the District of Columbia Sector: 2006 A ten year review. Retrieved October 21, 2006 from, http://www.fightforchildren.org/docs/State_of_DC_Charters_Oct0106_Final.pdf
- Welsh, Karen. Bill to raise 100-school cap has yet to be brought to Senate floor. Carolina Journal.
- Wiersma, W. (1995). Research methods in education: an introduction. 6th ed. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Williams, S. & Scharer, J. (2000, October). North Carolina Center For Public Policy News Release. *Insights*, v19 #1 & 2, p. 58.
- Ziebarth, Todd. (2006) Alliance calls on state legislators to lift charter cap. National Alliance of Public Charter Schools.