

Appendix A from Chi and Welner, “Charter Ranking Roulette: An Analysis of Reports That Grade States’ Charter School Laws” (AJE, vol. 114, no. 2, p. 273)

Table A1
Ranking Scorecard of States

	NV	LA	NJ	IL	RI	MN	NC	VA	DE	FL	MA	CT	KS	CO	AR	OH	NM	SC	WI	CA	WY
Item 1	Y	Y	Y	0	0	Y	0	0	0	Y	Y	0	0	0	0	Y	0	0	0	0	Y
Item 2	0	0	0	0	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N	Y	0	0	0	Y
Category 1	1	1	1	-1	2	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	-1	-1	-1	2
Item 3	Y	0	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	0	0	Y	0	Y	Y	0	0	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	Y
Item 4	Y	Y	0	Y	0	0	Y	Y	Y	0	0	0	0	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	0	0	0
Category 2	2	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	-2	1	1	0	0	2	-2	2	1	1	1
Item 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	Y	0	Y	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Y	0	0	0
Item 6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	0	Y	Y	0	0	0	Y	Y	0
Category 3	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	-2	2	2	0
Item 7	Y	0	0	Y	0	0	0	Y	0	0	0	0	0	Y	0	0	Y	Y	0	0	Y
Item 8	0	0	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	0	Y	Y	Y	0	0	0
Item 9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Y	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category 4	-1	-2	0	1	-2	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	2	1	-2	0	1	1	-2	-2	-1
Item 10	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	0	Y
Item 11	0	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Item 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Y	0	0
Category 5	-1	1	-1	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-2	-1	-1	-1	-2	-1	1	-2	-1
Item 13	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
Item 14	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2
Item 15	2.5	3.3	3.2	1.7	.0	1.3	2.7	8.6	1.3	1.4	.9	3.0	2.9	.4	1.8	.8	.2	3.0	.6	1.0	.0
Item 16	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Item 17	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	0
Item 18	2	2	...*	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Item 19	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	0
Category 6	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.4	.9	1.6	1.5	2.1	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.6	1.6	.9	1.7	1.0	.7	1.6	.4	1.6	.6
Item 20	1	1	2	2	1	2	0	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Item 21	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Item 22	2	1	-1	2	2	-2	2	1	0	-1	1	1	-2	-1	1	0	1	-2	-1	0	-2
Category 7	1.0	1.3	.3	1.3	1.0	.7	.7	.7	.7	.3	.7	.7	.0	.0	1.0	.3	1.3	-.3	.0	.3	-.3
Total	.9	.9	.8	.6	.5	.5	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.3	.3	.3	.3	.3	.2	.2	.2	.1	.1
	IN	TX	NY	IA	AZ	OR	HI	ID	TN	PA	OK	NH	GA	DC	MS	MD	MO	AK	MI	UT	
Item 1	Y	Y	Y	0	0	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	Y	
Item 2	0	0	N	0	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	0	0	N	0	0	0	0	0	0	N	N	
Category 1	1	1	-1	-1	2	1	2	2	2	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-2	-1	
Item 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Item 4	Y	0	0	Y	Y	0	0	0	0	Y	Y	0	Y	0	0	0	0	0	Y	0	
Category 2	0	-2	-2	0	0	-2	-2	-2	-2	0	0	-2	0	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	0	-2	
Item 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	0	0	0	Y	0	Y	Y	

App. A from Chi and Welner, “Charter Ranking Roulette”

Item 6	0	0	Y	0	0	0	0	0	Y	0	Y	0	0	0	0	0	Y	0	0	0
Category 3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	-2	0	-2	0	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	-2	-2
Item 7	Y	0	Y	Y	0	0	0	Y	Y	0	0	Y	Y	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0
Item 8	0	0	0	0	0	Y	0	0	0	Y	Y	Y	0	0	0	Y	0	0	0	0
Item 9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category 4	-1	-2	-1	-1	-2	0	-2	-1	-1	0	0	1	-1	-1	-2	0	-2	-2	-2	-2
Item 10	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	0	Y	Y
Item 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Item 12	0	Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Category 5	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-2	-1	-1	-2	-1	-1
Item 13	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2
Item 14	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	1
Item 15	1.8	.9	.9	.0	1.5	1.8	.0	.6	.0	1.0	1.3	1.7	1.0	1.7	.0	.0	1.7	2.1	.8	.0
Item 16	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Item 17	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
Item 18	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	2
Item 19	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2
Category 6	.8	1.3	1.3	.3	1.4	1.4	.7	1.2	.3	.7	1.0	.8	1.3	1.4	1.1	.6	1.1	.9	.7	1.0
Item 20	1	0	1	2	-2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	-2	1	0	0	-1	0	-2
Item 21	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Item 22	0	1	1	2	-2	-2	1	1	1	-2	-2	-1	-2	-1	2	-2	-1	1	-1	0
Category 7	.3	.3	.7	1.3	-.7	-.3	1.7	1.0	.7	.0	.0	.0	-.3	-.3	1.0	-.7	-.3	.0	-.3	-.7
Total	.1	.1	.0	.0	-.1	-.1	-.1	-.1	-.1	-.1	-.1	-.2	-.2	-.4	-.4	-.5	-.6	-.7	-.8	-.9

Note. Item 1 = public realm—for-profit cannot apply for a charter: the data for this subcategory are primarily from the Center on Educational Governance (2004). Item 2 = public realm—for-profit cannot operate/manage a charter: the data for this subcategory are primarily from the Center on Educational Governance (2004). Category 1 = public realm: combined weight of 10%. The category 1 cumulative scores were derived based on the reasoning that any state prohibiting operating/managing is assigned 2 points, any state prohibiting just applying is assigned 1 point, any state silent on both issues is assigned -1 points, and any state specifically authorizing for-profit management is assigned -2 points. Item 3 = at-risk access—racial guidelines—racial enrollment reflects surrounding school district: the data for this subcategory are primarily from Frankenberg and Lee (2003) and Green (2001, 2004). Item 4 = at-risk access—racial guidelines—charter school required to comply with desegregation orders: the data for this subcategory are primarily from Green (2004). Category 2 = at-risk access—racial guidelines: combined weight of 12%. The category 2 cumulative scores were derived based on the reasoning that, since all charters are, in all likelihood, bound by desegregation orders, item 4 is used by us as an indication of lawmakers’ attention to at-risk issues. The more important factor is item 3. Item 5 = at-risk access—student preference—school association: the data for this subcategory are primarily from ECS (2006), supplemented with state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Item 6 = at-risk access—student preference—at risk: the data for this subcategory are primarily from ECS (2006), supplemented with state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Category 3 = at-risk access—student preference: combined weight of 12%. Each of the two factors is given equal weight. Item 7 = at-risk access—transportation—plan in application: the data for this subcategory are primarily from ECS (2006), supplemented with state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Item 8 = at-risk access—transportation—distance: the data for this subcategory are primarily from ECS (2006), supplemented with state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Item 9 = at-risk access—transportation—free lunch: the data for this subcategory are primarily from ECS (2006), supplemented with state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Category 4 = at-risk access—transportation: combined weight of 13%. The most common provision, requiring applicants to address transportation issues in their application (item 7), is also the weakest. Accordingly, this factor is given less weight than the other two. Providing transportation for lower-income families (item 9) was given the most weight. Item 10 = at-risk access—special education—nondiscriminatory admissions: the data for this subcategory are primarily from Fiore and Cashman (1998), supplemented with state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Item 11 = at-risk access—special education—targeting population: the data for this subcategory are primarily from ECS (2006), supplemented with state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Item 12 = at-risk access—special education—chartering preference for special education focus: the data for this subcategory are primarily from ECS (2006), supplemented with state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Category 5 = at-risk access—special education: combined weight of 13%. Nondiscriminatory admissions policy provisions (item 10) simply restate federal law, but they are indicative of sensitivity to the issues. The most important provisions here create incentives and preferences for charter schools to serve these at-risk populations. Item 13 = accountable and evaluated—evaluation—opportunity to cure violation: the data for this subcategory are from state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Item 14 = accountable and evaluated—evaluation—clear criteria for revocation: the data for this subcategory are primarily from ECS (2006), Palmer and Gau (2003), and state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Item 15 = accountable and evaluated—evaluation—willingness to revoke: the data for this subcategory are from CER (2006). The scores in this subcategory were created by dividing the percentage of charter school closures by the number of years the state has had charter schools. Item 16 = accountable and evaluated—evaluation—request termination via vote: the data for this subcategory are from the state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Item 17 = accountable and evaluated—evaluation—regular monitoring: the data for this subcategory are primarily from Palmer and Gau (2003), supplemented with state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Item 18 = accountable and evaluated—evaluation—monitoring of school improvement actions: the data for this subcategory are for 2002–3 only and are primarily from the U.S. Government Accountability Office (2005). Item 19 = accountable and evaluated—evaluation—collection of non-No Child Left Behind achievement information: the data for this subcategory are for 2002–3 only and are primarily from the U.S. Government Accountability Office (2005). Category 6 = accountable and evaluated—evaluation: combined weight of 20%. Each of these seven elements is given equal weight, except that empty cells are excluded from the calculations. Item 20 = accountable and evaluated—caps/duration—duration: the data for this subcategory are from state legislation found at WestEd (2006). In this subcategory, the coding was “2” for 3–4 years, “1” for 5–6 years, “0” for 7–8 years, “-1” for 9–12 years, and “-2” for 13 or more years. Item 21 = accountable and evaluated—caps/duration—preexpiration review: the data for this subcategory are from state legislation found at WestEd (2006). Item 22 = accountable and evaluated—caps/duration—cap: the data for this subcategory are from state legislation found at ECS (2006) and WestEd (2006). The scores were generated based on whether the state law had a true cap, a regional or authorizer cap, a cap on yearly increases, or no cap. Category 7 = accountable and evaluated—caps/duration: combined weight of 20%. Each of these three elements is given equal weight. Note that the prereview category is scaled down to only zero, reflecting its status as a less serious omission.

* NJ reported that there were no charter schools in need of improvement in 2002–3.

Additional References Listed in the Appendix

- Center on Educational Governance. 2004. *Charter School Laws and Partnerships: Expanding Opportunities and Resources*. Denver: Education Commission of the States, <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/51/12/5112.doc>.
- Frankenberg, Erica, and Chungmei Lee. 2003. "Charter Schools and Race: A Lost Opportunity for Integrated Education." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 11 (32), <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n32/>.
- Green, Preston. 2001. "Racial Balancing Provisions and Charter Schools: Are Charter Schools out on a Constitutional Limb?" *Brigham Young University Education and Law Journal* 1:65–83.
- Green, Preston. 2004. "Charter Schools and Racial Balancing Provisions and Grutter v. Bollinger." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA, April.
- WestEd. 2006. U.S. Charter Schools: State Information, http://www.uscharterschools.org/pub/uscs_docs/sp/index.htm.