


1 ROCKETSHIP EDUCATION:
2 AN EXPLORATORY PUBLIC POLICY CASE STUDY

3 A Dissertation Presented to
4 The Faculty of the Connie L. Lurie College of Education
5 San José State University

6 In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
7 Doctor of Education

8 by
9 Vladimir Gresham Ivanović 

10 August 2022

11 Version 0.7.5491 created on 2022-05-13 23:11:39-07:00

1 *Rocketship Education: An Exploratory Public Policy Case Study*
2 by Vladimir Gresham Ivanović
3 is licensed under a
4 Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License
5 which is available at:
6 <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/legalcode>

1 ROCKETSHIP EDUCATION:
2 AN EXPLORATORY PUBLIC POLICY CASE STUDY

3 Abstract

4 This dissertation is an exploratory case study of the finances of the Rocketship
5 charter school chain. Rocketship is a not-for-profit, charter management
6 organization, one of the first in Santa Clara County, California. This study seeks
7 to determine if Rocketship yields profits for investors, despite it being a
8 non-profit entity, and if it does, how and where does it do so. In order to
9 characterize fairly and completely Rocketship's profitability, this study uses
10 publicly available documents to track money flowing in and out of Rocketship.
11 Using data from initial and renewal charter petitions, annual budget
12 documents, filings with county, state and federal government agencies, bond
13 prospectuses, tax credit programs, state and federal grants, plus data from
14 publicly available datasets, this study derives an estimate of Rocketship's
15 profitability. It found that [Results TBD]. [Conclusion TBD]. These results, it is
16 hoped, will serve to inform local, state, and federal legislatures when they
17 establish public policy for charter schools.

18 *Keywords:* Rocketship Education, charter management organization,
19 privatization, charter finances, education public policy

1 Contents

2	Abstract	iv
3	List of Tables	vii
4	List of Figures	viii
5	Abbreviations	ix
6	1 Introduction	1
7	Schools and Charter Schools	2
8	What is the Purpose of this Study?	5
9	Research Question	6
10	Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks	7
11	A Case Study Approach as a Practical Framework	8
12	Public Policy as a Theoretical Framework	9
13	2 A Review of the Literature	12
14	A History of Charter Schools	15
15	The Origins of Charter Schools in Segregation	15
16	Charter Schools, Free Markets and Privatization	17
17	Types of Charter Schools	22
18	Charter School Authorizers and Oversight	22
19	Profit-Making Status	23
20	Type of Instruction	25
21	Charter Schools in the United States	26
22	Charter Schools in California	27
23	Surveys of Charter School Research	28
24	Research on Charter School Finances	32
25	Rocketship	34
26	Founders and Supporters	35
27	Rocketship History	36
28	Rocketship Finances	36
29	Rocketship Expansion Funding	39
30	Rocketship Expansion Difficulties	40

1	Charter School Accountability	40
2	Rocketship and Privatization	41
3	Privatization	42
4	Philanthrocapitalism	44
5	3 Research Design and Methodology	46
6	Process Overview	48
7	An Overview of California School Financing	49
8	Budgets & Interim Reports	52
9	Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAPs)	53
10	Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports	54
11	Charter School Financing	55
12	Charter Financial Documents	56
13	Petitions & Renewals	57
14	Other Data	60
15	State and Federal Filings	61
16	Bond prospectuses	62
17	Indirect Profits	63
18	Are There Gaps or Anomalies in the Data?	64
19	Triangulation	66
20	Are There More Serious Problems?	66
21	Analyzing Rocketship's Bond Financing	68
22	What About the Flow of Money Through Rocketship?	69
23	4 Findings and Results	72
24	5 Discussion	73
25	References	74
26	A School Financing in California	90
27	Glossary	98

1		List of Tables	
2	1	<i>Attributes of Private, Charter, and Public Schools in California</i>	24
3	2	<i>Rocketship Schools in Santa Clara County, California</i>	37
4	3	<i>Charter School Financial Documents</i>	57

1		List of Figures	
2	1	<i>California 2019–20 K–12 Funding by Source</i>	50
3	2	<i>Flow of Funds: Overview</i>	69
4	3	<i>Flow of Funds: Cross-Collateralization</i>	70
5	4	<i>Operating Resource Flows</i>	71
6	5	<i>LASD 2019–20 All Funds Summary</i>	91
7	6	<i>LASD YE 2020 Summary of Net Position</i>	94
8	7	<i>LASD YE 2020 Change of Net Position</i>	95
9	8	<i>LASD YE 2020 Net Cost of Services</i>	95
10	9	<i>LASD YE 2020 Capital Assets</i>	96
11	10	<i>LASD YE 2020 Long-term Liabilities</i>	96
12	11	<i>LASD 2019–20 Multi-Year Projection</i>	97

Abbreviations

1	
2	ARUSD Alum Rock Unified School District
3	BAN Bond anticipation note
4	CAFR Comprehensive Annual Financial Report
5	CDE California Department of Education
6	CMO Charter school management organization
7	COE County Office of Education
8	COVID-19 Corona Virus Disease 2019
9	CPRA California Public Records Act
10	CSBA California School Boards Association
11	DOE U.S. Department of Education
12	EC Education Code of California law
13	EMO Education management organization
14	FOIA (federal) Freedom of Information Act
15	GO bond General obligation bond
16	LASD Los Altos School District
17	LCAP Local Control and Accountability Plan
18	LCFF Local Control Funding Formula
19	LEA Local education agency
20	SACS Standardized Account Code Structure
21	SARC School Accountability Report Card
22	SARS-CoV-2 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Corona Virus #2
23	SCCBOE Santa Clara County Board of Education
24	SCCOE Santa Clara County Office of Education
25	SCC Santa Clara County
26	SEDA Stanford Educational Data Archive
27	TPS Traditional Public School
28	TRAN Tax revenue anticipation note

Introduction

If, in Harold Lasswell's words, politics is about who gets what, when, and how (Lasswell, 1936), then education is surely one of the most consequential — and fascinating — of public policy issues. At stake is the future well-being of 56.4 million students on whose behalf federal, state, and local governments spend upwards of three quarters of a trillion dollars annually.¹ The number of stakeholders is huge: every parent and every child is a stakeholder, as are teachers, administrators, legislators, employees of fifty state departments of education, the federal Department of Education, the President of the United States, the U.S. Supreme Court, and state and local courts. Stakeholders exist throughout the United States, in states, counties, cities, towns, villages, and in almost 100 thousand schools in thousands of school districts. The COVID-19 pandemic of the last 2+ years has revealed just how important public education is to stakeholders.

Education is the arena in which parents, legislators, unions, political parties, billionaires, technologists, scholars and educators clash, all vying for influence and reward. Education is where religion, politics, free market neoliberalism, and social justice — all of them beliefs — intersect. One topic in particular has, in the last fifty years, generated a disproportionate share of discord: the privatization of public education, i.e. school choice.²

Formerly sleepy school board elections have attracted national interest, and with that interest, a flood of money. The 2020 Los Angeles school board election cost over \$14M for just four seats and generated articles in the national press. Likewise, a

¹The 50 states and the federal government spent \$734.9B in 2017–18. Using an inflation rate of 2%, spending for 2021–22 would be just shy of \$800B. (Author's estimate using data from "Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education: FY 18", NCES, 2020)

²"School choice" is an Orwellian name designed to mislead, to dress up an otherwise unpalatable reality: privatization takes something that used to be available to all and restricts it exclusively to those who can afford to pay.

1 November 2016 statewide proposition in Massachusetts that sought to expand
2 charter schools was covered extensively by national newspapers with one advocacy
3 group spending more than \$15M (not including a \$425,000 fine for violating
4 campaign law). Betsy DeVos, U.S. Secretary of Education under the twice impeached
5 President Donald Trump, drew fierce criticism from the start of her tenure, criticism
6 which was endlessly reported on. What caused these uproars? Why was so much
7 money spent on these and other elections? The answer is charter schools.

8 Schools and Charter Schools

9 Schools in the United States take three basic forms: the traditional public school
10 (TPS), charter schools, and private schools. Only two states, Nebraska and North
11 Dakota, have resisted all forms of school choice; all have private schools and an
12 extensive public school system. By definition, school choice encompasses charter,
13 private, magnet, and homeschooling, i.e. every kind of school traditional except
14 public schools. But, because school vouchers in particular are becoming more
15 common, school choice now increasingly refers to school vouchers in addition to
16 charter schools (Enlow, 2022). In this dissertation, I will use school choice to refer to
17 charter schools.

18 Schools, under this definition of school choice, take a number of forms: they can,
19 like TPSs be in-person, but unlike TPSs, they can also be online (virtual), or even a
20 blend of the two. How school choice is financed varies as well. School vouchers,
21 education savings accounts, and tax-credit education savings accounts, tax-credit
22 scholarships, individual tax-credits & deductions, have all been used, often
23 augmented by tax dollars. The phrase “school choice” is also associated with 529
24 savings accounts, student income loans, social impact bonds, and
25 philanthrocapitalism.

1 Regardless of how school choice is financed, school choice complicates what used
2 to be a system of mostly public schools plus a few private schools that had been in
3 place for over 150 years. This new kind of financing has raised some fundamental
4 questions: Who benefits from this new financing? Do the children for whom
5 education is the difference between poverty and flourishing benefit? Is education is
6 being turned into a low-risk, profitable investment for hedge funds, private equity
7 firms, investment banks, and the 1%?

8 The various forms of school choice have waxed and waned, but charter schools
9 were present at the creation of the privatization movement in education and have
10 continued to enroll more and more students, diverting more and more dollars out of
11 the public school system (Lafer, 2017a, pp. 131–132; Lafer, 2018, p. 18; Lafer et al., 2021,
12 p. 9). School choice has spawned an entire industry devoted to marketing school
13 choice: academic departments and institutions, educational associations, think
14 tanks, astroturf³ advocacy groups, and political action committees, all of which are
15 examples of the marketing of the privatization of public education.

16 According to the National Center of Education Statistics in the U.S. Department
17 of Education, there were 7,547 elementary and secondary charter schools in the
18 United States enrolling 3,431,230 students in 2019–20 school year (de Brey et al.,
19 2022, Table 216.90, p.144). This represents 7.7% of the total number of elementary and
20 secondary schools and 6.8% of the total number of students in the United States. The
21 state with the greatest charter school presence was California which had 1,321 schools
22 (12.7% of the total) and 674,652 students (11.0%). Within California, in the 2019–20
23 school year, charter schools in Santa Clara County enrolled 31,584 students (13.6% out
24 of 231,865) (California Department of Education, n.d.).

³Wordnik definition: “The disguising of an orchestrated campaign as a “grass-roots” event – i.e., a spontaneous upwelling of public opinion.”

1 These are notable patterns, and the COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the
2 growth of charter schools, in contrast to recent years of slowing growth. This recent
3 growth appears to be almost completely due to the expansion of virtual charter
4 schools (Strauss, 2021). Despite continued growth, charter schools remain
5 controversial and have generated heated debate. Reports and studies from charter
6 school opponents have been answered by reports and studies from charter school
7 advocates. Both sides claim their methodology to be superior and consider the other
8 side's fatally flawed.⁴

9 What the research indicates – again and again – is that *some* charter schools,
10 under *some* circumstances, for *some* students, seem to do *somewhat* better than
11 traditional public schools. (Garcia, 2018, p.119) Charter schools are, on average,
12 unsurprisingly, just average. If charter schools are on average not better than public
13 schools, why are they so fervently touted as the answer to the perceived ills of
14 American public education? Why are eye-popping sums (10× the usual amounts)
15 spent supporting public school board candidates who favor charter schools? Why are
16 charter schools still growing in both enrollment and in number? Is the profit motive
17 is the overriding goal of charter schools, or are they instead driven by a genuine
18 desire to radically improve the educational outcomes of children who could most
19 benefit from a quality education? My goal in this dissertation is to offer some
20 answers to questions like these by looking closely at the finances of a single charter
21 school chain, Rocketship Education.

22 I will use the term *charter school chains* to refer both to for-profit and to non-profit
23 organizations that manage more than one charter school since both take financial
24 control away from the school and centralize outside of schools. Charter school chains

⁴Jeffery Henig in his book *Spin Cycle: How Research is Used in Policy Debates: The Case of Charter Schools* (J. Henig, 2009), offers a fascinating look at the war of words that resulted from just one report and one newspaper article.

1 are essentially franchise operations like McDonald's or Hertz, but in education
2 instead of hamburgers or rental cars. For-profit charter school chains have
3 traditionally been called *educational management organizations* (EMOs) and non-profit
4 charter school chains *charter management organizations*, but since there is little
5 difference between the two, I will use *charter school chains* when the distinction is
6 unimportant.

7 The remainder of this chapter provides some context for why I conducted this
8 study. The chapter *A Review of the Literature* discusses the voluminous literature on
9 charter schools. The following chapter, *Research Design and Methodology*, details what
10 data will be collected, how it will be collected, and how it will be analyzed. The
11 chapter *Findings and Results* provides the results of analyzing that data in context of
12 this study's research questions. The last chapter, *Discussion* considers the public
13 policy implications of my study and its conclusions, and makes some suggestions for
14 how current public policy should be changed to achieve some of the seven goals that
15 the California Legislature set out in *The Charter School Act of 1992*.

16 What is the Purpose of this Study?

17 The goal of this case study is to analyze as carefully and fully as possible the
18 finances of Rocketship Education and associated entities. Is Rocketship profitable?
19 and if it is, how does it generate those profits? I chose Rocketship Education⁵ to
20 study because its popularity has led to core aspects of its model being adopted by
21 other charter school chains such as the Caliber Public Schools or the Navigator
22 Schools, both in California. It is an exemplar of a popular charter school and has had
23 an outsized influence on public education in Santa Clara County.

⁵Rocketship Public Schools is the new name of Rocketship Education, but since it has been known as Rocketship Education for much longer than it has been as Rocketship Public Schools, I've chosen to retain the former name.

1 Charter schools, Rocketship included, offer themselves as better alternatives to
2 traditional public schools. Rocketship claims that its pedagogical model of blended
3 learning

- 4 • is more efficient than that of traditional public schools,
- 5 • offers personalized learning⁶ through computer-mediated instruction, and
- 6 • offers a human connection (at least part of the time) that is similar to
7 traditional public schools.

8 These are claims that can be tested in other studies by comparing individual
9 Rocketship schools to independent charter schools and to TPSs in the same district.
10 The Rocketship chain can be compared to other charter school management
11 organizations, to portfolios of charter schools, as well to traditional public school
12 districts, but such studies need to be done with care to avoid methodological errors
13 that would reduce the validity of their conclusions.

14 Many studies have looked at the outcomes of charter schools and charter chains,
15 including one specifically on Rocketship's effect on Milwaukee's public schools had
16 proposed legislation passed. But Rocketship's finances, as a whole, have not been
17 studied in detail.

18 *Research Question*

19 These themes lead to the following research question: Has Rocketship structured
20 itself and its finances, to earn a return to investors, and if so, how?

21 More broadly, there are additional reasons for studying charter school finances.
22 Are we (the states, the federal government) misallocating the money we spend on

⁶Note that personalized learning is not the same differentiated instruction. All students follow the same path with personalized learning, albeit at different rates, instead of following different paths at different rates, as with properly implemented differentiated instruction.

1 charter schools? Could we be spending our tax dollars more wisely? What did
2 taxpayers get for these expenditures?

3 This case study is believed to be unique in that it examines in depth the finances
4 of a single charter school chain. There have been studies of the finances of
5 aggregations of charter school chains (e.g., all known charter school chains in the
6 United States,⁷ or a selected group of charter school chains). Other studies have
7 looked at the effects of charter schools on segregation or academic achievement, or
8 the financial impact of charter schools on their surrounding public school district.
9 But academic studies of the finances of just a single charter school chain seem to be
10 missing.⁸ It is hoped that the lessons learned from this case study will be used by
11 policy makers to strengthen charter school law in California and elsewhere in order
12 to increase desired outcomes and to minimize unintended consequences.

13 Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

14 According to Grant and Osanloo (2014), creating and understanding the
15 theoretical framework for one's dissertation is "one of the most important aspects in
16 the research process." (p.12) They liken the theoretical framework of a dissertation to
17 the blueprints that define a house. That framework both defines the organization and
18 the structure of a dissertation, as well as what counts as elements and their
19 relationships. A theoretical framework articulates "the researcher's understanding of
20 how the research problem will best be explored, the specific direction the research
21 will have to take, and the relationship between the different variables in the study."
22 (Grant & Osanloo, 2014, pp. 16–17)

⁷See Miron et al. (2021) for a list of currently known charter school chains.

⁸I distinguish between academic studies and criminal investigations. Clearly, the grand jury indictment of 11 persons associated with A3 Education was a study of a single charter school chain, but it was a criminal investigation, not an academic study.

1 Further, a “conceptual framework offers a logical structure of connected concepts
2 that help provide a picture or visual display of how ideas in a study relate to one
3 another within the theoretical framework” (Grant & Osanloo, 2014, pp. 16–17). This
4 dissertation uses a case study approach as its theoretical framework within a public
5 policy framework, its conceptual framework.

6 *A Case Study Approach as a Practical Framework*

7 Broadly, social science research falls into one of two categories. The research may
8 make many observations with a narrow focus, or may instead adopt a broader focus,
9 but with a correspondingly smaller number of observations. Gerring calls these
10 “large C” or “small C” studies, respectively (Gerring, 2017, p. xvii). Of course, the
11 boundary between large C and small C studies is not sharply defined.

12 Gerring calls small C studies *case studies*. In this dissertation I look at one entity,
13 Rocketship Education, and at only one aspect of Rocketship, its finances. But I look at
14 its finances broadly, examining as many different kinds of financial transactions as
15 are publicly available for the subset of Rocketship schools that are in Santa Clara
16 County. I discuss the elements of what makes a case study a good case study in
17 chapter 5, *Discussion*.

18 McCombes (2019) says that case studies are a “detailed study of a specific subject,
19 such as a person, group, place, event, organization, or phenomenon”. They are ‘good
20 for describing, comparing, evaluating and understanding kdifferent aspects of a
21 research problem” and are “an appropriate research design when it allows you to
22 explore the key characteristics, meanings, and implications of the case.” Two papers
23 go into detail about using the case study approach: Crowe et al. (2011) and Rashid
24 et al. (2019). Yin (2018) provides a detailed methodology for doing case study research
25 well.

1 A case study framework for public policy research is ideal because the theory and
2 practice of case studies is well-known and has been used both for public policy
3 research and in public policy analysis for years. A case study framework formalizes
4 an in-depth examination of a single topic, in this case, Rocketship's finances.

5 *Public Policy as a Theoretical Framework*

6 A public policy framework provides a rich set of tools and techniques with which
7 to analyze Rocketship's finances. Three factors support using a public policy
8 framework to guide understanding and evaluating Rocketship's finances. First,
9 charter school finance is constrained primarily by public policies set by state
10 legislatures, the creators of charter schools. These laws regulate taxes, grants,
11 borrowing capacity, and reporting requirements of charter schools and charter
12 school chains (Aguinaldo et al., 2020), and by definition, whatever falls within the
13 purview of legislators is public policy. Second, Brighthouse et al. (2018), in *Educational*
14 *goods*, provide a succinct definition of what public policy analysis is which matches
15 the purpose of undertaking this case study. They use a values, evidence, and
16 decision-making framework "to make judgments about how well specific policies are
17 likely to realize valued outcomes" (Brighthouse et al., 2018, p.1). Last, these three
18 concerns — values, evidence, decision-making — are considered the key concerns by
19 academics and researchers in the public policy field (Bueno de Mesquita, 2016;
20 Clemons & McBeth, 2021; Fowler, 2013; Gupta, 2011). Using a public policy framework
21 is appropriate when examining charter school finances.

22 The discipline of public policy sanctions a wide variety of tools and techniques
23 when analyzing issues. Public policy has been studied for years (there are public
24 policy departments in many universities) and it is a mature area of academic
25 research. As in most academic fields, there are fierce debates about the merits and

1 robustness of a particular approach compared to alternatives, but at a high level,
2 what to do is generally agreed upon. Most identify the following five steps (or
3 variants thereof) that are used when creating public policy:

- 4 1. Define the issues and set the agenda.
- 5 2. Formulate one or more policies that address the issues identified.
- 6 3. Evaluate those policies using tools and techniques like cost-benefit analysis,
7 value analysis, political feasibility, game theory, and economic analysis.
- 8 4. Implement those policies by passing legislation, changing practices, or by
9 using the courts.
- 10 5. Evaluate the effectiveness of the policy changes.

11 Two keys to identifying alternatives during policy formation and later when
12 evaluating consequences are choosing or creating a model, and forecasting. Models
13 identify what is going to be studied and their relationships, and forecasting is a
14 prediction of the future whose consequences are (hopefully) identified in a model.
15 Page (2018) lists 26 major models that have been used in science, business, and
16 medicine.

17 This dissertation relies on two excellent guides to public policy: Fowler (2013),
18 which offers a broad and complete treatment of public policy specifically in the field
19 of education, and Clemons and McBeth (2021) which offers a number of well-tried
20 tools and techniques useful in analyzing public policy. An additional comprehensive
21 treatment of public policy can be found in Gupta (2011).

22 This introduction makes the case that public education is important to many
23 stakeholders, but that there is also discord around larger issues like values, ideology,
24 and implementation. Charter schools have been offered as way of disrupting
25 American public education from its hide-bound, archaic, and sclerotic present,

1 driving it, despite opposition, into a dynamic future where education is tailored to
2 each child's real needs. Establishing whether financial gain plays a key or even a
3 primary role in American educational reform by carefully examining Rocketship's
4 finances is both timely and important: Rocketship is growing and has served as a
5 model for other charter school chains.

6 The next chapter reviews what other researchers and scholars have said about the
7 origins of charter schools, their history, and their ostensible goals before
8 characterizing first the finances of all public schools in California and then the
9 unique aspects of charter school finance. Finally, it reviews the history of Rocketship
10 Education.

A Review of the Literature

American public education has – allegedly – been a failure, and hence, in desperate need of reform ever since the idea of free public education took hold in the early 1800s.⁹ Since then, a succession of educators and reports have documented the abysmal [sic] state of American education. Prior to the Civil War, Horace Mann introduced widely copied reforms (Pulliam & Van Patten, 2007) into a system which was not free, not open to all, and not compulsory. Those schools had hardly changed since the founding of the Boston Latin School on April 23, 1635. In the early 1900s, John Dewey, an educational leader of the Progressive Era (1896–1916) preached reform, but it was not until the publication of *Nation at Risk* in 1983 that the modern zeal for education reform took form. Pulliam and Van Patten (2007) list 29 major education reform reports from 1982 to 2005. That American public education needed reform was repeated constantly, mainly by conservatives, despite underwhelming evidence of its veracity and substantial evidence to the contrary. Through repetition, the need for reform has become accepted wisdom. The answer to this need was to take the government’s “monopoly in education” (Milton Friedman’s characterization) out of the hands of faceless bureaucrats and subject it to the rigors of free markets which would, it was asserted with scant evidence, increase efficiency, choice, and quality. Thus vouchers and charter schools were legitimized.

No amount of research, it seems, can dispel the *idée fixe* that American education is in dire straits, and further, piecemeal changes were simply not enough to make substantive changes. No matter what J. R. Henig (1994) or Berliner and Biddle (1997) or Nichols and Berliner (2007) or Glass (2008) or Berliner and Glass (2014) wrote, the

⁹Wikipedia has an excellent summary article on *Education in the United States* available at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Education_in_the_United_States.

1 idea that American education needed fundamental, pervasive reform persisted;
2 education reform was an evidence-free endeavor.

3 To be clear, it is not the case that every American school is a model for the rest of
4 the world: systematic and persistent, pervasive inequities and injustices abound and
5 have been powerfully written about in Kozol (1992) and again in Kozol (2005),
6 Valenzuela (1999), Heitzeg (2009), and Roithmayr (2014). But it is also clear that those
7 schools have been systematically underfunded for decades; their dismal performance
8 is more likely the result of the poverty of their neighborhoods and their lack of
9 funding than it is the other way around. For example, the California School Boards
10 Association's (CSBA) Education Legal Alliance Adequacy Committee found that there
11 exists a "substantial gap in funding between what K-12 education [in California]
12 receives and what K-12 education needs even to meet the standards prescribed by the
13 state (Bray, 2015, iii). B. D. Baker et al. (2018) in their aptly titled report *The Real Shame*
14 *of the Nation*, develop a *National Education Cost Model* (B. D. Baker et al., 2018) which
15 accounted for regional cost differences as well different funding levels to show that
16 inadequate funding is present throughout the United States. Garcia (2018) says in
17 *School Choice* that the "existence and importance of the issues that reformers believe
18 plague public education are based as much on tradition and reputation as they are on
19 tangible research evidence" (Garcia, 2018, p. 54). Finally, and tellingly, grossly
20 inadequate funding is a characteristic of communities that are racially segregated
21 and which are not white (Darling-Hammond, 2012; Rothstein, 2017).

22 J. R. Henig (1994)'s book, *Rethinking school choice*, which came out a mere three
23 years after the passage of the nation's first state charter school law in Minnesota¹⁰
24 and two years after the second in California¹¹ lays out a key argument against charter

¹⁰Laws of Minnesota 1991, chapter 265, article 9, section 3

¹¹Education Code, Title 2, Division 4 Part 26.8, §47600 *et. seq*

1 schools. Henig says, “[T]he real danger in the market-based choice proposals is not
2 that they might allow some students to attend privately run schools at public
3 expense, but that *they will erode the public forums in which decisions with societal*
4 *consequences can democratically be resolved.*” (emphasis added) (J. R. Henig, 1994, *xiii*).
5 Translated this means that the decisions about public education’s form and content
6 are not going to be made by parents and teachers, but by people who do not have a
7 stake in the outcome. It’s a matter of badly misaligned incentives.

8 But even before that, in 1982, Earl Craig, Jr. attached a minority report to
9 *Rebuilding Education to Make It Work* which advocated for vouchers. He says in a
10 paragraph that is as accurate today as it was in 1982:

11 In conclusion, this report is part of a national movement toward
12 privatization of public services and responsibilities. I believe this
13 movement will have the eventual result of a complete retreat by this
14 society from a societal responsibility for the powerless who are difficult
15 or expensive to educate, house, protect, etc. I believe the committee and
16 board majority when they say that they are committed to equal access
17 and equity. They say, trust that we will do the right thing. I do trust
18 them, I do not trust the societal momentum of which vouchers is a part.
19 It is a very destructive wave that has caught up many good people. It
20 scares me to death. (Citizens League, Education Alternatives
21 Committee, 1982, p. 48)

22 The belief that that American schools were in crisis is simply not supported by the
23 evidence. But the idea that American schools are in crisis has been relentlessly
24 promoted, and sheer repetition has turned fiction turned into fact; charter schools
25 then became an idea whose time had come. Charter schools didn’t actually take off
26 until “education reformers across party lines realized that charter school laws could
27 be crafted in ways that made it possible to open nonunion public schools, or even
28 allow public schools to be managed by for-profit companies” (Goldstein, 2015, p. 172).

1 This literature review will first examine charter schools, their origins and the
2 early research, before reviewing the types of charters which exist. Then it looks at the
3 various models of charter schools like virtual charter schools, charters which use
4 blended learning, and charter management organizations before taking a closer look
5 charter schools in Santa Clara County and in Rocketship in particular. It ends with a
6 consideration of the finances of charter schools.

7 A History of Charter Schools

8 Charter schools (privately run, but publicly financed) had an ugly racist origin in
9 the post-*Brown v Board of Education* era as a method of evading the U.S. Supreme
10 Court's mandate to educate both black and white Americans equally and not
11 separately. Fifty years later, charter schools turned segregation academies into the
12 preferred vehicle for privatizing public schools for profit while maintaining
13 segregation.

14 *The Origins of Charter Schools in Segregation*

15 The first charter schools were not founded for educational or economic reasons.
16 Charter schools had their origin in the aftermath of "*Brown v. Board of Education*".
17 "[*Brown*] was the genesis of school choice as a public policy mechanism." (Garcia,
18 2018, p. 8) In the Deep South, academies sprung up as part of the massive resistance
19 to the U.S. Supreme Court's unanimous 1954 ruling which answered the question

20 Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race,
21 even though the physical facilities and other "tangible" factors may be
22 equal, deprive children of the minority group of equal educational
23 opportunities? (Warren, 1954, p. 9)

24 with "We believe that it does." (p.9)

1 In order to circumvent *Brown*, white parents in eleven states formed thousands of
2 private schools, and until the early 1970's, these segregation academies received
3 public funds (Rooks, 2017). These origins of charter schools have been amply
4 documented, in Frankenberg et al. (2010), Frankenberg et al. (2011), and especially in
5 Suitts (2019) and Suitts (2020). Alexander in *The new Jim Crow* quotes Rosenberg (1991,
6 p. 52) "The statistics from the Southern states are truly amazing. For ten years,
7 1954–1964, virtually *nothing happened*." [emphasis in (Alexander, 2011, p. 223)] She goes
8 on to say,

9 Not a single black child attended an integrated public grade school in
10 South Carolina, Alabama, or Mississippi as of the 1962–1963 school year.
11 Across the South as a whole, a mere 1 percent of black school children
12 were attending school with whites in 1964—a full decade after *Brown* was
13 decided.

14 In the years after *Brown*, some localities went further than merely forming
15 segregation academies. Prince Edward County in Virginia closed all of its schools for
16 five years rather than integrate. Others closed pools, parks, zoos, and recreational
17 facilities instead of integrating. This deliberate evasion of racial equality continued
18 until a 1968 Supreme Court ruling put a stop to the practice of closing public facilities
19 to avoid integrating them (Brennan, 1968).

20 The irony is that while charter schools started life as 100% white, they now serve
21 intensely segregated students of color. Frankenberg et al. (2019) noted that

22 Nearly three out of four students in the typical black student's charter
23 school are also black. This indicates extremely high levels of isolation,
24 particularly given the fact that black students comprise less than
25 one-third of charter students. Latino isolation is also high, but not as
26 severe as for blacks or whites across all charter schools. (p. 47)

1 Unfortunately, these segregation academies still exist, but instead of excluding
2 children of color the way segregation academies did, they disproportionately target
3 and enroll children of color. While these schools are no longer referred to as
4 segregation academies, they make up a sizable subset of charter schools and often
5 include the word “Academy” in their name. In Santa Clara County, for example, 11 out
6 of 21 charter schools authorized by the county currently include “Academy” in their
7 name (SCCOE, 2021).

8 Nikole Hannah-Jones, in her keynote speech at the Network for Public Education’s
9 Fourth Annual Conference, said that it has never been the case that a majority of
10 African-Americans have attended majority white schools (“Keynote at the Network
11 for Public Education’s 4th Annual Conference,” 2017). She then added ruefully, that
12 this was quite a feat considering that African-Americans make up roughly one
13 seventh of the population of the United States. Orfield and Frankenberg note that the
14 percent of African-Americans in majority white schools rose from 0% in 1954 to a peak
15 of 43.5% in 1988 before steadily declining to 23.2% in 2011. (Table 3: Percent of Black
16 Students in Majority White Schools, 1954–2011, Orfield & Frankenberg, 2014, p. 10).
17 Hannah-Jones also commented that American public education doesn’t even live up
18 to the Separate but Equal doctrine espoused in *Plessy v Ferguson* and overturned by
19 *Brown v Board of Education*: Schools are still segregated and are still unequal.

20 Charter Schools, Free Markets and Privatization

21 Just a year after *Brown*, Friedman (1955) published his article “The Role of
22 Government in Education” in *Economics and the Public Interest* (Friedman, 1955) that
23 reframed charter schools as an economic problem in education instead as a way of
24 evading court-ordered integration. That paper ensured that charter schools would no
25 longer be morally tainted by their association with virulent racism, but rather would

1 take on the honorable task of breaking up what was called a monopoly. Charters,
2 operating in a free market¹², would allow parents to choose the best alternative from
3 an array of competing choices. Tellingly left unspecified was exactly how the free
4 market would ensure that the array of competing choices actually offered valuable
5 educational alternatives rather than merely alternatives in different locations.

6 In 1981, Ronald Reagan ran and became President of the United States based on a
7 platform of less government is better government. This platform included
8 eliminating the U.S. Department of Education (“The Republican Party platform of
9 1980,” 1980). True, eliminating the Department of Education is not the same as
10 shutting down an entire school district the way white parents did in 1964, but the
11 thought is there. Haney-López (2014) expertly dissects how it’s possible to voice racist
12 thoughts without actually using racial words, a practice perfected by President
13 Ronald Reagan (Haney-López, 2014).

14 Now, only liberty and freedom matter, in education, as in other fields. It’s school
15 choice or bust; school choice is proffered not only as *the* panacea for all that ails
16 America’s schools, but is even touted as the morally right thing to do. With trace of
17 irony, the twice impeached President Donald Trump framed school choice as the
18 “civil rights issue of our time” in a garbled statement at the signing of an executive
19 order on Safe Policing for Safe Communities:

20 School choice is the civil rights statement of the year, the decade and
21 probably beyond. Because all children have to have access to quality
22 education. A child’s zip code in America should never determine their
23 future.

24 (as quoted in Lennox, 2020)

¹²No one really wants a free market because a market completely free of regulation would have unenforceable contracts, rampant monopolies, and constant and ruinous market failures. What people really want when they use the phrase “free market” is a heavily regulated market which allows them to profit, unfettered, while restraining or excluding others.

1 Education reformers have latched on to the notion that schools need to be
2 privatized and freed from bureaucratic control for reasons of efficiency, increased
3 flexibility, and accountability (Garcia, 2018). This claim is made despite educational
4 management organizations (EMOs) themselves being high overhead, opaque
5 bureaucracies with scant accountability.

6 B. Baker and Miron identified four major policy concerns with the privatization
7 of public education:

- 8 1. A substantial share of public expenditure intended for the delivery of
9 direct educational services to children is being extracted
10 inadvertently or intentionally for personal or business financial gain,
11 creating substantial inefficiencies;
- 12 2. Public assets are being unnecessarily transferred to private hands, at
13 public expense, risking the future provision of “public” education;
- 14 3. Charter school operators are growing highly endogenous,
15 self-serving private entities built on funds derived from lucrative
16 management fees and rent extraction which further compromise the
17 future provision of “public” education; and
- 18 4. Current disclosure requirements make it unlikely that any related
19 legal violations, ethical concerns, or merely bad policies and practices
20 are not realized until clever investigative reporting, whistleblowers or
21 litigation brings them to light.

22 (B. Baker & Miron, 2015, p. 3)

23 In California at least, these policy concerns have not been addressed in the six years
24 since B. Baker and Miron wrote about them¹³.

25 Charter schools are now just one of the many forms of *privatization*, when public
26 functions are performed by private parties for profit. Privatization is a manifestation

¹³Changes in policy to address some of these concerns have been strenuously opposed by charter school advocates. For example, the California Charter Schools Association opposed an accountability bill, AB1316 *School accountability: financial and performance audits: charter schools: contracts*. (2021–2022), which merely sought to make charter school finances more transparent.

1 of the corporate takeover of the world. More than fifty years ago, Domhoff (2014)
2 published the first of eight editions of *Who rules America?* in which he argues that
3 corporations and the corporate elite really run the United States, and by extension,
4 the world. Kahn and Minnich (2005) make much the same point in their book *The fox*
5 *in the henhouse: How privatization threatens democracy* (Kahn & Minnich, 2005). They list
6 “[s]chools, prisons, welfare, Social Security, water and sewer systems, buses, trains,
7 subways, highways, waterways, sanitation systems” (p. 30) as examples of formerly
8 government run functions that are in whole or part privatized. They could have also
9 listed postal mail, space travel, and now every facet of education, as being wholly or
10 partly privatized. Cohen and Mikaelian (2021) lay out in detail how privatization has
11 infiltrated American life and the consequences of this takeover of public goods by
12 private firms run for profit (Cohen & Mikaelian, 2021). *Black in Schoolhouse Burning*
13 (Black, 2020) focuses on the less tangible but arguably more important consequences
14 of privatization of public schools, the loss of democratic control.

15 Privatizers make money by turning goods or services that used to be publicly
16 available into private goods and services that must be paid for before they can be
17 used. The canonical example of privatization is the enclosure of the commons in
18 Britain in the 16th and 17th centuries whereby land which had previously been owned
19 collectively by a village was now owned by an individual who charged villagers for the
20 privilege of using that land (Simon Fairlie, 2009). But modern privatizers have many
21 more ways of turning a profit. They can:

- 22 • Obtain tax benefits
- 23 • Invest in other firms with public monies
- 24 • Invest in financial instruments with public monies
- 25 • Obtain a monopoly
- 26 • Engage in fraud, corruption, or outright theft

- 1 • Engage in self-dealing
- 2 • Obtain grants or loans on favorable terms
- 3 • Sell what doesn't belong to them
- 4 • Avoid paying for externalities
- 5 • Pay below market rates for goods or services
- 6 • Skew public-private partnerships to create unearned profits
- 7 • Engage in pay-for-success contracts
- 8 • Offer social impact bonds

9 Charter school operators have even more options. They can inflate enrollment,
10 charge excessive management fees, mis-characterize expenses, omit or inaccurately
11 report financial data, fail to open a school or close one soon after receiving a grant,
12 and sell their facilities to investors and lease them back, both at inflated prices. Many
13 charter schools have a long history of duplicitous or fraudulent actions (In the Public
14 Interest, 2018; Burris & Bryant, 2020; B. Baker & Miron, 2015).

15 School choice has been relentlessly marketed and promoted by billionaires who
16 do not send their children to public schools.¹⁴ The Walton family, Eli Broad, Bill
17 Gates, the Koch brothers, the Zuckerbergs, and Laurene Jobs, are all on the list of the
18 500 richest people in the world. Their collective wealth exceeds half a trillion dollars,
19 and they are busily engaged using that wealth to fix the very problems that their
20 accumulation of wealth caused. Giridharadas (2018) whose book, *Winners Take All: The*
21 *Elite Charade of Changing the World*, says that it's a
22 "Trying-to-Solve-the-Problem-with-the-Tools-That-Caused-It" issue (Giridharadas,
23 2018, p. 142).

24 The effects of billionaire spending on education cannot be over emphasized. Bill
25 Gates made \$2B in grants aimed at creating smaller schools (Gates, 2009, p. 11),

¹⁴Ravitch (2010) lumps these billionaires together, calling them the "Billionaires Boys Club", an epithet first used in *The Death and Life of the Great American School System*.

1 despite a lack of evidence that they were educationally valuable. The grants were
2 eventually discontinued when the initiative didn't produce the intended results.
3 Gates was also instrumental in funding and promoting the Common Core State
4 Standards and associated assessments whose premise was that if we only had high
5 enough academic standards, student outcomes would improve, again without
6 evidence that the reforms were educationally valuable.

7 Types of Charter Schools

8 Charter schools can be broadly classified along three axes. The
9 authorizer/oversight axis has to do with what entity approved their charter and who
10 will exercise oversight. The profit/non-profit axis classifies schools by their intent to
11 generate a profit, or not. Lastly, the in-person/blended/virtual axis characterizes
12 pedagogical approach. Are their classes in-person, virtual, or a blend of the two?

13 *Charter School Authorizers and Oversight*

14 Charter schools in California are potentially subject to a three step process to gain
15 authorization to operate. The first step is to submit a petition to the school district in
16 which the charter wishes to reside. This petition must contain a number of required
17 elements, all of which are specified in Education Code §47605(c)(5)(A–O), the
18 so-called “15 Required Elements (A–O elements)” (Aguinaldo et al., 2021, p. 89).
19 Besides some technical details, the petition must contain a description of the
20 charter’s annual goals which must align with state priorities, for all pupils and for
21 various subgroups; how these outcomes are to be measured; how the charter is to
22 achieve a racial and ethnic balance similar to its district, its governance structure, and
23 its finances. All of these elements are captured in “*Charter Petition Evaluation Matrix*”
24 by FCMAT, a document intended to provide a legally sound checklist for authorizers.

1 If a petition contains all the required elements, then the public school district
2 may approve the petition, possibly with additional stipulations. If the public school
3 district denies the charter school's petition, the charter school may appeal that denial
4 to that County's Board of Education (CBOE), and if the CBOE denies the charter
5 school's appeal, under certain circumstances, the charter school may appeal to the
6 State Board of Education (SBE). A denial by the SBE terminates the process, and the
7 charter school is not permitted to open.

8 Public school districts (LEAs, local education agencies, in the parlance of the
9 California Department of Education (CDE)) may authorize one several kinds of
10 charter schools. A district may sponsor a charter school directly, in which case the
11 LEA exercises oversight. These dependent charter schools are authorized by the local
12 public school board and are subject to the board's jurisdiction. It also is possible for
13 all the schools in a district to convert to charter schools, and then the public school
14 board becomes the charter school board. Table 1, *Attributes of Private, Charter, and*
15 *Public Schools in California*, is a summary of the attributes of the types of schools in
16 California.

17 *Profit-Making Status*

18 Until the 2019–20 school year, charter schools in California could be run directly
19 or indirectly by a profit-making organization. California now prohibits
20 profit-making organizations, either a single school or a charter management
21 organization, from submitting an initial charter school petition or a renewal.

22 Even though profit-making charters are banned, there are many ways of getting
23 around this restriction. Charter operators can contract with outside firms to provide
24 all or just some services, and those firms may be profit-making firms. Charter
25 operators are able to lease, buy, or sell their facilities, and those transactions might

Table 1*Attributes of Private, Charter, and Public Schools in California*

Attribute	Private	Charter	Public
Funding	parent tuition	tax dollars	tax dollars
Governance	self-appointed	self-appointed	elected board
Duration	unlimited	time-limited	unlimited
Ed. Code	no	no	yes
Taxation Powers	none	none	limited
Facilities Bonds	no	no	yes
Facilities Grants	no	yes	no
Enrollment	limited	limited	unlimited
Unionized	rarely	rarely	often
Curriculum	completely flexible	very flexible	flexible
Standardized Testing	no	yes	yes
Accountable	no	authorizer	state & parents
Teacher Certification	no requirement	yes	yes
Teacher Pension	perhaps	perhaps	yes

1 generate a profit. Charter operators can sell their facilities and lease them back from
2 the buyer. This kind of financial transaction converts an illiquid asset (buildings) into
3 a liquid asset, cash, and also generates a revenue stream from the rental income, all
4 of which is ultimately paid for by taxpayers. Charter operators may also charge
5 schools a management fee or an expansion fee. Charter operators are not restricted
6 in the salaries they pay administrators.

7 However, charter school board members in California have recently become
8 subject to the conflict-of-interest laws specified in Government Code §§1090–1099
9 and §§87100–87314 (Becerra & Medeiros, 2018). Generally, government officials are
10 prohibited from benefiting financially from their positions as public servants, but it
11 remains to be seen if these conflict-of-interest laws will prevent profiteering by
12 school board members, administrators, or relatives of either.¹⁵

¹⁵The law is necessarily complex. Two useful guides (total: 300 pages) are Chaney et al. (2010) and Kevin Ennis et al. (2016). A more general guide to local government ethics is “Understanding the Basics of Public Service Ethics” from California’s Institute for Local Government.

1 *Type of Instruction*

2 Charter schools, unlike almost all public schools, vary in their instructional
3 format. In-person instruction is similar to that in traditional public schools. On the
4 other hand, virtual charter schools have no face-to-face instruction; everything is
5 mediated by some sort of technology, typically, computers running specialized
6 software, paid for by taxpayers. Blended instruction is a mixture of in-person and
7 virtual instruction.

8 Virtual charter schools have been studied extensively by Alex Molnar, Gary Miron
9 and others and at the National Education Policy Center, University of Colorado,
10 Boulder since 2013. (*Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2013*, 2013; *Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2014*,
11 2014; *Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2015*, 2015; Miron & Gulosino, 2016; *Virtual Schools in the*
12 *U.S. 2017*, 2017; *Full-Time Virtual and Blended Schools: Enrollment, Student Characteristics,*
13 *and Performance*, 2018; *Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2019*, 2019; *Virtual Schools in the U.S.*
14 *2021*, 2021) Their annual reports are depressingly consistent: virtual school not run by
15 a public school district significantly underperform public schools. Their conclusions
16 are echoed by Woodworth et al. (2015) and Garcia (2018). Yet, despite being clearly
17 academically inferior to public schools, the number of students attending virtual
18 schools has risen year after year. Their pre-pandemic growth seems to be slowing,
19 but their performance, compared to TSPs, has not measurably improved.¹⁶ (*Virtual*
20 *Schools in the U.S. 2019*, 2019, p. 11).

21 Pre-pandemic, charter schools in California were legally deemed
22 classroom-based (e.g. not virtual) if students spent no more than 20% of their time in

¹⁶Although *Charter Schools in Perspective: A Guide to Research* is otherwise an excellent summary of the research on charter schools, they incorrectly state (p.117) that there is little research of online or virtual charter schools. The authors must not be aware of the NEPC series on virtual charter schools. However, according to *Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2019* (2019, p. 117), there is only one study on blended charter schools.

1 front of a computer.¹⁷ Blended charter schools, on the other hand, offer some sort of
2 face-to-face interaction with a teacher along with online activity without face-to-face
3 interaction. But they too offer only marginally better educational outcomes than fully
4 virtual charter schools (*Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2019*, 2019, p. 52). Rocketship schools
5 use a blended instructional model.

6 Charter Schools in the United States

7 Charter schools are one of several different kinds of school choice that are or have
8 been available in the United States. Vouchers, private schools, home schooling,
9 educational savings accounts, freedom-of-choice plans, magnet schools, and open
10 enrollment are all forms of school choice. Home schooling accounts for less than 5%
11 of all the students in United States. Private schools enroll about 12% of the total.
12 Magnet school account for a few percent. Roughly, the various form of school choice,
13 including charter schools, account for just under a quarter of all American students.

14 The characteristic that home schooling and private schools share is that they are
15 agnostic about public schools. Not so for charter schools, voucher, and
16 freedom-of-choice plans. Charter schools, voucher programs, parent trigger
17 programs, and freedom-of-choice plans explicitly want to supplant or replace public
18 schools (Garcia, 2018).

19 The first charter schools, other than segregation academies, were founded in
20 Milwaukee, Wisconsin in 1991, followed by California starting in 1993. Conceptually,
21 charter schools were based on an amalgam of ideas from Milton Friedman, Albert
22 Shanker, and Ray Budde. Milton Friedman came at it from an ideological point of

¹⁷The California Education Code §47612.5(e)(1) doesn't mention computers, but bases its definition of classroom-based on students being physically at the schoolsite with a certificated teacher in charge. Under that definition, a roomful of students behind computers with a teacher in attendance would qualify as classroom-based and not virtual. California's Education Code does not recognize the blended category.

1 view couched in economic terms. Albert Shanker, in 1988, in a speech at the National
2 Press Club, proposed that *teachers* in conjunction with *parents* be allowed to form a
3 school *within* a school district. Shanker made no mention of competition, or free
4 markets, or even of charter schools. Shanker's speech emphasized curriculum and
5 learning, not governance or finance. Ray Budde first thought of charter schools in the
6 early 1970s, but his proposal generated no interest and it was not until 1988 that he
7 published his ideas (Budde, 1988).

8 *Charter Schools in California*

9 Charter schools, in California as elsewhere in the United States, enter into a
10 contract (the charter) with a chartering authority that specifies what they are to do
11 and how, and in return, are exempt from the entirety of California's Education Code
12 (with the exception of five technical provisions). The California Legislature, when it
13 enacted the *The Charter School Act of 1992*¹⁸ (Ed. Code §47600), spelled out its intent in
14 passing that legislation. The Act has been amended many times in its nearly 30 years
15 of existence, but its intent has remained the same. Charter schools should:

- 16 a) Improve pupil learning.
- 17 b) Increase learning opportunities for all pupils, with special emphasis on
18 expanded learning experiences for pupils who are identified as academically
19 low achieving.
- 20 c) Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods.
- 21 d) Create new professional opportunities for teachers, including the
22 opportunity to be responsible for the learning program at the school site.

¹⁸Current California law can be accessed at
<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/home.xhtml>. California Regulations are at
<https://ccr.oal.ca.gov>. California's Education Code (Ed.Code) is at
<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codesTOCSelected.xhtml?tocCode=EDC&tocTitle=+Education+Code+-+EDC>

- 1 e) Provide parents and pupils with expanded choices in the types of educational
- 2 opportunities that are available within the public school system.
- 3 f) Hold the schools established under this part accountable for meeting
- 4 measurable pupil outcomes, and provide the schools with a method to change
- 5 from rule-based to performance-based accountability systems.
- 6 g) Provide vigorous competition within the public school system to stimulate
- 7 continual improvements in all public schools.¹⁹

8 It is important to keep these seven goals in mind because charter schools have
9 contractually agreed to meet these goals in return for funding, independently of
10 whatever other goals they explicitly specified in their charter. Note, in particular, that
11 nothing has been said about profitability, and in fact, California enacted a
12 prohibition against for-profit charter schools (Ed. Code §47604 et seq.) in 2018.

13 Surveys of Charter School Research

14 It's been about 30 years since the first charter school law was passed. In the last
15 decade, researchers have published several surveys of the research on charter
16 schools. The first two decades (1990–2010) were somewhat experimental and
17 different enough that the research that came out of that period is less relevant than
18 more recent research. The first survey of the last decade, “Beyond ideological warfare:
19 the maturation of research on charter schools,” is by Smith et al. It is a systematic
20 review of charter school research as it existed in 2011. Smith et al. (2011) are
21 interested, not so much in the conclusions of the studies they looked at, but how the
22 research was performed, how was it structured, what facets of charter schools were
23 looked at, and what was the subject of the research in order to “separate empirical

¹⁹This goal was added in 1998.

1 evidence from politicized conjecture” (p. 460). They reviewed a total of 323
2 peer-reviewed articles and research center reports and found that student and school
3 outcomes were the most commonly studied topics. They noted many studies were
4 unable to generalize their findings because variations in policy between states and
5 localities. Smith et al. also noted that there was a lack of longitudinal studies which is
6 not surprising due to policy variations. Furthermore, they found that “acceptance
7 into a peer reviewed journal does not always ensure that qualitative research adheres
8 to the standards of providing substantiation that findings are credible and
9 trustworthy or that quantitative research provides evidence of the studies’ validity,
10 reliability and generalizability.” (p.466) Finally, the authors noted that many studies
11 could not draw causal connections. They conclude that more research is needed.

12 Four years later, Berends (2015) chose as his focus the various theories that
13 researchers used when looking at the social organization of charter schools. In
14 “Sociology and School Choice,” Berends (2015), found, like Smith et al., that most
15 studies concentrated on student achievement and neglected educational attainment
16 such as high school graduation, college admission, and the granting of a degree. He
17 notes that “the effects of charter schools on student achievement are mixed (some
18 positive, some negative and some neutral)” (p. 170) Berends thinks the context in
19 which charter schools operate is important in order to understand the magnitude of
20 any effects and to understand what we can expect from school reform. He identifies
21 longer school days, a focus on achievement, behavioral policies, teacher coaching and
22 feedback, and data-based decision-making as characteristics most often associated
23 with effective charter schools. Lastly he looks at innovation and distinguishes
24 between curriculum and class-room based changes, and organizational changes and
25 finds that charter schools mostly innovate on the structural side rather than the
26 academic side. He concludes that more research is needed.

1 Next, Epple et al. (2016), in *Charter schools*, did much the same as Berends, but
2 concentrated on the technical aspects of study design (Epple et al., 2016). They
3 observed that which the research question being answered by a particular study was
4 often much narrower or significantly different than the research question authors set
5 out to answer or thought they were answering. The heart of their review is an
6 analysis of “the methodological challenges in evaluating charter effectiveness” (p.141),
7 and the strength and weaknesses of the various approaches that have been used.
8 They find that researchers used one of five statistical methods: lottery-based design,
9 fixed-effect approaches, matching procedures, ordinary least squares (OLS)
10 regression, and instrumental variable approaches (p. 165), and they evaluate each
11 approach. Epple et al. also discuss the much scrutinized virtual control record
12 method of matching charter school students to public school students that came out
13 of Stanford’s Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) which was
14 criticized on purely statistical grounds in Andrea Gabor (2015). Epple et al. concluded
15 that more research is needed.

16 In 2015 and then updated in 2018, Public Agenda released a guide to charter
17 school research for non-academics, a review of current charter school research that
18 was written in a way that is accessible to the public. The chapter on finance focused
19 on four questions related to how charter schools are funded, comparisons between
20 per pupil funding between charter and traditional schools, financial effects on
21 traditional public schools, and differential spending patterns between traditional
22 public and charter schools (Public Agenda, 2018, pp. 78–89).

23 The finance chapter must have been a difficult chapter to write because the 48
24 states with school choice programs have 48 different methods of funding public
25 schools and charter schools. In addition, each state has likely gone through several
26 iterations of models of charter school funding, and this lack of commonality prevents

1 researchers from conducting valid longitudinal studies.

2 Their answer to their first question is to point to compilations of state funding.
3 Their answer to the second question is yes, and in some cases, by 40% to nearly 60%
4 less. Their take on whether it matters is hedged because studies differ in their
5 conclusions for a variety of reasons. Not mentioned is B. D. Baker (2018) which
6 emphatically says that money does matter, perhaps because it was published after
7 *Charter Schools in Perspective: A Guide to Research* was. They answer their third question
8 with an unambiguous yes. More recent research, Lafer (2018), B. D. Baker (2019), and
9 Miron et al. (2021) validates their conclusion. Finally, they conclude that charter
10 schools do spend their revenues differently, in part because spend more on
11 administration than public schools do and sometimes more on facilities. The authors
12 conclude that more research is needed.

13 The last of the four academic surveys, Zimmer et al. (2019), considered who was
14 served, racial segregation effects, both academic and non-academic outcomes,
15 management structure, and financial effects of charter schools. Since Zimmer is a
16 co-author of both this survey and of the previously cited Epple et al. (2016), the kinds
17 of study designs analyzed are similar. Zimmer et al. intend to synthesize “the best
18 research to inform the debate [about the value of charter schools]” (p. 2). They go
19 beyond the 2016 study and survey studies on racial segregation, cream skimming²⁰,
20 and student pushout²¹. They conclude that charter schools lead to greater segregation
21 for African Americans, but not necessarily for whites or Hispanics. They find that
22 charter schools do engage in sometimes subtle forms of cream skimming and
23 student pushout. After summarizing three different kinds of research (fixed effects,
24 lottery-based, and match and other regression), they turn their attention to research

²⁰selecting the best students from TPSs

²¹pushing out their lowest performing students

1 on non-cognitive outcomes. Their penultimate chapter looks at research on indirect
2 effects. They conclude in their last chapter that more research is needed.

3 Although Garcia (2018) is not explicitly a survey of the existing literature, Garcia
4 (2018), in Chapter 3 (pp. 91–146), contains much material on the research evidence
5 which guides (or should guide) school choice policies. His goal is to present general
6 trends that “reflect the weight of the evidence” (p. 93). The weight of the evidence,
7 Garcia finds the research points to the conclusions that “school choice policies are
8 more likely to separate, rather than integrate, students from different racial/ethnic
9 and socioeconomic backgrounds” (pp. 159–60), “how countries and states structure
10 school choice policies can have a profound impact on how school choice functions at
11 a practical level” (p. 160), “low-income students face obstacles to participating in
12 school choice plans” (p. 161), lastly, “one should expect student achievement gains
13 under school choice plans to be modest at best and inconsistent across subjects and
14 years” (p. 161), and “a major reason for the inability of school choice to have an impact
15 on the academic core of schools—teaching and learning—is that school choice came
16 of age at the same time as high-stakes accountability policies that encourage
17 standardization” (p. 162)

18 Garcia makes a point that hasn’t been made before: Since both public schools and
19 charter schools are measured the same way (standardized tests), “the incentives to
20 implement innovative pedagogical strategies are curtailed because the methods by
21 which students are able to demonstrate their learning are uniform across all schools
22 and restricted to the format of the tests.” (p. 163) He does not conclude that more
23 research is needed, but instead predicts that school choice in its many forms will
24 continue to expand.

25 *Research on Charter School Finances*

1 Charter schools have been much studied, and the last decade has produced a
2 number of reports examining charter school finances based on carefully collected
3 evidence. For example, in 2014, Lafer (2014), now at In the Public Interest, published
4 an analysis of a proposed law in Milwaukee, WI (Lafer, 2014) that was specifically
5 tailored to benefit a to-be-opened Rocketship school. Lafer went on to author two
6 other studies on charter schools, public policy, and finance: *Spending blind: the failure*
7 *of policy planning in california charter school funding* and *Breaking point: The cost of charter*
8 *schools for public school districts*. Carol Burris, Executive Director of the Network for
9 Public Education, and several co-authors have produced three reports on charter
10 schools: Burris and Pflieger (2020), Burris and Bryant (2020), and Burris and
11 Cimarusti (2021). The National Education Policy Center is a research center based at
12 the University of Colorado, Boulder, with over 150 scholars and academics from
13 institutions across the U.S. whose goal is “to produce and disseminate high-quality,
14 peer-reviewed research to inform education policy discussions” (“National Education
15 Policy Center,” n.d.). The NEPC has produced hundreds of reviews of research, policy
16 and legislative briefs, some of which are annual surveys of charter schools. The series
17 on profiles of EMOs have been produced annually for fifteen years; the series on
18 virtual charter schools, for ten years.

19 Bruce Baker’s contributions to the NEPC are especially noteworthy. He is an
20 author or co-author of 28 reviews of reports, studies, or articles on school finance, in
21 addition to six policy, legislative, or research briefs. Baker co-wrote with Gary Miron
22 *The business of charter schooling: Understanding the policies that charter operators use for*
23 *financial benefit*. B. Baker and Miron (2015) which introduces many of the tools and
24 techniques for evaluating how charter schools operate for profit. It will serve as a key
25 resource for this dissertation.

26 Lafer (2017b)’s report, *Spending blind: the failure of policy planning in california charter*

1 *school funding* is particularly scathing. He says, “Any time there is a low bar of entry for
2 firms seeking to access government funds, one can expect to find corruption, and the
3 charter industry is no exception.” (p.18) But even absent corruption, there is ample
4 opportunity to make lots of money. Lafer documents \$2.5B of Californian taxpayer
5 money spent over fifteen years on charter school facilities, in many cases where there
6 is no documented educational need and where the charter school is of lower quality
7 than nearby public schools. Lafer says, “It’s as if legislators turned on a faucet of
8 money and then just walked away.” (p.12) It is saddening that in the four years since
9 Lafer’s report came out, nothing has fundamentally changed.

10 Rocketship

11 Rocketship is well-known in the charter school world. It even has been the subject
12 of a “biography”, *On the rocketship* (Whitmire, 2014).²². Rocketship’s leaders and
13 supporters routinely describe it as “high performing”, “deserving of huge credit”,
14 “dynamic”, and “nationally lauded”. Rocketship schools, it is claimed, outperform
15 some of the best public schools in the country. Rocketship “believe[s] that every
16 student deserves the right to dream, to discover, and to develop their own unique
17 talent”. Rocketship, charter school advocates, and privatizers excel at choosing
18 names and tag lines that are impossible to argue against.

19 Rocketship is one of the largest non-profit blended charter school management
20 organization in the United States. They operate 21 schools in three states and
21 Washington, D.C.; thirteen in California, three in both Nashville, TN and
22 Washington, D.C., and two in Milwaukee, WI. In Santa Clara County, CA, they have
23 eight TK-5 elementary schools authorized by the county that served 4,254 students in

²²Just two other charter schools share this distinction: Geoffrey Canada’s Harlem Children’s Zone (Tough, 2009) and the KIPP schools (Mathews, 2009; Horn, 2016)

1 the 2019–20 school year plus 1240 students in two district authorized schools, for a
2 total of 5494 students.

3 *Founders and Supporters*

4 Rocketship was founded by John Danner, Don Shalvey, Jennifer Andaluz, and Eric
5 Resnick in 2007. Danner had significant teaching experience (Nashville, TN public
6 schools) prior to Rocketship, as did Shalvey (Aspire Public Schools) and Andaluz
7 (Downtown College Prep). Resnick, the fourth member of the founding group was a
8 hedge fund manager who had a “a deep understanding of financial management and
9 real estate transactions” (Danner, 2006, p. 13). The inclusion of Resnick, an expert in
10 real estate transactions, at the very beginning of Rocketship, is interesting because
11 one of the preferred ways for charter school investors and founders to generate
12 profits is via real estate deals. John Danner eventually left Rocketship in 2013 to found
13 Zeal, an online math tutoring tool, and was replaced by Preston Smith who became
14 CEO.

15 Not mentioned in the first charter petition, nor in the Articles of Incorporation of
16 Rocketship Education, the owners of the first Rocketship school, were Preston Smith,
17 Matt Hammer, and Reed Hastings, CEO of Netflix. Smith became the first principal
18 of the Rocketship’s first school, Mateo Sheedy, and was subsequently listed as a
19 Rocketship co-founder in the charter petition for Rocketship’s second school.
20 Hammer brought Danner and Smith together, and has relentlessly promoted charter
21 schools through his advocacy non-profit, Innovate Public Schools.²³ Hastings
22 proselytized Rocketship to the larger charter school community and when he
23 promised Rocketship \$250K for each of the first eight Rocketship schools they opened

²³<https://innovateschools.org/>

1 his donation caught the attention of philanthropic venture funds (Whitmire, 2014,
2 p. 50).

3 *Rocketship History*

4 The first Rocketship school, Mateo Sheedy, opened in Santa Clara County in 2007.
5 Rocketship's initial petition to the San José Unified School District was denied, so
6 they appealed to the Santa Clara County Board of Education, which granted their
7 petition. Over the years, Rocketship opened ten schools in Santa Clara County. Of
8 those ten, only two were authorized by a public school district. The remainder were
9 either countywide charters or charter schools whose petitions were denied by the
10 local public school district, but subsequently approved by the Santa Clara County
11 Board of Education. Table 2, *Rocketship Schools in Santa Clara County, California*, lists
12 the eleven Rocketship schools that were approved and the ten that opened. Note that
13 only two were approved by the school district in which there were expected to locate.
14 This lopsided result suggests that current charter school laws are tilted in favor of
15 charter schools.

16 *Rocketship Finances*

17 Charter schools have a number of unique financial needs. They need startup
18 funds, operating funds, and often funds to expand, funds that public schools do
19 without. Rocketship is no exception. The *operation* of charter schools are funded by
20 federal, state, and local governments, but funding *expansion* may or may not be
21 funded with tax dollars, depending on the laws of a particular state. The difference
22 between what's funded at taxpayer expense and what's not must somehow be funded
23 with outside money. Startup money is needed for facilities, desks and chairs, teacher
24 and administrator salaries, legal fees, curriculum materials, etc., all of this before

Table 2*Rocketship Schools in Santa Clara County, California*

School	Type	Opened	Renewed	Notes
Mateo Sheedy	District appeal	2007	2009, 2015	Denied by SJUSD, approved by SCCOE
Sí Si Puede	District appeal	2009	2011, 2017	Denied by ARUSD, approved by SCCOE
Los Sueños	Countywide	2010	2015	SCCOE countywide
Discovery Prep	Countywide	2011	2016	SCCOE countywide charter
Mosaic	District	2011	2016	Approved by ARUSD
Brilliant Minds	Countywide	2012	2017	SCCOE countywide charter
Alma Academy	Countywide	2012	2017	SCCOE countywide charter
Spark Academy	District	2013	2018	Approved by FMSD
Alum Rock	District appeal	—		Denied by ARUSD, approved by SCCOE, but withdrawn 2015
Fuerza	Countywide	2014	2018	SCCOE countywide charter
Rising Stars	District appeal	2016	2021	Denied by FMSD, approved by SCCOE

1 even one student registers. Startup facilities cost vary widely. If the charter school
 2 chooses to use public school district facilities under Proposition 39²⁴, their need for
 3 funds will be less. Regulations drawn up by the State Board of Education further
 4 define the phrase “sufficient to accommodate the charter school’s students”
 5 (California Code of Regulations, Title 5, §11969.), then startup facilities cost might be
 6 small; if they choose not to avail themselves of Proposition 39, then startup facilities
 7 costs might involve the purchase of land and the construction of school buildings, or
 8 might just involve lease payments. But since state funding is tied to attendance,
 9 some startup funding is necessary. Thus the federal government provides grants,
 10 administered by the states, for this purpose.

²⁴Proposition 39, passed by California voters in November 2000, contains a provision that requires public school districts to provide charter schools facilities “sufficient to accommodate the charter school’s students” (Secretary of State, California, 2000, pp. 38—41) (Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act, 2000)

1 Rocketship has indicated from the beginning its intent to expand. In 2009,
2 Rocketship announced plans to open six new schools (Cook, 2009). It submitted a
3 petition to Santa Clara County to open countywide charters and within three years
4 had actually opened four. Like many other CMOs and EMOs, Rocketship must
5 expand in order to increase revenue enough to be worth the while of investors. A
6 single school's profit is not enough to satisfy investors, but by using economies of
7 scale, a "portfolio" of charter schools might suffice. A portfolio of charter schools is a
8 collection of schools – almost always charter schools – managed as a whole.

9 The idea of a portfolio of schools comes from finance where a carefully chosen
10 portfolio of investments can have lower collective risk for a given level of return than
11 a mere collection of individual investments. (See "Markowitz model," 2021, for an
12 overview of the mathematics of modern portfolio theory). Hill et al. claim to have
13 invented the term *portfolio school district* (Hill et al., 2009, p. 1) and with it a strategy to
14 implement such a district. Just a year later, J. R. Henig et al. define portfolio strategy
15 for schools as

16 ...a loosely coupled conglomeration of ideas held together by the
17 metaphor of a well-managed stock portfolio and its proponents'
18 *unshakable belief* that the first step for successful reform must be to
19 dismantle the bureaucratic and political institutions that have built up
20 around the status quo. [emphasis added] (J. R. Henig et al., 2010)

21 Hill et al. acknowledge, in dry, understated language, that overcoming the
22 objections and criticisms of educators and scholars to their unshakable belief will be
23 difficult: "It is hard to imagine that a portfolio strategy could be introduced into a
24 major city without significant conflict." Portfolio strategy is most often associated
25 with Paul Hill and The Center for Reinventing Public Education, which is now located
26 at the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University.

1 *Rocketship Expansion Funding*

2 California, startup charter school funding has waxed and waned, in part because
3 federal funding has varied. Currently, the U.S. Department of Education provides
4 startup funds to states under the Charter Schools Program State Educational Agency
5 (SEA) grant program²⁵. The federal charter school funding programs are listed in
6 National Charter School Resource Center (2020). *The federal charter schools program:*
7 *2020 annual report* notes that

8 At the core of the Charter Schools Program are the Grants to State
9 Entities (SE Grants). The State Entity program offers competitive grants
10 to states, which then make subgrants within their states to *open new*
11 *charter schools and replicate or expand existing charter schools*. [emphasis
12 added]

13 (National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, 2020)

14 Funds like the New School Venture Fund²⁶ and the Charter School Growth Fund I
15 & II²⁷ exist to fund the development and expansion of charter schools and charter
16 management organizations. In 2007, when Rocketship Mateo Sheedy was started,
17 Rocketship used lines of credit and loans to fund its beginning (Danner, 2006, p. 260).
18 Now, charter schools have many more options for funding startup or operations.

19 Charters have at least three other sources of facilities funding: bonds, tax credits
20 and foundation or individual contributions. Betsy DeVos, who served as Secretary of
21 Education for Donald Trump, has donated \$12.6M to Rocketship. Reed Hastings, a
22 founder and now CEO Netflix has donated more than \$2M. In addition, charter
23 schools can avail themselves of the New Market Tax Credit if they meet certain

²⁵<https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oii/csp/funding.html>

²⁶<https://www.newschools.org/>

²⁷<https://chartergrowthfund.org/>

1 investment criteria, and if they do, they can get back 39% of their investment in tax
2 credits in seven years. If their investment returns, say, 20%, then combined, they are
3 looking at nearly a 60% return on their investment. A sixty percent return is fantastic.
4 Charter schools and charter school operators can also issue revenue bonds. Revenue
5 bonds are guaranteed by a revenue stream instead of by property tax revenues the
6 way general obligation bonds are. Note that both are tax-exempt. As of 2015, charter
7 schools issued over \$11B in revenue bonds according to Clark-Herrera et al. (2019).

8 *Rocketship Expansion Difficulties*

9 In 2014, the Santa Clara County Office of Education and Rocketship were sued by
10 four Santa Clara County public school districts: Alum Rock, Mount Pleasant,
11 Franklin-McKinley and Evergreen. At issue was the SCCOE's bulk authorization of
12 twenty countywide Rocketship charter schools. Sixteen months, 17,500 pages of
13 evidence, and an estimated \$435,000 later, Rocketship, the public school districts,
14 and Santa Clara County settled (Noguchi, 2015). As part of the settlement, Rocketship
15 agreed to withdraw 13 of the 20 countywide charters thus far authorized. Since one
16 of the remaining countywide charter had already been withdrawn, that left six
17 potential charters still authorized but as of yet, unopened. So far, it appears that
18 Rocketship has attempted to expand in locations beyond Santa Clara County: San
19 Pablo²⁸ and Concord in California, Nashville in Tennessee, Milwaukee in Wisconsin,
20 Washington, D.C. and Fort Worth in Texas.

21 *Charter School Accountability*

22 In California, all K–12 schools, including privately managed charter schools like
23 Rocketship, must submit annual budgets, Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports

²⁸unsuccessfully

1 (CAFR), and since 2014, Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAP). LCAPs are
2 three year plans updated in years two and three and which in detail how a school will
3 use its funds to address state priorities, and to improve educational outcomes for
4 foster youth, English learners, and low-income students, along with the metrics
5 which will be used to show progress (Aguinaldo et al., 2021, pp. 66–84). These
6 characteristics make LCAPs particularly interesting from both a financial point of
7 view and from an educational point of view.

8 Rocketship and Privatization

9 Some contend that the central purpose of charter schools is to disguise a
10 money-making operation (Saltman, 2018). Whitmire, who now sits on the board of
11 Rocketship Education and who in 2014 published *On the rocketship*, makes note of the
12 role that private venture funds played in Rocketship financing (Whitmire, 2014,
13 pp. 25, 65), and it is instructive to remember that private, for-profit venture funds
14 exist to make money. True, they often are “double bottom line” grantors (Clark et al.,
15 2004). As Ball (cited in Tewksbury (2016, p. 75)) makes clear

16 ... particularly with the added case of Rocketship, a blended learning
17 chain of charter schools, is that the NSVF [New Schools Venture Fund] is
18 using its clout to further blur the lines between for-profit and nonprofit
19 educational projects and organizations, thus smoothing the grooves
20 [grooves?] for marketizing educational policy and practices. Ball (2012)
21 makes the connections and rationalities clear: “Symbolically,
22 philanthropy provides an ‘acceptable’ alternative to the state in terms of
23 its moral legitimacy. It has also provided a kind of rehabilitation for the
24 form of capital that were subject of ‘ill repute’ in the public imagination.
25 Strategically, philanthropy has provided a “Trojan horse” for the
26 modernizing move that opened the ‘policy door’ to new actor and new
27 ideas and sensibilities.” (Ball, 2012, p. 32)

1 Privatizers use investment banks, hedge funds, and private equity firms as their
2 vehicle for investing (Stowell, 2018). These investment vehicles are called *alternative*
3 *investments*, in contrast to *traditional investments* like stocks and bonds. Investment
4 banks provide the financial expertise that hedge funds and private equity firms need.

5 *Privatization*

6 Charter CMOs and EMOs appear to be following the lead of prison and health
7 care privatizers. They lobby legislators intensively. They position themselves as being
8 more efficient than the “wasteful” public sector, and they claim to to be able to do
9 better than public schools, prisons or hospitals at a lower cost. Since charter schools
10 have positioned themselves as being in competition with TPSs, they need to do at
11 least as well as TPSs, or failing that, appear to do so. This calls for creative marketing,
12 and so to that end, pro-charter advocacy organizations, some university-affiliated
13 institutions and some think tanks have been harnessed to churn out pro-charter puff
14 pieces that are regularly debunked.²⁹ Evidently even creative marketing is not
15 enough to prod the free market to supply the educational choice that charter school
16 advocates feel is necessary, so pro-choice advocacy organizations also lobby state
17 representatives and fund pro-charter board candidates.

18 Charter school marketing is extensive. Organizations like The 74 Million, a
19 reference to the 74 million children in America, or Innovate Public Schools, an
20 advocacy organization, produce reports, news items, briefs and what claims to be
21 research that is slanted toward charter schools and away from public schools,

²⁹The National Educational Policy Center (<https://nepc.colorado.edu>) in the School of Education at the University of Colorado (Boulder) currently has over 150 NEPC Fellows who aim “to produce and disseminate high-quality, peer-reviewed research to inform education policy discussion” on a wide variety of topics. They often review pro-charter school publications which have been presented as academic research even though those publications have not been peer-reviewed and often have serious methodological problems which weaken or negate their conclusions.

1 teachers, unions, school boards, and anything and anyone who doesn't buy into the
2 notion that American education is in desperate need of reform. One technique that is
3 used is to fund media outlets to write allegedly unbiased and non-partisan articles
4 and blog postings that promote "successes" while dismissing any harm that charter
5 schools might cause.

6 These influence techniques are reminiscent of how OxyContin was marketed by
7 the Sackler family, which is not surprising since Jonathan Sackler, now deceased,
8 founded or funded charter advocacy groups like 50CAN, ConnCAN, Families for
9 Excellent Schools, the Northeast Charter School Network, Education Reform Now,
10 Partnership for Educational Justice, and The 74 Million. Dubb (2017) describes the
11 similarities in marketing strategies used to sell oxycontin and those used to promote
12 charter schools, where the focus of all communications was to highlight benefits
13 while ignoring or erasing harms. While this is the standard playbook of corporate
14 marketing, we now have public education dollars being spent on such tactics. When a
15 national exposé published by National Public Radio (NPR) documented serious
16 concerns about Rocketship's practices, The 74 Million immediately published an *ad*
17 *hominem* attack accusing the NPR reporting to have been a "hit piece" on the charter
18 network instead of responding with reasonable and reasoned arguments.

19 Unlike many other forms of privatization, charter schools have competition.
20 When a local government turns over the task of supplying water to a town, for
21 example, there is not another, public water company serving the same customers to
22 serve as a comparison. Privatization is often an all-or-nothing proposition. Charter
23 schools, on the other hand, can be and are often compared to the public schools in the
24 same school district. The presence of very visible competition has an interesting
25 consequence: charter schools view public schools as an existential threat, precisely
26 the opposite of the cooperative, synergistic relationship that state legislators

1 envisioned. In fact, the sharing of innovations appears so infrequently that it might
2 as well be completely absent.

3 Given that charter schools in California get the same per pupil funding as do
4 public schools, there are a limited number of ways that charter schools can generate
5 “excess” funds. They can lower operating costs. They can tap into state or federal
6 facilities grants. They can collect and sell student data. They can contract out to a
7 for-profit management company. They buy technology from business partners. In all
8 these cases, the net result is always the same: money flows out of the public school
9 system into private hands.

10 Charter schools employ fewer and less experienced teachers than public schools
11 do. A teacher with 10 or 20 years of experience can easily command a salary that is
12 twice that of a newly minted teacher. Rocketship has a student-to-teacher ration
13 that’s as high as 36:1 (SCCOE, 2021, pp. 23–30). The combination of fewer and less
14 expensive teachers can reduce the cost of teacher salaries to one-third of what public
15 schools pay for teachers. This reduction is significant because teacher salaries
16 typically account for from one-third to three-quarters of the total expense of running
17 a school. Charter schools that employ a blended pedagogy can further reduce the cost
18 of salaries, with virtual schools dispensing entirely with teachers, effectively
19 reducing the single largest component of running a school to zero.

20 Philanthrocapitalism

21 Philanthrocapitalism is the term used to describe the approach to philanthropy
22 that prioritizes operating non-profits as businesses, i.e. making money while “doing
23 good”. The epigraph to Giridharadas’s book *Winners Take All* is a quote taken from Leo
24 Tolstoy’s *Writings on Civil Disobedience and Nonviolence* which captures the absurdity of
25 making money while “doing good”:

1 I sit on a man's back choking him and making him carry me, and yet
2 assure myself and others that I am sorry for him and wish to lighten his
3 load by all means possible ... except by getting off his back.

4 For philanthrocapitalists, the techniques and vehicles used to extract a profit
5 from public education are impressive. Saltman (2018) lists the following in *The swindle*
6 *of innovative educational finance* (pp.xii–xiii):

- 7 • social impact bonds,
- 8 • higher education lending and student income loans,
- 9 • charter school real estate, tax credit, and municipal schemes, and
- 10 • philanthrocapitalist educational technology schemes.

11 Marachi and Carpenter (2020), Burris and Cimarusti (2021), Scott (2009), B. Baker
12 and Miron (2015) all make the same point: education has been captured by big
13 business, profits are hidden, and the profits are substantial.

Research Design and Methodology

This dissertation is an *exploratory, case study* using a *public policy* lens to examine the *finances* of Rocketship Education. Exploratory means that the precise data that will be collected and the precise methods used to analyze those data are not fully known in advance and will depend on this study's findings as the inquiry evolves. Case studies are in-depth examinations of a single topic that are limited in space or time. Public policy is the set of rules, laws, regulations, and mores that affect the actions of an element of society. It is "the decisions, measures, programmes, strategies and courses of action adopted by the government or the legislative body" (Knill & Tosun, 2020, p. 3). Public policy mandates and constrains Rocketship Education's actions and how it structures its finances to meet its goals. Finance, as it pertains to Rocketship Education, encompasses all transactions of monetary value which involve the legal entity called Rocketship Education, its principals and executives, and other entities with which it has significant relationships. Not only are the finances of Rocketship itself included in this definition, but also those of its founders who, perhaps went on to found companies that sold software to Rocketship, and also any entities focused on real property from whom Rocketship might have bought, leased, or sold real property. Included as well are financing transactions like bonds, tax credits, loans, and grants.

The next section, *Process Overview*, describes at a very high level the four steps of inquiry this dissertation will follow. Since understanding how schools are financed is essential to understanding Rocketship's finances, the next section, *An Overview of California School Financing*, will give an overview of school financing in California by describing the normal, common financial disclosures and reports made by all districts and schools, including charter schools. It is important to remember that budgets reflect the future, and audits reflect the past. Budgets are estimates,

1 guesses, projections, whereas audits are a definitive, fixed record of the past.

2 In order to make what's being analyzed more concrete, Appendix A, *School*
3 *Financing in California* contains some example tables drawn from the Los Altos School
4 District (LASD) for the 2019–20 school year. These are standard financial reports
5 taken from the school's SACS data, but presented in a way that is both visually
6 appealing and informative.³⁰ The high level view is given in Figure 5, *LASD 2019–20 All*
7 *Funds Summary*. That view is further broken down in five more tables. The last table is
8 a projection of LASD's of financial numbers for the current year (2018–19), the year
9 whose budget is being presented (2019–20), and five years into the future. The first
10 half of the table contains the assumptions used to generate the amounts in the
11 second half.

12 Once the overall financing landscape has been described, the study can start to
13 analyze actual data from Rocketship. There are three such groups of data: petitions,
14 financial reports, and other data. Each will be covered in the third section, *Charter*
15 *School Financing* of this chapter.

16 Once all the data have been gathered, the analyses can begin. The first such
17 analysis is of profits that do not accrue to Rocketship itself, but rather to associated
18 entities. They are covered in section *Indirect Profits*.

19 The fifth section, *Are There Gaps or Anomalies in the Data?*, discusses how potential
20 gaps or anomalies in the financial data might be discovered. This is where
21 triangulation can be used to cross-check the validity of that data. Does everything
22 add up? Are there important, missing documents? How much do these gaps or
23 anomalies matter? Are the oddities long-standing or fleeting? Examples of

³⁰LASD's annual reports have consistently won the Meritorious Budget Award for Excellence from the Association of School Business Officials International for the quality and comprehensiveness of its financial statements for each of the last 15 years.

1 triangulation might be comparing Rocketship's LCAPs to their budget, or comparing
2 IRS Form 990 data to their audited financial statement of salary expenses.

3 Lastly, the sixth section, *What About the Flow of Money Through Rocketship?*,
4 describes how this dissertation will study the flow of money in and out of Rocketship.
5 Until now, this study has treated Rocketship's finances statically, i.e. at points in time.
6 Just as important are the dynamic flows of money. Where do they come from, and
7 where do they go?

8 Process Overview

9 Explaining the finances of Rocketship Education is the heart of this dissertation.
10 Where do Rocketship's revenues come from? Where are they spending that revenue?
11 Are there investors who make money off of Rocketship? And, critically, if Rocketship
12 takes in more money than it spends on education, where does that money go?

13 To respond to these questions, the basic process steps for this dissertation will
14 include the following:

- 15 1. Gather financial data for the Rocketship schools being studied. The initial set
16 of data being analyzed is discussed in the section *Charter School Financing* later
17 in this chapter.
- 18 2. Identify any gaps or anomalies in the data. This is where triangulation is
19 useful and is discussed further in the section *Triangulation*.
- 20 3. Analyze the flow of money in and out of Rocketship. That is covered in the
21 section *What About the Flow of Money Through Rocketship?* which tries to
22 determine where Rocketship funds come from, where is that money being
23 spent, and what public policies (or lack thereof) account for Rocketship's
24 actions.

1 4. Identify to the extent possible how people or entities that are not part of
2 Rocketship may nonetheless profit from Rocketship.

3 Analyzing the finances of Rocketship Education means, for example, determining
4 if general obligation or revenue bonds are purchased by entities that are related to
5 Rocketship, i.e. they are not arm's length transactions. All bonds are risky to some
6 extent, some more than others, and purchasers of those bonds are compensated for
7 taking on that risk by being paid interest on the amount borrowed. An immediate
8 question comes to mind: Is the interest rate appropriate for the risk being taken on?
9 Answering that question entails comparing Rocketship Education to other, similar
10 borrowers. If the interest rate is higher than expected, then Rocketship Education is
11 effectively giving away some of its revenue. Another question one might ask is, "How
12 is Rocketship Education spending its bond proceeds?" Are those expenses in line with
13 what other charter school chains or public school districts are spending their bond
14 proceeds on?

15 An Overview of California School Financing

16 Primary and secondary schools (grades K–12) and charter schools in California
17 are financed with a combination of federal, state, and local monies as seen in
18 Figure 1, *California 2019–20 K–12 Funding by Source*. Since federal funds account for
19 only 8.01% of total funding for California's elementary school children (Legislative
20 Analyst's Office, 2021), the federal contribution will not be considered further. Note
21 that federal facilities grants to charter schools are not part of this 8.01%.

22 In June of every year, the California Legislature passes a budget for the next fiscal
23 year (July 1 – June 30) and the Governor signs it into law. This is called the enacted
24 budget. This version of the budget describes the *intent* of the Governor and the

Figure 1
California 2019–20 K–12 Funding by Source

K-12 Funding by Source

(Dollars in Millions)

	2017-18 Final	2018-19 Revised	2019-20 Enacted	Change From 2018-19	
				Amount	Percent
Proposition 98					
General Fund ^a	\$47,194	\$48,327	\$49,322	\$994	2.1%
Local property tax	19,644	20,645	21,921	1,276	6.2%
Subtotals	\$66,839	\$68,973	\$71,243	\$2,270	3.3%
Other State					
Other General Fund	\$6,879	\$9,749 ^b	\$10,503 ^b	\$754 ^c	7.7%
Lottery	\$1,382	\$1,305	\$1,304	-\$1	-0.1%
Special funds	\$75	\$79	\$228	\$149	189.0%
Subtotals	\$8,336	\$11,133	\$12,036	\$903 ^c	8.1%
Other Local ^d	\$12,023	\$12,712	\$11,814	-\$898	-7.1%
Federal	\$7,435	\$8,190	\$8,284	\$94	1.1%
Total	\$94,633	\$101,008	\$103,377	\$2,369	2.3%
Students ^e	5,960,120	5,944,769	5,933,407	-11,362	-0.2%
Proposition 98 funding per student	\$11,214	\$11,602	\$12,007	\$405	3.5%
Total funding per student	\$15,878	\$16,991	\$17,423	\$432	2.5%

^a Consists of funding for K-12 education, preschool, and other agencies serving K-12 students.

^b Includes \$3.9 billion in additional retirement payments authorized in the 2019-20 budget package (\$2.8 billion attributed to 2018-19 and \$1 billion attributed to 2019-20).

^c These year-to-year comparisons are notably affected by how the administration attributed the additional retirement payments authorized in the 2019-20 budget package across fiscal years.

^d Includes revenue from local fees, property taxes collected in excess of the Local Control Funding Formula allotments, parcel taxes, and reimbursements.

^e Reflects average daily attendance.

Note: Legislative Analyst's Office (2021). Public record.

1 Legislature, but does not fund anything. The real work is done in what are called
2 *trailer bills* that are passed piecemeal in the months following the adoption of the
3 budget. During the course of the fiscal year, revisions are made to this enacted
4 budget either because of circumstance or because of changed priorities, and at the
5 end of the fiscal year, this is now called the revised budget. After the budget year has
6 passed, technical adjustments are still made: Exactly how much money was spent, or
7 what was misclassified and improperly allocated will change the revised budget
8 numbers. This then becomes the final budget. The upshot of this is that there are
9 actually three versions of California’s education budget: the one for next year
10 (enacted), the one for the current year (revised) and the one for the prior year (final).
11 Normally, the enacted budget is the one that is meant when people speak of the
12 budget.

13 Figure 1, *California 2019–20 K–12 Funding by Source*, shows what money California
14 has to fund its primary and secondary educational system, i.e. grades K–12. This
15 money is then allocated to local educational agencies (LEAs), through a formula
16 known as the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). LEAs include individual charter
17 schools, county offices of education, and local public school districts. The total
18 amount of money for K–12 funding is allocated using a formula that was enacted by
19 voters in 1988 (LAO, 2017): Proposition 98. Prop. 98 was originally meant to be a
20 minimum guaranteed funding level, but has evolved into a ceiling. The Legislative
21 Analyst’s Office (LAO), which serves as an independent, non-partisan research arm of
22 the California Legislature in much the same way that the Congressional Research
23 Service serves the U.S. Congress, calls Prop. 98 “A Tale of Complexity” and says that “A
24 Plethora Tests and Rules Govern the Minimum Guarantee”, and that “State Has Made
25 Myriad Adjustments to the Proposition 98 Calculations”. Undoubtedly LCFF is
26 complex, but LCFF is more transparent, has fewer rules, is more equitable, and is

1 more responsive than the Revenue Limit System which came before it. The Revenue
2 Limit System was also complex, but in a completely difference way; it had many
3 separately funded programs, called categorical programs, each with their own set of
4 requirements, rules, durations, and funding levels. Each passing year saw more
5 programs being added to the set of categorical programs until the collection of
6 categorical programs became so unwieldy it threatened to soak up all of a district's
7 financial resources.

8 As seen in Figure 1, *California 2019–20 K–12 Funding by Source*, Proposition 98
9 funding accounts for nearly 70% of California's K–12 funding, the remainder coming
10 from local property taxes and fees, and from various state sources. This money gets
11 distributed to county offices of education which then distribute it to public school
12 districts. Districts then distribute funds to charter schools.

13 Some districts are funded outside of the LCFF system. These are called “basic aid”
14 districts, or now the preferred term, “community funded” districts. Districts whose
15 annual property tax revenue is greater than their annual LCFF entitlement are
16 community funded since they get only “basic aid”, i.e. the constitutionally required
17 minimum funding (the greater of \$120 per pupil or \$2,400 in total) from the state.
18 For non-community funded districts, the state contribution is the difference between
19 a district's LCFF entitlement and its share of district property taxes. In other words,
20 the state ensures that each district gets at least its LCFF entitlement, an amount
21 which is determined by Prop. 98.³¹

22 *Budgets & Interim Reports*

23 Budgets, in California, are the first of four important financial documents that
24 schools produce during a fiscal year. For any given fiscal year, which runs from July 1

³¹A detailed description of K-12 funding in California, for both public school districts and charter schools, can be found in Aguinaldo et al. (2021). It is an annual publication.

1 to June 30, the first financial document produced is the annual budget, a forward
2 looking financial statement, which is approved before the end of the prior fiscal
3 year.³² Next are two (unaudited) interim reports, one in December, and another in
4 March, which track how well the school or district is adhering to the approved annual
5 budget, and finally, after a certified public accountant has audited the school or
6 district, a comprehensive annual financial report (CAFR). State law requires that an
7 independent auditor certify this retrospective account of the school or district's
8 financial activity as being an accurate representation of the school's finances for the
9 previous fiscal year.

10 *Local Control Accountability Plans (LCAPs)*

11 An important, recurring, non-financial report of schools is the Local Control
12 Accountability Plan (LCAP). Although the LCAP is a three year plan, it is updated
13 annually. The focus of an LCAP is on the programs that the school (public or charter)
14 is going to implement, finance, and monitor that will allow it meet the goals that the
15 state has set. These are goals that the California Department of Education sets
16 periodically, primarily to ensure that students with the greatest needs are in fact
17 served and are in addition to the seven goals that the Legislature set for charter
18 schools in general. Furthermore, the school's community must be offered the
19 opportunity to provide input to a school's LCAP and this is why a separate meeting
20 specifically and only on the LCAP is a requirement.

21 Typically LCAP goals remain the same, but their financing may change if the
22 metrics used to measure progress toward achieving those goals isn't showing
23 progress. In unusual circumstances, how the goals are to be achieved might change.

³²Since a school's budget needs to be approved before the state budget is finalized, it is guaranteed that a school's budget will need to be modified after it has been approved.

1 LCAPs are the State of California's way of ensuring that all public schools, including
2 charter schools, meet the same set of priorities or goals. LCAPs contain
3 specifications for how a school or district will meet all eight of the state's goals and
4 how achievement will be measured. Apparently, some LCAPs have been on the order
5 of 500 pages long, although the norm is much less.

6 For each activity or group of activities, schools indicate what goal is being met, if
7 the goal includes increased services for disadvantaged student, how well the school
8 or district has met that goal, and the money that has been allocated to achieving and
9 reporting those goals. (The reality of what the Department of Education wants is an
10 order of magnitude more complicated than this description, but it is accurate as far
11 as it goes.)

12 Unlike budgets and CAFRs, LCAPs don't have to "add up", nor do they have to offer
13 a complete financial picture, but they do have to be consistent with other data.
14 Expenditures have to be budgeted, and the amounts in a school's budget must agree
15 with what's in the LCAP. The charter or public school's board must approve an LCAP at
16 the same time as it approves its annual budget.

17 *Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports*

18 A major source of financial data are the annual, independently audited,
19 comprehensive financial statements of Rocketship Education. Comprehensive
20 Annual Financial Reports (CAFRs) are sent to the California Department of Education
21 (CDE) and to a charter's County Office of Education (COE) annually. They cover the
22 previous fiscal year and are similar to annual budgets because they report the same
23 information, perhaps in a different format. CAFRs are retrospective whereas budgets
24 are prospective. The major difference is that CAFRs are independently audited and
25 budgets are not.

1 Similarly to bond underwriters, financial auditors are liable for “omitting,
2 misstating, or obscuring [items which] could reasonably be expected to influence
3 decisions that the primary users make on the basis of those financial statements”
4 (Cayamanda, 2020), and this requirement tends to increase the diligence of the
5 auditors. However, potential liability doesn't always result in truly comprehensive
6 financial statements; sometimes the lure of accounting fees overwhelms any
7 misgivings, as was the case with Enron and Arthur Andersen in 2001, and apparently
8 with Donald Trump in 2022. Errors and sloppiness may exist, but in general, fraud is
9 thankfully rare, in part because fraud on the part of auditors would likely result in the
10 loss of the auditor's license, effectively ending their business.

11 In order to make what's being analyzed more concrete, I present in Appendix A
12 on page 90 some examples drawn from the Los Altos School District (LASD) for the
13 2019–20 school year. These LASD documents make good models because they have
14 consistently won the Meritorious Budget Award for Excellence from the Association
15 of School Business Officials International for the quality and comprehensiveness of
16 its financial statements for each of the last 15 years.

17 Charter School Financing

18 In California, charter schools are financed the same way as public schools are,
19 from the same pot of money, using the same set of rules, except for one significant
20 difference: how they finance facilities. Charter schools have no taxing authority
21 unlike public schools, so they cannot pass bond measures or parcel taxes. This lack of
22 a taxing authority means that charter schools may either occupy existing public
23 school facilities (potentially displacing existing public school students) or seek grants
24 and donations. The federal government provides significant amounts of facilities
25 grant money and relies on the states to administer the program.

1 The topic of charter school finances is broader than that of public schools because, in
2 addition to all of the financial dealings of traditional public schools, almost all of
3 which also apply to charter schools, charter schools have large and immediate needs
4 for facilities that TPSs don't have. This brings into the picture bonds, loans, grants,
5 leases, construction, and the purchase and sale of real estate. TPSs do issue several
6 kinds of bonds, levy parcel taxes, and buy real estate on which they build schools.
7 Public schools usually have done this years ago, but charter schools have an
8 immediately and reoccurring need for facilities. They face these needs once when
9 they start up, and whenever they outgrow their facilities because of increased
10 enrollment. The charter schools' need for facilities charter schools is more pressing,
11 more immediate, and more common than the corresponding needs of TPSs whose
12 enrollment doesn't fluctuate as much.³³

13 Once a charter has been granted the right to operate, it must file annually with
14 the California Department of Education, just like public school district, certain forms
15 that detail its revenues and expenses. State law also mandates an annual audit by an
16 independent accounting firm which charter schools must file with their County
17 Office of Education. All together, these forms should provide a complete picture of a
18 charter school's finances, and crucially, everything should be in agreement. Charters
19 must approve and publish at a public meeting their annual budget, and they, just like
20 TPSs, cannot spend – at least in theory – unbudgeted money unless the governing
21 board approves at a public meeting any changes.

22 *Charter Financial Documents*

³³Usually a TSP sees a change in enrollment because of significant demographic changes like immigration or emigration, birth rate increases or declines. Charter schools can see enrollment changes absent any demographic change, with the total number of students residing in a district staying the same. In a few instances, increased enrollment in charter schools comes from public school students switching from the public school system to charter schools. This is what is happening to Oakland, CA and it produces simultaneous but opposite changes in enrollment.

1 There are numerous publicly available sources of the same charter school
2 financial data. These are, in roughly chronological order, petitions/renewals,
3 budgets, LCAPs, interim financial statements, and finally, audited Comprehensive
4 Annual Reports (CAFRs). Table 3, *Charter School Financial Documents*, summarizes the
5 financial reports which are available about charter school finances. The first two
6 documents are specific to charter schools and have no public school equivalent.

Table 3
Charter School Financial Documents

Name	Description	Frequency	When
Initial Petition	Comprehensive description	Once	Before opening
Renewal Petitions	Similar to initial petition	Every 5 years	Years 5, 10, 15, ...
Budget	Complete financial plan	Annually	Before June 15 th
LCAP	How to meet state priorities	Tri-annually	With budget
Interim Reports	Current spending	Twice yearly	December, March
CAFR	Audited financials	Annually	In the following year

7 Viewed chronologically, the first financial statement from a charter school is
8 contained in their initial petition. Although petitions are not submitted under
9 penalty of perjury, any material change to a petition would likely be cause for a
10 re-evaluation of the petition, something that is undesirable. Petitions are presented
11 at the start of a charter school's life and whenever a charter needs to be renewed.
12 They are discussed next.

13 Petitions & Renewals

14 Chronologically the first category of financial data that's publicly available is
15 what's in a charter school's initial petition. Renewal petitions occur at five year
16 intervals and are very similar to the initial petition. One of the required elements of
17 any petition is a financial projection. Although no one expects a charter school (or
18 any school for that matter) to prepare and adhere to a budget that exactly matches

1 what's been projected, budgets are expected to be similar to actual expenditures, for
2 some meaning of "similar".

3 Before a charter school is allowed to begin operation, every charter school in
4 California is required to present to a chartering authority a petition which must
5 contain certain required elements. The absence of one of these elements is grounds
6 for denying the charter's petition to operate. For example, what is the intent of the
7 charter school? How is the charter school going to measure its success or failure?
8 What population is it targeting? And, what are its financial projections?

9 These petitions run anywhere from a hundred or so pages to over a thousand.
10 They contain a wealth of data on curriculum, demographics, pedagogy, discipline,
11 teacher recruitment, and, of course, on the charter school's finances. Only a few
12 financial statements are needed to get a good overall picture of a school's or district's
13 finances. These are the enacted annual budget and interim reports, the audited
14 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), parts of the Local Control
15 Accountability Plan (LCAP), and for charter schools, the financial portions of their
16 petitions.

17 Fortunately, these documents are all publicly available and could, if needed, be the
18 subject of a California Public Records Act (CPRA) request. The CPRA is the California
19 equivalent of the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Many of the documents
20 mentioned in this dissertation should be available from the California Departments
21 of Education and Finance, or from the Santa Clara County Office of Education.³⁴

22 Since Rocketship schools are all operated by a single entity, Rocketship
23 Education, Inc., their financial statements and those of their affiliates are rolled up
24 into a single document, the Consolidated Financial Statements and Supplementary

³⁴Since these documents are publicly available and may be freely copied, so no copyright is applicable, nor can one be claimed.

1 Information. Every school is included as are separate Launchpad Development LLC's
2 which own the facilities that are leased to individual schools.

3 The primary questions that these financial data analyses are seeking to answer
4 involves a clear mapping of the financial flows tied to Rocketship's ten schools in
5 Santa Clara County. That mass of data needs to be organized and interpreted, and
6 using an interpretive framework will make the analysis easier. Some examples of
7 potential frameworks are:

- 8 • The six year forecast spreadsheet that LASD uses, an example of which is
9 reproduced in Figure 11 *LASD 2019–20 Multi-Year Projection* on page 97. Most of
10 the elements of a forecast are combinations of SACS³⁵ codes. The main
11 drawback of using this framework is that each school would have to have its
12 elements extracted from their SACS submissions. “The main benefit is that
13 these elements have been used for years and so are known to be useful in
14 budgeting.
- 15 • A spreadsheet of the 9 high-level SACS object codes. This option is has the
16 advantage that these sums can be calculated automatically using reports
17 available on Annual Financial Data web page³⁶ maintained by the California
18 Department of Education. These reports go back to FY2003–4. The main
19 disadvantage is that any gaps or anomalies may not show up in the aggregate
20 numbers.
- 21 • A third way of approaching the problem of making sense of large amounts of
22 data is to use a model. Some possible models are

³⁵The Standardized Account Code Structure (SACS) is the chart of accounts (cost centers) used by the California Department of Education. These are defined in “California School Accounting Manual: Definitions, Instructions, and Procedures.” The function (activity) codes are on pp.149–151 (§325–3 *et seq.*)

³⁶<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/fd/fd>

- 1 – Bruce Baker’s *National Education Cost Model* (B. D. Baker et al., 2018, p. 5)
- 2 – the Operating Resource Flow model from B. Baker and Miron (2015, p. 16)
- 3 and Figure 4
- 4 – the resource cost model (RCM) or the education cost function (ECF) as
- 5 developed by B. D. Baker (2018, pp. 188–197)
- 6 – ratio analysis or index analysis as in B. D. Baker and Richards (2004,
- 7 pp. 70–86)

8 Of the four models mentioned, only the last is likely to be useful in this study’s
9 analysis because that method can identify quickly what’s different in a particular
10 budget or petition. Ratio and index analysis compares the relationship between
11 financial data elements. In addition to B. D. Baker and Richards (2004) cited above,
12 National Forum on Education Statistics (2007, pp. 35–44) lists a dozen or so ratios
13 and indexes that have proven useful when analyzing school finance.

14 *Other Data*

15 Vast amounts of data are available from the federal, state and local governments,
16 easily over half a million datasets. Unfortunately these data have been collected in
17 different formats, over different time periods, using different inclusion criteria,
18 more or less carefully. Picking a subset of educational data to use and then cleaning it
19 is a huge endeavor well beyond the scope of this dissertation. That being said, a very
20 small subset of available datasets will be consulted, based on the immediate need at
21 hand. The most likely datasets to be consulted are:

- 22 • California Department of Education and the State Board of Education
- 23 • The County of Santa Clara and the Santa Clara County Office of Education
- 24 • The California Open Data Portal

- 1 • National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) at the Institute for Education
- 2 Sciences (IES)
- 3 • Stanford Educational Data Archive (SEDA)
- 4 • School Finance Indicators Database
- 5 • EdSource, Ed-Data, and other aggregators of educational data specific to
- 6 California

7 State and Federal Filings

8 Two filings are of particular interest: FPPC Form 700, Statement of Economic
9 Interests, and IRS Form 990, Return of Organization Exempt from Income Tax. Both
10 forms force the disclosure of personal financial information (Form 700) or personal
11 financial information and business financial information (Form 990).

12 Some officers of Rocketship may be required to submit annually to the California
13 Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) Form 700, Statement of Economic
14 Interests. This particular requirement of charter school officers is not settled law, but
15 if Form 700 is filed, it will list the submitter's assets and income. The intent is to
16 prevent related-party transactions by enumerating an officer's economic interests so
17 that the school can avoid doing business with entities that might benefit an officer.

18 The federal Internal Revenue Service grants income tax exemptions to
19 organizations that meets the requirements of §501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue
20 Code.³⁷ These organizations must file annually Form 990 that provides some minimal
21 financial data. (Tax returns of for-profit organizations are not public documents and
22 their contents do not have to be disclosed; however, in order to sell stock to the public,
23 i.e. on a stock exchange, firms are required to publish various financial documents,
24 which like bond prospectuses, are required to be informative and complete.)

³⁷ 26 USC 501, i.e. Title 26, Subtitle A, Chapter 1, Subchapter F Part I § 501(c)(3)

1 Bond prospectuses

2 Bond prospectuses are also a source of financial information. When bonds are
3 issued, they are described in detail in a prospectus. These documents, in addition to
4 specifying the terms (e.g. interest rate, repayment schedule, collateral) of the bond,
5 contain information relevant to assessing the risk associated with purchasing that
6 bond.

7 Bond prospectuses can be mined for data that might not appear in petitions and
8 financial statements because bond underwriters are “potential liability for any
9 material misrepresentations or omissions contained in a registration statement or
10 prospectus” (Block et al., 2008). This liability, of course, is not unlimited. If bond
11 underwriters exercise due diligence or the misrepresentation is not material, they
12 are probably not liable. Crucially, the definitions of *material misrepresentation* and *due*
13 *diligence* depended on both statute and case law, so a bond underwriter can only make
14 a reasoned guess at their exposure to liability. The result is that bond underwriters
15 are likely to be more diligent than is absolutely necessary.

16 Unlike many studies, there is not a paucity of data on Rocketship, rather there is a
17 surfeit. The data collected so far is voluminous. The current number of pages of
18 initial and renewal petitions runs to 7371 pages. Three bond prospectuses total over
19 1000 pages. And there are many financial data documents yet to obtain. For example,
20 of the six categories of financial data listed in Table 3, only half have been collected.

21 The challenge for this inquiry will be to organize the data so that gaps and
22 anomalies can be identified, interesting and valid comparisons can be made with
23 public schools and other charter schools, and the flows of money in and out of
24 Rocketship can be identified. One approach would be to create a common framework
25 and recast all the financial data from each school into that common framework. But,
26 until the data have actually been collected and analyses started, choosing one

1 particular framework within which to work is likely to lead to work which will need to
2 be redone using a different framework.

3 Indirect Profits

4 It is not necessarily the case that all profit be derived from Rocketship itself.
5 Other people or entities could profit indirectly from Rocketship's activities. For
6 example, contracts which are not at arm's length are automatically suspect.

7 Leases are another area where profits can be made. Some charter schools receive
8 a per-pupil rent subsidy which reduces their effective net rent (gross rent –
9 government subsidy). But, if the operator of a charter school is also the owner of the
10 facilities, then a profit is to be made. It is the difference between the (market) rent
11 charged and the net rent. Furthermore, if the rent (paid by the charter to a third
12 party) is actually a mortgage payment by the third party to a bank, then the sale of of
13 the property can result in a significant profit. The mortgage (effectively) was paid for
14 by the government, but the proceeds of the sale accrue to the third party, the owner of
15 the facilities.

16 Tax credits are another source of profit. The New Markets Tax Credit is a 39% tax
17 credit, usable over seven years, available to those who make an investment in
18 specified economically depressed neighborhoods. A 39% tax credit is roughly twice
19 the current corporate tax rate which means that this credit wipes out the taxes on
20 gains equal to twice the initial investment (which also has a return).

21 The NewSchools Venture Funds, the Charter School Fund, and the Charter School
22 Growth Fund are just a few examples of venture funds that specialize in charter
23 schools. Since it is unlikely that investors will invest in a fund that does not return a
24 profit, establishing exactly how these funds turn a profit is going to be a key goal of

1 this study's explorations.³⁸

2 Are There Gaps or Anomalies in the Data?

3 All of the sources mentioned above should be in basic agreement, i.e. the LCFF
4 funding received by a Rocketship charter school should match what the state thinks
5 it's sending to the school, what the school reports to the state it received and spent,
6 what independent auditors report the school received and spent, and what it actually
7 spent. Further, bond prospectuses and Security Exchange Commission (SEC) filings
8 should be in agreement with themselves and with budgets. If these figures are not in
9 agreement, something is amiss and should be investigated.

10 In some fashion or another, all profit must originate from Rocketship's revenue.
11 In the case of the sale-leaseback of facilities, for example, the rent over and above
12 market rates constitutes profit to the property owners, and this is an operational
13 expense ultimately paid for by tax payers. If facilities are bought with public dollars
14 (i.e. federal grants) and subsequently sold, the net proceeds are profit that might
15 accrue to an organization other than Rocketship. If technology is being used and the
16 contracts are not at arm's length, then someone or some organization is making
17 more than the usual profit. If student data is being sold by a for-profit entity that
18 operates non-profit charter schools, that's revenue that rightfully belongs to the
19 students or to the non-profit schools.

20 Determining whether there are gaps or anomalies in a charter school's financial
21 data is time-consuming but not very complex. Reviewing the data is not difficult –
22 usually there are no advanced algorithms to apply; basic arithmetic may be used to
23 check if all the numbers add up. When looking at financial statements, one should be

³⁸It is interesting that none of the web sites of these funds mentions that fund's return. The absence of any indication of a return on investment is either an innocent mistake or (more likely) an attempt at obfuscation.

1 alert to unusual year-to-year changes, ratios (e.g. salaries to total expenses) that are
2 markedly different from the norm, entries that are missing components, or entries
3 that are not supported by detail elsewhere. Complex third-party transactions that
4 don't seem to add value are also indicators that further investigation is needed.

5 In the search of gaps or anomalies, one might ask questions such as:

- 6 • Are the data available and accessible? Charter schools are notorious for simply
7 not filing required documents or filing them horrendously late, or submitting
8 documents that are incomplete. Petitions are not usually a problem because
9 without a petition, or with a materially incomplete petition, the petition will
10 not be granted. However, once a school is operational, late or missing filings
11 will not bring everything to a halt. Although Rocketship was fined for failing an
12 attendance audit, it was allowed to continue to operate.
- 13 • Have the data been misrepresented? There are forensic techniques (e.g.
14 Benford's Law) that can point to suspect data (Zhu et al., 2021). There is also
15 triangulation which involves comparing one source of data with another to see
16 if they match. For example, charter petitions make forecasts of revenue and
17 expenses. How accurate were those forecasts? Were the reasons given for
18 anomalies plausible? foreseeable? reasonable? One mistake is not usually a sign
19 that something is being covered up, but several large mistakes usually are.
- 20 • California requires that LEAs meet the numbers they previously forecast or
21 explain why they didn't meet those numbers. Were those goals met, and if not,
22 were the reasons proffered legitimate? When preparing a budget, LEAs must
23 also certify they can meet their financial obligations for the current year, and
24 for the next two years. If an LEA cannot certify that they can, they might receive
25 a visit from the California Department of Education's Financial Crisis &

1 Management Assistance Team (FCMAT), and in the extreme case be subject to a
2 state takeover or to involuntary closure.

3 *Triangulation*

4 Another technique for determining if there are gaps or anomalies is to use
5 triangulation. Triangulation is the use of multiple sources of data. While
6 triangulation in the social science research often refers to the mixed methods use of
7 quantitative and qualitative methodologies, the common definition refers to the
8 analysis of multiple forms of corroborating evidence in the form of financial and
9 media documentation. For example, Bhandari (2022) notes that one of the forms of
10 triangulation is “[u]sing data from different times, spaces and people” and also that
11 “[t]riangulation in research means using multiple datasets, methods, theories and/or
12 investigators to address a research question. It’s a research strategy that can help you
13 enhance the validity and credibility of your findings.”³⁹

14 *Are There More Serious Problems?*

15 Unfortunately, charter schools and charter school chains have a long history of
16 various kinds of fraud. Lafer (2017b), In the Public Interest (2018), Burris et al. (2020),
17 and Burris and Bryant (2020), are just a few of the reports that detail fraud and waste
18 in charter schools. Although Rocketship has engaged in a number of questionable
19 activities, it has not been charged anything illegal.⁴⁰ But with billions of dollars

³⁹Triangulation does not imply exactly three concepts or ideas; often, as is in this dissertation, more than three concepts, ideas, data are combined in the analysis.

⁴⁰Rocketship schools in Santa Clara have had ties with a virtual charter school serving special education students hundred of miles away. They have collected pandemic-relief funds intended for businesses and not available to public schools. Rocketship has been the subject of several Letters of Concern from the California Department of Education, and it has had petitions to open schools denied for substantive reasons. Many of these issues have been collected and can be viewed at <https://www.scoop.it/topic/charter-choice-closer-look> (Marachi, 2016–2022).

1 allocated to charter schools for facilities in the last 15 years in California alone (Lafer,
2 2017b, p. 4), coupled with lax or no oversight, the temptation to misappropriate funds
3 must be strong. It is also instructive to note that Californian charter schools have
4 fought tooth and nail to prevent any laws that would increase transparency or hold
5 charter operators to the same conflict-of-interest standards that public schools and
6 other government entities are held to. While the charter sector has for the most part
7 been successful in warding off demands for accountability, the Attorney General of
8 California issued an official ruling in 2018 stating that the Brown Act, the CPRA, and
9 Government Code §1090 apply to charter schools as well as to other LEAs (Becerra &
10 Medeiros, 2018).

11 However, it's not necessary to misappropriate funds to make money off of charter
12 school facilities. As the report *Fraud and waste in California's charter schools* from In the
13 Public Interest details,

14 While charter schools constructed with general obligation bonds cannot
15 be sold or used for anything other than the authorized school, schools
16 constructed with tax-exempt conduit bonds become the private property
17 of the charter operator. Even if the charter is revoked, neither the state
18 nor a local school district can take control of this property. Additionally,
19 schools constructed with private funding subsidized by New Market Tax
20 Credits or acquired with private funds but whose mortgage payments
21 are reimbursed through the Charter Facilities Grant Program (known as
22 "SB740") are typically owned without restriction.

23 (In the Public Interest, 2018, p. 6)

24 Rocketship has issued just shy of \$90M of tax-exempt bonds to "finance and/or
25 refinance the acquisition, construction, expansion, remodeling, renovation,
26 improvement, furnishing and equipping of the land and facilities" (California School
27 Finance Authority, 2015b, 2015a, 2017b, 2017a). These conduit bonds are exactly the

1 kind referenced in In the Public Interest (2018). The properties owned or leased are
2 partially paid for out of public funds but are privately owned.


3 *Analyzing Rocketship's Bond Financing*

4 Bond financing can be both complicated (a hard problem, but solution methods
5 exist) and complex (many unknowns and interrelated factors). Illustrating this are
6 two examples of the analysis from just a single prospectus, that of Rocketship's \$43M
7 bond offering. That offering is described in the 536 pages which comprise
8 "\$42,160,000 Charter School Revenue Bonds (Rocketship Education - Obligated
9 Group)." The \$43M offering is complicated because there are many moving parts
10 which are described in the offering in the well-known language of bond finance.
11 Terms, rates, contingencies, amounts, dates, and required performance are all
12 specified in a fashion that has withstood legal onslaught many times over. But the
13 offering is also complex because it must also convince others that its predictions are
14 reasonable. The most important of those predictions is that the issuer can pay the
15 interest and repay the principal when they due.

16 Figure 2 on the following page *Flow of Funds: Overview* gives the overall picture and
17 shows how rents from schools (blue) are "intercepted" by the California Controller
18 (red) and paid directly to landlords, or paid into the Gross Revenue Fund (red) from
19 which the Master Trustee pays lessors (orange) and bond holders and expense
20 accounts (orange). What is not shown is the \$750 per ADA (in 2017, rising to \$1,211 in
21 2020–21) that Rocketship will apply to lease payments. Since money is fungible, the
22 State of California is giving Rocketship between \$2.4 and \$3.7M depending on the
23 year, money they would otherwise not have. This is effectively profit.

24 The next figure, Figure 3 on page 70 *Flow of Funds: Cross-Collateralization* adds an

Figure 2
Flow of Funds: Overview



53

Note: California School Finance Authority (2017a, p. 53). In the public domain.


1 important detail: how Rocketship uses its assets as collateral more than once.⁴¹ In
 2 this case, if the payments of “School Tenants” are insufficient, the Master Trustee may
 3 require additional monthly payments from the “Obligated Group Representatives
 4 and Member” to supplement those from “School Tenants”.

5 These two examples show the kind of analysis that is needed to characterize a
 6 bond offering.

7 What About the Flow of Money Through Rocketship?

⁴¹Cross-collateralization means using an asset as collateral for two or more obligations, here lease and bond payments.

Figure 3
Flow of Funds: Cross-Collateralization




55

Note: California School Finance Authority (2017a, p. 55). In the public domain.

- 1 Since a goal of this dissertation is to map the flow of money into and out of
- 2 Rocketship, I will use diagrams similar to the one used by B. Baker and Miron (2015),
- 3 which is reproduced here as Figure 4. In this example, money flows from left to right,
- 4 and there are no loops. Colors are used merely to distinguish the various blocks.

Figure 4
Operating Resource Flows



Note: B. Baker and Miron (2015, p. 16). Used with permission.

Findings and Results

1
2 This chapter discusses my findings and results. Recall my research question: Has
3 Rocketship structured itself and its finances, to earn a return to investors, and if so,
4 how?

References

- Aguinaldo, L., Fry, D., Garcia, B., Gray, J., Heckler, D., Herrera, P., Hyland, K., McEntire, R., Miyashiro, R., Phillips, M., Speck, S., Kathleen Spencer, & Underwood, M. M. (2020). *School Funding and Accountability in California: 2020 Edition*. School Services of California, Inc.
- Aguinaldo, L., Fry, D., Garcia, B., Gray, J., Heckler, D., Herrera, P., Hyland, K., McEntire, R., Miyashiro, R., Phillips, M., Speck, S., Kathleen Spencer, & Underwood, M. M. (2021). *School Funding and Accountability in California: 2021 Edition*. School Services of California, Inc.
- Alexander, M. (2011). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness* (Revised edition). New Press
OCLC: ocn656451603.
- Andrea Gabor. (2015, April 28). *New CREDO Study, New Credibility Problems: From New Orleans to Boston*. Andrea Gabor. Retrieved July 29, 2020, from <https://andreagabor.com/2015/04/28/new-credo-study-new-credibility-problems-from-new-orleans-to-boston/>
- Baker, B., & Miron, G. (2015, December). *The business of charter schooling: Understanding the policies that charter operators use for financial benefit*. National Education Policy Center, School of Education, University of Colorado.
- Baker, B. D. (2018). *Educational inequality and school finance: Why money matters for america's students*. Harvard Education Press.
- Baker, B. D. (2019). NEPC Review: California Charter Schools: Costs, Benefits, and Impact on School Districts (Center on Reinventing Public Education, May 2019), 27.
- Baker, B. D., & Richards, C. E. (2004). *The ecology of educational systems: Data, models, and tools for improvisational leading and learning*. Prentice Hall/Merrill.
<https://books.google.com/books?id=ygdKAAAAYAAJ>

- 1 Baker, B. D., Weber, M., Srikanth, A., Kim, R., & Atzbi, M. (2018, February). *The Real*
2 *Shame of the Nation*.
- 3 Ball, S. (2012). *Global education inc.: New policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary*.
4 Routledge.
- 5 Becerra, X., & Medeiros, M. M. (2018, December 26). 101 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen 92 (Official
6 Reports No. 1-201). Office of the Attorney General, State of California.
7 Sacramento, CA.
- 8 Berends, M. (2015). Sociology and School Choice: What We Know After Two Decades
9 of Charter Schools. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41(1), 159–180.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112340>
- 11 Berliner, D. C., & Biddle, B. J. (1997). *The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack*
12 *on america's public schools*. Longman Publishers USA.
13 <https://books.google.com/books?id=VCCUPwAACAAJ>
- 14 Berliner, D. C., & Glass, G. V. (Eds.). (2014). *50 Myths & Lies That Threaten America's*
15 *Public Schools*. Teachers College Press.
- 16 Bhandari, P. (2022, January 3). *A beginner's guide to triangulation in research*. Scribbr.
17 Retrieved January 15, 2022, from
18 <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/triangulation/>
- 19 Black, D. W. (2020, September). *Schoolhouse Burning: Public Education and the Assault on*
20 *American Democracy*. Public Affairs.
- 21 Block, D. J., Hoff, J. M., & Bloomstein, J. (2008, March 26). *Underwriter Due Diligence In*
22 *Securities Offerings*. Findlaw. Retrieved July 21, 2021, from
23 [https://corporate.findlaw.com/finance/underwriter-due-](https://corporate.findlaw.com/finance/underwriter-due-diligence-in-securities-offerings.html)
24 [diligence-in-securities-offerings.html](https://corporate.findlaw.com/finance/underwriter-due-diligence-in-securities-offerings.html)
25 Reprinted with permission from the May 27th issue of the New York Law
26 Journal

- 1 Bray, K. J. (2015). *California's challenge: Adequately funding education in the 21st century*.
2 California State Boards Association. West Sacramento, CA 95691. Retrieved
3 July 4, 2019, from [https://www.csba.org/Advocacy/~media/CSBA/](https://www.csba.org/Advocacy/~media/CSBA/Files/GovernanceResources/Reports/2015CaliforniasChallenge-Adequacy.ashx)
4 [Files/GovernanceResources/Reports/2015CaliforniasChallenge-](https://www.csba.org/Advocacy/~media/CSBA/Files/GovernanceResources/Reports/2015CaliforniasChallenge-Adequacy.ashx)
5 [Adequacy.ashx](https://www.csba.org/Advocacy/~media/CSBA/Files/GovernanceResources/Reports/2015CaliforniasChallenge-Adequacy.ashx)
- 6 Green v. County School Board of New Kent County.
- 7 Brighthouse, H., Ladd, H. G., Loeb, S., & Swift, A. (2018). *Educational goods: Values,*
8 *evidence, and decision-making*. University of Chicago Press.
- 9 Budde, R. (1988). Education by charter: Restructuring school districts.
10 <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED295298.pdf>
- 11 Bueno de Mesquita, B. (2016). *Political economy for public policy*. Princeton University
12 Press.
- 13 Burris, C., & Bryant, J. (2020). *Asleep at the Wheel*. Network for Public Education.
- 14 Burris, C., & Cimarusti, D. (2021, March). *Chartered for profit: The hidden world of charter*
15 *schools operated for financial gain*.
- 16 Burris, C., Cimarusti, D., & Kilfoyle, M. (2020, February 11). *Still Asleep at the Wheel*.
17 Network for Public Education.
- 18 Burris, C., & Pflieger, R. (2020, August 12). *Broken promises: An analysis of charter school*
19 *closures from 1999-2017*. Retrieved October 21, 2020, from
20 [https://networkforpubliceducation.org/wp-](https://networkforpubliceducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Broken-Promises-PDF.pdf)
21 [content/uploads/2020/08/Broken-Promises-PDF.pdf](https://networkforpubliceducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Broken-Promises-PDF.pdf)
- 22 (CA Dept of Education). (2021, August 25). *Charter School Annual Information Update -*
23 *Charter Schools*. Charter School Annual Information Update. Retrieved
24 February 13, 2022, from
25 <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/csinfosvy.asp#org>

- 1 California Department of Education. (2019). California School Accounting Manual:
2 Definitions, Instructions, and Procedures (2019th ed.). [https:](https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/ac/sa/documents/csam2019complete.pdf)
3 [//www.cde.ca.gov/fg/ac/sa/documents/csam2019complete.pdf](https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/ac/sa/documents/csam2019complete.pdf)
- 4 California Department of Education. (n.d.). *Enrollment for Charter and Non-Charter*
5 *Schools - Santa Clara County* (Online data reporting portal). California
6 Department of Education. Retrieved May 5, 2021, from
7 [https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/DQCensus/EnrCharterLevels.](https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/DQCensus/EnrCharterLevels.aspx?cds=43&aggllevel=County&year=2020-21)
8 [aspx?cds=43&aggllevel=County&year=2020-21](https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/DQCensus/EnrCharterLevels.aspx?cds=43&aggllevel=County&year=2020-21)
9 ItemType: dataset
- 10 California School Finance Authority. (2015a, August 6). \$6,385,000 California School
11 Finance Authority.
- 12 California School Finance Authority. (2015b, December 7). Executive Summary:
13 \$32,0000.000 Charter School Revenue Bonds (Rocketship Education -
14 Multiple Projects), Series 2016A (Tax-Exempt) and 2016B (Taxable).
- 15 California School Finance Authority. (2017a, February 17). \$42,160,000 Charter School
16 Revenue Bonds (Rocketship Education - Obligated Group).
- 17 California School Finance Authority. (2017b, October 11). Executive Summary:
18 \$19,000,000 California School Finance Authority Charter School Revenue
19 Bonds (Rocketship Education – Obligated Group).
- 20 Cayamanda, K. (2020, December 29). *Materiality Threshold in Audits - Overview and*
21 *Methods*. Corporate Finance Institute. Retrieved July 21, 2021, from
22 [https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/knowledge/](https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/knowledge/accounting/materiality-threshold-in-audits/)
23 [accounting/materiality-threshold-in-audits/](https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/knowledge/accounting/materiality-threshold-in-audits/)
- 24 Chaney, D. S., Renner, J. K., & Morazzini, Z. P. (2010). Conflicts of Interest 2010
25 (T. Prim & E. V. Peth, Eds.). Retrieved April 8, 2021, from [https:](https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/publications/coi.pdf)
26 [//oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/publications/coi.pdf](https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/publications/coi.pdf)
- 27 Citizens League, Education Alternatives Committee. (1982, May 4). *Rebuilding*
28 *Education to Make It Work*. Retrieved February 19, 2022, from

- 1 [https://citizensleague.org/wp-](https://citizensleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/PolicyReportEducationMay-1982.pdf)
2 [content/uploads/2017/07/PolicyReportEducationMay-1982.pdf](https://citizensleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/PolicyReportEducationMay-1982.pdf)
- 3 Clark, C., William Rosenzweig, David Long, & Sara Olsen. (2004, January). *Assessing*
4 *social impact in double bottom line ventures*. Retrieved May 22, 2021, from
5 [https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wp-content/uploads/sites/](https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2015/02/Report_Clark_DoubleBottomLineProjectReport_2004.pdf)
6 [7/2015/02/Report_Clark_DoubleBottomLineProjectReport_2004.pdf](https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2015/02/Report_Clark_DoubleBottomLineProjectReport_2004.pdf)
- 7 Clark-Herrera, E., Bauer, M., Brewer, T., Steffi Chan, Glymph, D., Kathryn Garner, &
8 Radecki, A. (2019). *Public Charter Schools: Borrowing With Tax-Exempt Bonds*
9 *(Third Edition)*. Copyright © 2019 by Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP.
- 10 Clemons, R. S., & McBeth, M. K. (2021). *Public policy praxis: A case approach for*
11 *understanding policy and analysis* (4e). Routledge.
- 12 Cohen, D., & Mikaelian, A. (2021). *The privatization of everything: How the plunder of*
13 *public goods transformed america and how we can fight back*. New Press.
- 14 Cook, M. A. (2009, April 21). *Mainstreet Los Gatos: Rocketship blasts off to bridge the*
15 *education gap*. The Mercury News. Retrieved April 18, 2022, from
16 [https://www.mercurynews.com/2009/04/21/mainstreet-los-gatos-](https://www.mercurynews.com/2009/04/21/mainstreet-los-gatos-rocketship-blasts-off-to-bridge-the-education-gap/)
17 [rocketship-blasts-off-to-bridge-the-education-gap/](https://www.mercurynews.com/2009/04/21/mainstreet-los-gatos-rocketship-blasts-off-to-bridge-the-education-gap/)
- 18 Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The
19 case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 11(1), 100.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-11-100>
- 21 Danner, J. (2006, May 1). Rocketship One Public School: Charter Petition.
22 [https://www.sccoe.org/supoffice/charter-schools-](https://www.sccoe.org/supoffice/charter-schools-office/_layouts/15/DocIdRedirect.aspx)
23 [office/_layouts/15/DocIdRedirect.aspx](https://www.sccoe.org/supoffice/charter-schools-office/_layouts/15/DocIdRedirect.aspx)
- 24 Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). Why is congress redlining our schools? [magazine]. *The*
25 *Nation*. Retrieved January 14, 2022, from
26 [https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/why-congress-](https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/why-congress-redlining-our-schools/)
27 [redlining-our-schools/](https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/why-congress-redlining-our-schools/)

- 1 de Brey, C., Zhang, A., & Duffy, S. (2022, February 10). *Digest of Education Statistics*
2 *2020, 56th Edition* (NCES 2022-009). National Center for Education Statistics
3 at IES. Washington, D.C. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2021/2022009.pdf>
4 Note: The PDF isn't yet available, but the online tables are.
- 5 Domhoff, G. W. (2014). *Who rules America? The triumph of the corporate rich* (Seventh
6 edition). McGraw-Hill Education.
- 7 Dubb, S. (2017, November 14). *Sackler Applies OxyContin Marketing Lessons to Charter*
8 *School Movement*. Non Profit News | Nonprofit Quarterly. Retrieved March 17,
9 2022, from [https://nonprofitquarterly.org/sackler-applies-](https://nonprofitquarterly.org/sackler-applies-oxycontin-marketing-lessons-charter-school-movement/)
10 [oxycontin-marketing-lessons-charter-school-movement/](https://nonprofitquarterly.org/sackler-applies-oxycontin-marketing-lessons-charter-school-movement/)
- 11 Enlow, R. C. (2022). *The ABCs of School Choice*. EdChoice.
- 12 Epple, D., Romano, R., & Zimmer, R. (2016). *Charter schools: A survey of research on their*
13 *characteristics and effectiveness* (w21256). National Bureau of Economic
14 Research. Cambridge, MA. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w21256>
- 15 FCMAT. (2022, February). Charter Petition Evaluation Matrix. Retrieved March 8,
16 2022, from [https://www.fcmat.org/publicationsreports/charter-](https://www.fcmat.org/publicationsreports/charter-petition-eval.pdf)
17 [petition-eval.pdf](https://www.fcmat.org/publicationsreports/charter-petition-eval.pdf)
- 18 Fowler, F. C. (2013). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction* (4e). Pearson.
- 19 Frankenberg, E., Siegel-Hawley, G., & Want, J. (2010). Choice without Equity:
20 Charter School Segregation and the Need for Civil Rights Standards.
- 21 Frankenberg, E., Ee, J., Ayscue, J. B., & Orfield, G. (2019). Harming our Common
22 Future: 44.
- 23 Frankenberg, E., Siegel-Hawley, G., & Wang, J. (2011). Choice without Equity:
24 Charter School Segregation. *education policy analysis archives*, 19, 1.
25 <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v19n1.2011>
- 26 Friedman, M. (1955). The Role of Government in Education. In *Economics and the Public*
27 *Interest* (p. 14).

- 1 *Full-Time Virtual and Blended Schools: Enrollment, Student Characteristics, and Performance*
2 (Research Brief). (2018). National Education Policy Center, School of
3 Education, University of Colorado. Boulder, CO. Retrieved April 10, 2020,
4 from [https://nepc.colorado.edu/sites/default/files/](https://nepc.colorado.edu/sites/default/files/publications/RB%20Miron%20Virtual%20Schools%202018_0.pdf)
5 [publications/RB%20Miron%20Virtual%20Schools%202018_0.pdf](https://nepc.colorado.edu/sites/default/files/publications/RB%20Miron%20Virtual%20Schools%202018_0.pdf)
- 6 Garcia, D. R. (2018). *School Choice*.
- 7 Gates, B. (2009, January 25). 2009 Annual Letter. Retrieved May 21, 2021, from
8 [https://docs.gatesfoundation.org/Documents/2009-bill-gates-](https://docs.gatesfoundation.org/Documents/2009-bill-gates-annual-letter.pdf)
9 [annual-letter.pdf](https://docs.gatesfoundation.org/Documents/2009-bill-gates-annual-letter.pdf)
- 10 Gerring, J. (2017). *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices* (2nd ed.). Cambridge
11 University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316848593>
- 12 Giridharadas, A. (2018). *Winners Take All: The Elite Charade of Changing the World*. Knopf
13 Doubleday Publishing Group.
- 14 Glass, G. V. (2008). *Fertilizers, pills, and magnetic strips: The fate of public education in*
15 *America*. Information Age Pub.
16 <https://books.google.com/books?id=s4wyIF2RgxEC>
- 17 Goldstein, D. (2015). *The teacher wars: A history of America's most embattled profession*.
18 Anchor Books.
- 19 Grant, C., & Osanloo, A. (2014). Understanding, Selecting, and Integrating a
20 Theoretical Framework in Dissertation Research: Creating the Blueprint for
21 Your "House". *Administrative Issues Journal Education Practice and Research*, 4(2).
22 <https://doi.org/10.5929/2014.4.2.9>
- 23 Gupta, D. K. (2011). *Analyzing Public Policy: Concepts, Tools, & Techniques* (2e). SAGE
24 Publications.
- 25 Haney-López, I. (2014). *Dog whistle politics: How coded racial appeals have wrecked the*
26 *middle class*. Oxford University Press.
27 <https://books.google.com/books?id=cZe1AQAQBAJ>

- 1 Heitzeg, N. A. (2009). —Education Or Incarceration: Zero Tolerance Policies And The
2 School To Prison Pipeline”, 21.
- 3 Henig, J. (2009). Chapter 3 How Cool Research Gets in Hot Waters: Privatization,
4 School Choice, and Charter Schools. In *Spin Cycle: How Research is Used in Policy*
5 *Debates: The Case of Charter Schools* (pp. 33–55). Russell Sage Foundation.
- 6 Henig, J. R. (1994). *Rethinking school choice: Limits of the market metaphor*. Pinceton
7 University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400821037>
- 8 Henig, J. R., Bulkley, K. E., & Levin, H. M. (2010). Can 'Portfolio Management' Save
9 Urban Schools? [newspaper]. *Education Week: School & District Management*.
10 Retrieved February 2, 2022, from
11 [https://www.edweek.org/leadership/opinion-can-portfolio-](https://www.edweek.org/leadership/opinion-can-portfolio-management-save-urban-schools/2010/10)
12 [management-save-urban-schools/2010/10](https://www.edweek.org/leadership/opinion-can-portfolio-management-save-urban-schools/2010/10)
- 13 Hill, P., Campbell, C., Menefee-Libey, D., Dusseault, B., DeArmond, M., & Gross, B.
14 (2009). Portfolio School Districts for Big Cities: 55.
- 15 Horn, J. (2016). *Work hard, be hard: Journeys through "No Excuses" teaching*. Rowman &
16 Littlefield Publishers.
17 <https://books.google.com/books?id=ZSe7CwAAQBAJ>
- 18 In the Public Interest. (2018). *Fraud and waste in California's charter schools*. In the Public
19 Interest. Oakland, CA.
- 20 Institute for Local Government. (2016). Understanding the Basics of Public Service
21 Ethics. Retrieved April 8, 2021, from
22 [https://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-](https://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/ethics_booklet_full_v4.pdf)
23 [attachments/ethics_booklet_full_v4.pdf](https://www.ca-ilg.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/ethics_booklet_full_v4.pdf)
- 24 Kahn, S., & Minnich, E. (2005). *The fox in the henhouse: How privatization threatens*
25 *democracy*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
26 <https://books.google.com/books?id=02J82AiJ4G8C>

- 1 Kenyon, R. (2019, June 15). Los Altos School District Annual 2019-20 Budget. <https://www.lasdschools.org/files/user/1/file/Budget%20Book%202019-20%20Final.pdf>
- 2
3
- 4 Kenyon, R. (2021a, April 28). Comprehensive Annual Financial Report FY 2020.
5 <https://www.lasdschools.org/files/user/1/file/CAFR%20YE%202020.pdf>
- 6
- 7 Kenyon, R. (2021b, August). Los Altos School District 2021–22 Annual Budget.
8 Retrieved January 1, 2022, from [https://www.lasdschools.org/files/user/1/file/Budget%20Book%202021-22\(3\).pdf](https://www.lasdschools.org/files/user/1/file/Budget%20Book%202021-22(3).pdf)
- 9
10
- 11 Kevin Ennis, Osa Wolff, & Erica Vega. (2016). A Guide for Local Agency Counsel:
12 Providing Conflict of Interest Advice (2016). Retrieved April 8, 2021, from
13 [https://www.cacities.org/Resources-Documents/Resources-](https://www.cacities.org/Resources-Documents/Resources-Section/Open-Government/Providing-Conflict-of-Interest-Advice)
14 [Section/Open-Government/Providing-Conflict-of-Interest-Advice](https://www.cacities.org/Resources-Documents/Resources-Section/Open-Government/Providing-Conflict-of-Interest-Advice)
- 15 *Keynote at the Network for Public Education's 4th Annual Conference.* (2017, October 14–15).
16 Oakland, CA. Retrieved September 16, 2020, from
17 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6DUR5MxCyGY>
- 18 Knill, C., & Tosun, J. (2020). *Public policy: A new introduction* (2nd edition). Macmillan
19 International Higher Education.
- 20 Kozol, J. (1992). *Savage inequalities: Children in america's schools*. HarperCollins.
21 <https://books.google.com/books?id=nJf7PhOEicUC>
- 22 Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in america*.
23 Three Rivers Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=VWH2u0PKwyAC>
- 24 Lafer, G. (2014). *Do Poor Kids Deserve Lower-Quality Education Than Rich Kids? Evaluating*
25 *School Privatization Proposals in Milwaukee, Wisconsin* (No. 375). Economic Policy
26 Institute. Washington, D.C.

- 1 Lafer, G. (2017a). *The one percent solution: how corporations are remaking America one state*
2 *at a time*. Retrieved May 13, 2022, from
3 <https://doi.org/10.7591/cornell/9781501703065.001.0001>
4 OCLC: 960641999
- 5 Lafer, G. (2017b, April). *Spending blind: The failure of policy planning in california charter*
6 *school funding*. In the Public Interest. Oakland, CA.
- 7 Lafer, G. (2018). *Breaking point: The cost of charter schools for public school districts*. In the
8 Public Interest.
- 9 Lafer, G., Crawford, C., Petrucci, L., & Smith, J. (2021, February). *Costly Failure:*
10 *California Is Overpaying for Online Charter Schools That Are Failing Students*. In the
11 Public Interest.
- 12 LAO. (2017, January 18). *A Historical Review of Proposition 98*. Retrieved February 17,
13 2022, from [https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2017/3526/review-prop-98-](https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2017/3526/review-prop-98-011817.pdf)
14 [011817.pdf](https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2017/3526/review-prop-98-011817.pdf)
- 15 Lasswell, H. D. (1936). *Politics; who gets what, when, how*. Whittlesey house.
16 https://books.google.com/books?id=e_6BAAAAMAAJ
- 17 Legislative Analyst's Office. (2021, July). *2021-22 K-12 Funding by Source*. Legislative
18 Analyst's Office | The California Legislature's Nonpartisan Fiscal and Policy
19 Advisor. Retrieved October 21, 2021, from
20 <https://lao.ca.gov/Education/EdBudget/Details/545>
- 21 Lennox, S. (2020, June 17). *President Trump Calls School Choice the Civil Rights Issue of Our*
22 *Time*. pjmedia.com. Retrieved March 27, 2021, from
23 [https://pjmedia.com/election/stacey-](https://pjmedia.com/election/stacey-lennox/2020/06/17/president-trump-calls-school-choice-the-civil-rights-issue-of-our-time-n542977)
24 [lennox/2020/06/17/president-trump-calls-school-choice-the-](https://pjmedia.com/election/stacey-lennox/2020/06/17/president-trump-calls-school-choice-the-civil-rights-issue-of-our-time-n542977)
25 [civil-rights-issue-of-our-time-n542977](https://pjmedia.com/election/stacey-lennox/2020/06/17/president-trump-calls-school-choice-the-civil-rights-issue-of-our-time-n542977)
- 26 Marachi, R. (2016–2022). *Charter Schools & "Choice": A Closer Look*. Retrieved May 8,
27 2022, from
28 <https://www.scoop.it/topic/charter-choice-closer-look>

- 1 Marachi, R., & Carpenter, R. (2020, October). Silicon valley, philanthro-capitalism
2 and policy shifts from teachers to tech. In *Strike for the common good: Fighting for*
3 *the future of public education*. University of Michigan Press.
4 <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.11621094>
- 5 Markowitz model. (2021, June 12). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved February 2, 2022, from
6 [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Markowitz_model&](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Markowitz_model&oldid=1028260830)
7 [oldid=1028260830](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Markowitz_model&oldid=1028260830)
8 Page Version ID: 1028260830
- 9 Mathews, J. (2009). *Work hard. Be nice.: How two inspired teachers created the most*
10 *promising schools in america*. Algonquin Books.
- 11 McCombes, S. (2019, May 8). *How to Do a Case Study | Examples and Methods*. Scribbr.
12 Retrieved January 17, 2021, from
13 <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/case-study/>
- 14 Miron, G., & Gulosino, C. (2016). *Virtual Schools in the U.S.* 2016.
- 15 Miron, G., Gulosino, C., Shank, C., Elgeberi, N., Davidson, C., Alvarez, F. H. D.,
16 Jurdzy, B., Larsen, J., Pham, D., Ruder, K., Urdapilleta, L., & Urschel, J. (2021,
17 February). *Profiles of For-Profit and Nonprofit Education Management*
18 *Organizations: Fifteenth Edition*. Retrieved July 23, 2021, from [http:](http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/emo-%20profiles-fifteenth-ed)
19 [//nepc.colorado.edu/publication/emo-%20profiles-fifteenth-ed](http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/emo-%20profiles-fifteenth-ed)
- 20 *A Nation at Risk* (ED 226 006). (1983). National Commission on Excellence in
21 Education, Washington, D.C. Retrieved March 25, 2020, from
22 <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED226006.pdf>
- 23 National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2020, June 17). *The federal charter schools*
24 *program: 2020 annual report*. National Alliance for Public Charter Schools.
25 Washington, D.C. Retrieved May 24, 2021, from [https:](https://www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/documents/2020-06/CSP%20Annual%20Report%20_%20Final.pdf)
26 [//www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/documents/2020-](https://www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/documents/2020-06/CSP%20Annual%20Report%20_%20Final.pdf)
27 [06/CSP%20Annual%20Report%20_%20Final.pdf](https://www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/documents/2020-06/CSP%20Annual%20Report%20_%20Final.pdf)

- 1 National Charter School Resource Center. (2020). *Accessing Federal Programs - A*
2 *Guidebook for Charter School Operators and Developers*. NCSRC. Bethesda, MD.
3 Retrieved May 24, 2021, from [https://charterschoolcenter.ed.gov/sites/default/files/files/field_](https://charterschoolcenter.ed.gov/sites/default/files/files/field_publication_attachment/Accessing%20Federal%20Programs%20-%20A%20Guidebook%20for%20Charter%20School%20Operators%20and%20Developers.pdf)
4 [publication_attachment/Accessing%20Federal%20Programs%20-](https://charterschoolcenter.ed.gov/sites/default/files/files/field_publication_attachment/Accessing%20Federal%20Programs%20-%20A%20Guidebook%20for%20Charter%20School%20Operators%20and%20Developers.pdf)
5 [%20A%20Guidebook%20for%20Charter%20School%20Operators%20and%](https://charterschoolcenter.ed.gov/sites/default/files/files/field_publication_attachment/Accessing%20Federal%20Programs%20-%20A%20Guidebook%20for%20Charter%20School%20Operators%20and%20Developers.pdf)
6 [%20Developers.pdf](https://charterschoolcenter.ed.gov/sites/default/files/files/field_publication_attachment/Accessing%20Federal%20Programs%20-%20A%20Guidebook%20for%20Charter%20School%20Operators%20and%20Developers.pdf)
7
- 8 National Education Policy Center. (n.d.). National Education Policy Center. Retrieved
9 November 16, 2021, from <https://nepc.colorado.edu/about-us>
- 10 National Forum on Education Statistics. (2007). *Forum Guide to Core Finance Data*
11 *Elements (NFES 2007-801)* (NFES 2007-801). National Center for Education
12 Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.
- 13 Nichols, S. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2007). *Collateral Damage: How High-Stakes Testing*
14 *Corrupts America's Schools*. Harvard Education Press.
15 <https://books.google.com/books?id=kaVhDwAAQBAJ>
- 16 Noguchi, S. (2015, April 1). *San Jose: Rocketship charter scales back grand expansion plans*.
17 The Mercury News. Retrieved April 26, 2021, from
18 [https://www.mercurynews.com/2015/04/01/san-jose-rocketship-](https://www.mercurynews.com/2015/04/01/san-jose-rocketship-charter-scales-back-grand-expansion-plans/)
19 [charter-scales-back-grand-expansion-plans/](https://www.mercurynews.com/2015/04/01/san-jose-rocketship-charter-scales-back-grand-expansion-plans/)
- 20 Orfield, G., & Frankenberg, E. (2014, May 15). *Brown at 60: Great Progress, a Long Retreat*
21 *and an Uncertain Future*. The Civil Rights Project, University of California at Los
22 Angeles. [https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-](https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/brown-at-60-great-progress-a-long-retreat-and-an-uncertain-future/Brown-at-60-051814.pdf)
23 [education/integration-and-diversity/brown-at-60-great-](https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/brown-at-60-great-progress-a-long-retreat-and-an-uncertain-future/Brown-at-60-051814.pdf)
24 [progress-a-long-retreat-and-an-uncertain-future/Brown-at-60-](https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/brown-at-60-great-progress-a-long-retreat-and-an-uncertain-future/Brown-at-60-051814.pdf)
25 [051814.pdf](https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/brown-at-60-great-progress-a-long-retreat-and-an-uncertain-future/Brown-at-60-051814.pdf)
- 26 Page, S. (2018). *The model thinker: What you need to know to make data work for you*. Basic
27 Books.
- 28 Public Agenda. (2018). *Charter Schools in Perspective: A Guide to Research*. Public Agenda.
29 <http://www.in-perspective.org/files/>

- 1 CharterSchoolsInPerspective_GuidetoResearch.pdf
- 2 updated 2018
- 3 Pulliam, J., & Van Patten, J. (2007). *History of education in america*. Merrill.
- 4 <https://books.google.com/books?id=dgQkAAAACAAJ>
- 5 Rashid, Y., Rashid, A., Warraich, M. A., Sabir, S. S., & Waseem, A. (2019). Case Study
- 6 Method: A Step-by-Step Guide for Business Researchers. *International Journal*
- 7 *of Qualitative Methods*, 18, 160940691986242.
- 8 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919862424>
- 9 Ravitch, D. (2010). *The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and*
- 10 *Choice Are Undermining Education* (Revised and Expanded). Basic Books.
- 11 *The Republican Party platform of 1980*. (1980). Retrieved March 27, 2021, from
- 12 [https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/republican-party-](https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/republican-party-platform-1980)
- 13 [platform-1980](https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/republican-party-platform-1980)
- 14 Roithmayr, D. (2014). *Reproducing Racism: How Everyday Choices Lock In White Advantage*.
- 15 NYU Press.
- 16 Rooks, N. M. (2017). *Cutting school: Privatization, segregation, and the end of public*
- 17 *education*. The New Press.
- 18 Rosenberg, G. (1991). *The hollow hope: Can courts bring about social change?* University of
- 19 Chicago Press.
- 20 Rothstein, R. (2017). *The Color of Law: A Forgotten History of How Our Government*
- 21 *Segregated America*. Liveright Publishing Corporation.
- 22 Saltman, K. (2018). *The swindle of innovative educational finance*. University of Minnesota
- 23 Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=Hph5DwAAQBAJ>
- 24 SCCOE. (2021). *2020-2021 Annual Charter Schools Data Book*.

- 1 Scott, J. (2009). The Politics of Venture Philanthropy in Charter School Policy and
2 Advocacy. *Educational Policy*, 23(1), 106–136.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904808328531>
- 4 Secretary of State, California. (2000). Voter Information Guide for 2000, General
5 Election. [https://repository.uchastings.edu/cgi/viewcontent.](https://repository.uchastings.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2185&context=ca_ballot_props)
6 [cgi?article=2185&context=ca_ballot_props](https://repository.uchastings.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2185&context=ca_ballot_props)
- 7 Simon Fairlie. (2009). A short history of enclosure in Britain [magazine]. *The Land*, 7,
8 16–31.
- 9 Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act (2000, November).
10 [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC§ionNum=47614.#)
11 [displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC§ionNum=47614.#](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC§ionNum=47614.#)
- 12 Smith, J., Wohlstetter, P., Farrell, C. C., & Nayfack, M. B. (2011). Beyond ideological
13 warfare: The maturation of research on charter schools. *Journal of School*
14 *Choice*, 5(4), 444–507. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15582159.2011.624938>
- 15 Solo, R. A. (Ed.). (1955). *Economics and the Public Interest*.
- 16 Stowell, D. (2018). *Investment banks, hedge funds, and private equity* (3rd). Elsevier
17 Science & Technology Books
18 Additional content: [https://www.](https://www.elsevier.com/books-and-journals/book-companion/9780128143520)
19 [elsevier.com/books-and-journals/book-companion/9780128143520](https://www.elsevier.com/books-and-journals/book-companion/9780128143520).
- 20 Strauss, V. (2021, October 15). *Enrollment jumps in charter schools — with big gains in*
21 *worst-performing part of charter sector*. Answer Sheet. Retrieved October 18, 2021,
22 from
23 [https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2021/10/15/charter-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2021/10/15/charter-school-enrollment-jump-pandemic/)
24 [school-enrollment-jump-pandemic/](https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2021/10/15/charter-school-enrollment-jump-pandemic/)
- 25 Suitts, S. (2019). Segregationists, Libertarians, and the Modern "School Choice"
26 Movement. *Southern Spaces*, 57. <https://doi.org/10.18737/43330.2019>

- 1 Suitts, S. (2020, February). *Overturing Brown: The Segregationist Legacy of the Modern*
2 *School Choice Movement*. NewSouth Books.
- 3 Tewksbury, G. E. (2016). *Schooling the Market: Venture Philanthropy, Field Building*
4 *and the NewSchools Venture Fund*, 206.
- 5 Tough, P. (2009). *Whatever it takes: Geoffrey canada's quest to change harlem and america*.
6 Mariner Books. <https://books.google.com/books?id=qNevESlWhh0C>
- 7 Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*.
8 SUNY Press.
- 9 *Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2013*. (2013).
- 10 *Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2014*. (2014).
- 11 *Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2015*. (2015).
- 12 *Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2017*. (2017). National Education Policy Center, School of
13 Education, University of Colorado. Boulder, CO.
- 14 *Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2019* (Research Brief). (2019). National Education Policy
15 Center, School of Education, University of Colorado. Boulder, CO. Retrieved
16 April 10, 2020, from [https://nepc.colorado.edu/sites/default/](https://nepc.colorado.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Virtual%20Schools%202019.pdf)
17 [files/publications/Virtual%20Schools%202019.pdf](https://nepc.colorado.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Virtual%20Schools%202019.pdf)
- 18 *Virtual Schools in the U.S. 2021*. (2021, May). Nation Education Policy Center. Boulder,
19 CO. Retrieved May 6, 2021, from
20 [http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/%20virtual-schools-](http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/%20virtual-schools-annual-2021)
21 [annual-2021](http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/%20virtual-schools-annual-2021)
- 22 Warren, M. C. J. E. (1954, May 17). *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S.
23 483 (1954). <https://catalog.archives.gov/id/1656510>
- 24 Whitmire, R. (2014). *On the Rocketship: How top charter schools are pushing the envelope*.
25 Jossey-Bass.

- 1 Woodworth, J. L., Raymond, M. E., Chirbas, K., Gonzalez, M., Negassi, Y., &
2 Donge, C. V. (2015). *Online Charter School Study*. Center for Research on
3 Education Outcomes (CREDO). Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- 4 Yin, R. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE
5 Publications.
- 6 Zhu, X., Ao, X., Qin, Z., Chang, Y., Liu, Y., He, Q., & Li, J. (2021). Intelligent financial
7 fraud detection practices in post-pandemic era. *The Innovation*, 2(4), 100176.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xinn.2021.100176>
- 9 Zimmer, R., Buddin, R., Smith, S. A., & Duffy, D. (2019). *Nearly three decades into the*
10 *charter school movement, what has research told us about charter schools?*
11 (EdWorkingPaper: 19-156). Annenberg Institute at Brown University.
12 Providence, RI. <http://www.edworkingpapers.com/ai19-156>

School Financing in California

Public school districts and charter schools receive funding from the state and the federal governments which most often goes into the district's or school's General Fund. A small portion of funding is restricted to particular programs, and sometimes that money goes into a specialized and restricted fund, but the norm is for the General Fund to account for the majority of transactions.

The first table to look at is the aggregate of all funds as shown in Figure 5 on the following page, *LASD 2019–20 All Funds Summary*. It is a very high-level summary of a school's or a district's budget. It's a snapshot of what the district's revenues are expected to be, roughly where that revenue is expected to come from, what the district's expenses are expected to be, and whether revenue and expenses are expected to be in balance. It is the rough equivalent of a business income statement.⁴²

Because Figure 5 on the next page, *LASD 2019–20 All Funds Summary*, is a snapshot, detecting unusual changes year-to-year is not possible. Changes are detectable using Figure 6 on page 94 which compares fiscal two years. However, with just a budget summary, one can nonetheless note some interesting ratios, for example, the percentage of expenses spent on salaries and benefits. For LASD in 2021–20, this is 80.18% which is in line with what is typical of elementary school districts in California. One can calculate the state-wide average for all districts for 2019–20 using the Data Table at www.ed-data.org/state/CA, and that comes out to 83.71%. So, LASD spends a little less on salaries and benefits than the average elementary school district in California does.

⁴²Schools group their finances by funds. Most of their revenue goes into the general fund, and most of their expenses come out of the general fund. Some transactions must by law be accounted for in different funds. The three largest are the General Fund, the Special Revenue Fund, and the Capital Projects Fund, and together they account for virtually all of the financial activity of LASD. Other schools may have a different set of funds, but all contain a General Fund that is the primary fund for their day-to-day financial activities.

Figure 5
LASD 2019–20 All Funds Summary

	General Fund	Special Revenue Funds	Capital Project Funds	Total All Governmental Funds
REVENUES				
LCFF/Revenue Limit Sources	43,551,141	300,174	-	43,851,315
Federal Revenue	1,155,694	-	-	1,155,694
Other State Revenue	3,417,200	-	-	3,417,200
Other Local Revenue	16,387,903	22,500	1,243,180	17,653,583
TOTAL REVENUES	64,511,938	322,674	1,243,180	66,077,792
EXPENDITURES				
Certificated Salaries	25,965,289	-	-	25,965,289
Classified Salaries	10,606,613	-	-	10,606,613
Employee Benefits	16,904,698	-	-	16,904,698
Books & Supplies	1,526,084	-	-	1,526,084
Services & Other Operating Expenditures	8,453,291	300,000	1,428,474	10,181,765
Capital Outlay	162,342	-	43,000	205,342
Other Outgo	341,064	-	-	341,064
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	63,959,381	300,000	1,471,474	65,730,855
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over Expenditures	552,558	22,674	(228,294)	346,938
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES/USES				
Interfund Transfers In	-	-	-	-
Interfund Transfers Out	-	-	-	-
TOTAL OTHER FINANCING SOURCES/USES	-	-	-	-
NET INCREASE/(DECREASE) IN FUND BALANCE	552,558	22,674	(228,294)	346,938
BEGINNING FUND BALANCES	107,727	3,603,040	1,745,439	5,456,206
ENDING FUND BALANCES	660,284	3,625,714	1,517,145	5,803,144

\$1 dollar difference in General Fund Ending Fund Balance due to rounding error.

Note: Kenyon (2019, p. 38). In the public domain.

1 Calculating this ratio brings up a general issue: What is an appropriate
2 comparison group? In this particular case, the Ed-Data web site does not have
3 county-level financial data, so the only comparison which can easily be made is at the
4 state level. But should the state-level comparison group be all districts, or just
5 elementary school districts? Should “basic aid” districts, also called
6 “community-funded” districts, districts whose property tax revenues exceed their
7 LCFF entitlement, be included or not? Again, the Data Table tab on
8 www.ed-data.or/state/CA does not filter by type of district (although the Graph
9 tab does), so, in this case, using just the Ed-Data data, our choices are forced since we

1 cannot use state-level data.

2 The other common financial business report is the balance sheet, which identifies
3 assets and liabilities. In the educational world, this is the statement of net position.
4 Figure 6 on page 94 shows LASD's assets and liabilities at the end of the 2019–20
5 school year. Note that unlike a balance sheet, a statement of net position for schools
6 (and other governmental entities) does not balance; assets are not exactly equal to
7 liabilities.⁴³

8 As an example of a number which stands out and is therefore worth investigating,
9 is the large increase in Capital Assets, year over year, an increase of \$132M (line 3 of 6
10 on page 94, *LASD YE 2020 Summary of Net Position*). In “Comprehensive Annual
11 Financial Report FY 2020,” six notes appear immediately after Figure 6, and these
12 provide an explanation for the increase: LASD purchased a property whose cost was
13 \$134.9M net of \$2.7M in depreciation. This purchase shows up again in line 1 of
14 Figure 9 on page 96 and explains the enormous 9052% increase in the value of LASD's
15 largest asset in FY2019, land.

16 In addition, the “Comprehensive Annual Financial Report FY 2020” contains a
17 section, on pp. 19–45, called *Notes to the Basic Financial Statements*. These notes are an
18 integral part of the certified, audited annual statement, just as they are in audited
19 financial reports in the business world; they cannot be omitted, and must be accurate
20 and complete. Note 7B of Kenyon (2021a, p. 7), General Obligation (GO) Bond
21 Anticipation Notes (BANs), explains how LASD uses a common technique to convert
22 general obligation bonds into cash: issue BANs, backed by general obligation bonds,
23 and payable when those GO bonds are issued.⁴⁴

⁴³Business accountants achieve this seemingly low probability equality by adding a fudge factor, *owner's equity*, so that *assets = liabilities + equity* always, exactly.

⁴⁴One reason this makes sense is that interest rate on BANs is less than the interest rate of GO bonds, so LASD makes money by issuing BANs to pay off GO bonds. In a different situation, school

1 It's important to remember is that although changes in finances can be
2 complicated, they should also be adequately explained in a transparent and complete
3 CAFR. When the documents are incomplete or opaque is when serious concerns
4 should be raised.

5 Within a CAFR are five summaries of financial tables that go one level deeper
6 than the All Funds Summary. These are

- 7 • Summary of Net Position (Figure 6 on the following page)
- 8 • Change in Net Position (Figure 7 on page 95)
- 9 • Net Costs of Services (Figure 8 on page 95)
- 10 • Capital Assets (Figure 9 on page 96)
- 11 • Long-term Liabilities (Figure 10 on page 96)

12 LASD rolls up its detailed financial data into a single multi-year summary, as
13 shown in Figure 11 on page 97. In addition to purely financial data, the multi-year
14 summary includes the key assumptions that were behind the numbers. In fact, the
15 first section of Figure 11 is only assumptions, and it is those assumptions which drive
16 the numbers in Sections 2–4. The value of this summary is that it captures in one
17 table the key data needed to make budgetary decisions and thus might serve as a
18 template for what data is important.

districts issue tax revenue anticipation notes (TRANs) because property taxes are paid by taxpayers semi-annually and salaries are paid monthly, so districts often and predictably do not have the cash on hand to pay their employees. The solution is to issue TRANs backed by anticipated revenue, and are paid off when the school or district receives the funds.

Figure 6
LASD YE 2020 Summary of Net Position

Table 1: Summary of Net Position				
	June 30, 2019	June 30, 2020	Change	Percentage Change
Assets				
Current and Other Assets	\$ 20,044,318	\$ 65,493,755	\$ 45,449,437	227%
Capital Assets	89,045,541	221,076,448	132,030,907	148%
Total Assets	\$ 109,089,859	\$ 286,570,203	\$ 177,480,344	163%
<i>Deferred Outflows of Resources</i>	\$ 22,094,579	\$ 19,321,134	\$ (2,773,445)	13%
Liabilities				
Other Liabilities	\$ 2,665,639	\$ 22,680,079	\$ 20,014,440	751%
Long Term Liabilities	141,558,936	269,006,215	127,447,279	90%
Total Liabilities	\$ 144,224,575	\$ 291,686,294	\$ 147,461,719	102%
<i>Deferred Inflows of Resources</i>	\$ 5,549,865	\$ 9,680,588	\$ 4,130,723	74%
Net Position				
Net Investment in Capital Assets	\$ 37,623,977	\$ 64,225,229	\$ 26,601,252	71%
Restricted	7,726,718	6,825,216	(901,502)	12%
Unrestricted	(63,940,697)	(66,525,990)	(2,585,293)	4%
Total Net Position	\$ (18,590,002)	\$ 4,524,455	\$ 23,114,457	124%

Note: Kenyon (2021a, p. 6). Public record.

Figure 7*LASD YE 2020 Change of Net Position*

Table 2: Change in Net Position				
	June 30, 2019	June 30, 2020	Change	Percentage Change
Revenues				
Program Revenues:				
Charges for Services	\$ -	\$ 446,710	\$ 446,710	100%
Operating Grants and Contributions	10,052,323	7,968,769	(2,083,554)	-21%
Capital Grants and Contributions	-	23,000,000	23,000,000	100%
General Revenues:				
Property Taxes	63,216,247	65,285,688	2,069,441	3%
Grants and Entitlements - Unrestricted	3,933,401	2,511,734	(1,421,667)	-36%
Other	7,347,728	7,498,513	150,785	2%
Total Revenues	84,549,699	106,711,414	22,161,715	26%
Program Expenses				
Instruction	52,349,163	54,025,994	1,676,831	3%
Support Services:				
Instruction-related services	7,219,873	7,282,281	62,408	1%
Pupil services	4,381,022	4,334,692	(46,330)	-1%
General administration	4,658,051	4,519,337	(138,714)	-3%
Plant services	8,526,753	8,569,628	42,875	1%
Payments to other agencies	-	7,036	7,036	100%
Interest and Fiscal Charges	2,893,333	4,857,989	1,964,656	68%
Total Expenses	80,028,195	83,596,957	3,568,762	4%
Change in Net Position	4,521,504	23,114,457	18,592,953	411%
Beginning Net Position	(23,111,506)	(18,590,002)	4,521,504	20%
Ending Net Position	\$ (18,590,002)	\$ 4,524,455	\$ 23,114,457	124%

Note: Kenyon (2021a, p. 7). Public record.

Figure 8*LASD YE 2020 Net Cost of Services*

Table 3: Net Cost of Services				
	Net Cost of Services for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2019	Net Cost of Services for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2020	Change	Percentage Change
Instruction	\$ 43,345,309	\$ 24,008,344	\$ (19,336,965)	-45%
Support Services:				
Instruction-related services	6,608,564	6,681,271	72,707	1%
Pupil services	4,033,498	4,019,853	(13,645)	0%
General administration	4,568,746	4,444,973	(123,773)	-3%
Plant services	8,526,422	8,162,012	(364,410)	-4%
Payments to other agencies	-	7,036	7,036	100%
Interest and Fiscal Charges	2,893,333	4,857,989	1,964,656	68%
Total Expenses	\$ 69,975,872	\$ 52,181,478	\$ (17,794,394)	-25%

Note: Kenyon (2021a, p. 9). Public record.

Figure 9
LASD YE 2020 Capital Assets

Table 5: Capital Assets				
	June 30, 2019	June 30, 2020	Increase (Decrease)	Percentage Change
Land	\$ 1,488,885	\$ 136,262,476	\$ 134,773,591	9052%
Site improvements	1,225,056	1,225,056	-	0%
Buildings and improvements	129,573,748	130,339,280	765,532	1%
Equipment	4,636,939	3,871,407	(765,532)	-17%
Total	136,924,628	271,698,219	134,773,591	98%
<i>Less: Accumulated Depreciation</i>	<i>47,879,087</i>	<i>50,621,771</i>	<i>2,742,684</i>	<i>6%</i>
Net Capital Assets	\$ 89,045,541	\$ 221,076,448	\$ 132,030,907	148%

Note: Kenyon (2021a, p. 10). Public record.

Figure 10
LASD YE 2020 Long-term Liabilities

Table 6: Long-term Liabilities				
	June 30, 2019	June 30, 2020	Increase (Decrease)	Percentage Change
Long-term Debt:				
General obligation bonds:				
Current interest bonds	\$ 40,665,000	\$ 95,850,000	\$ 55,185,000	136%
Unamortized bond premium	4,596,243	9,376,755	4,780,512	104%
Bond anticipation notes	10,000,000	79,000,000	69,000,000	690%
Lease-leaseback obligations	2,405,645	2,185,036	(220,609)	-9%
Subtotal long-term debt	57,666,888	186,411,791	128,744,903	223%
Other Long-term liabilities:				
Net pension liabilities	64,535,048	65,113,381	578,333	1%
Net OPEB obligation	18,914,928	16,922,035	(1,992,893)	-11%
Compensated absences	442,072	559,008	116,936	26%
Subtotal other long-term liabilities	83,892,048	82,594,424	(1,297,624)	-2%
Total Long-term Liabilities	\$ 141,558,936	\$ 269,006,215	\$ 127,447,279	90%

Note: Kenyon (2021a, p. 11). Public record.

Figure 11
LASD 2019–20 Multi-Year Projection

	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
% Change in Prop Tax Collections	7.06%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%
Enrollment	3,574	3,669	3,725	3,761	3,792	3,813
In-district students @ charter school	1043	1061	1061	1061	1061	1061
Total Enrollment, LASD + BCS	4,617	4,730	4,786	4,822	4,853	4,874
Transfer of Prop Tax to BCS	9,187,469	9,926,004	10,210,982	10,494,976	10,785,723	10,450,068
Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA)	0.00%	4.05%	2.98%	3.05%	3.00%	3.00%
Foundation Funding	2,400,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Parcel Tax	820	820	820	820	820	597
Class Size, K-3	19	22	22	22	22	22
Class Size, 4-6	25	25	25	25	25	25
Class Size, 7-8	25	26	26	26	26	26
Teachers, FTE	226	220	222	223	225	226
Raises (across-the-board)	2.00%	2.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Cost of Step/Column Movement	355,034	355,276	357,641	358,823	361,188	362,370
Step/Col (converted to % salary inc.)	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
Health Benefit rate increases	5.0%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%
Health Benefits (converted to % salary inc.)	0.9%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.6%	1.7%
STRS rate increases	-1.0%	0.8%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total Comp (as % of salary)	3.2%	5.4%	3.7%	2.6%	2.8%	2.9%
LCFF Sources	47,831,288	48,960,469	50,930,778	52,994,478	55,150,308	58,023,166
Federal Sources	2,966,976	1,128,389	1,162,015	1,197,456	1,233,380	1,270,382
Other State Sources	7,460,221	3,799,074	3,848,990	3,863,445	3,874,123	3,881,107
Other Local Sources	14,942,614	15,253,502	15,910,684	15,977,729	16,049,330	13,308,736
Total Revenues	73,201,099	69,141,434	71,852,467	74,033,108	76,307,141	76,483,390
Certificated Salaries	28,473,085	26,804,421	27,081,223	27,286,386	27,563,386	27,771,946
Classified Salaries	12,146,432	11,964,000	12,072,253	12,178,439	12,284,470	12,390,750
Employee Benefits	16,708,058	17,877,672	19,185,547	19,853,541	20,542,397	21,163,633
Retiree Benefits	934,490	960,791	1,001,625	1,044,194	1,088,572	1,134,836
Books & Supplies	3,926,089	1,508,677	1,542,077	1,573,747	1,607,611	1,640,136
Contract Services	9,782,495	8,879,712	8,999,752	9,143,511	9,308,868	9,477,329
Capital Outlay	251,893	235,312	240,835	246,658	253,080	259,653
Other	8,262	8,262	8,262	8,262	8,262	8,262
Total Expenses	72,230,804	68,238,847	70,131,574	71,334,737	72,656,646	73,846,545
Net Change	970,295	902,587	1,720,892	2,698,370	3,650,495	2,636,845
Adjusted Beginning Balance	4,469,801	5,440,096	6,342,683	8,063,576	10,761,946	14,412,441
Ending Balance	5,440,096	6,342,683	8,063,576	10,761,946	14,412,441	17,049,286
Encumbrances	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
General Fund Reserves	5,435,096	6,337,683	8,058,576	10,756,946	14,407,441	17,044,286
Reserves, Special Reserve Funds	3,590,562	3,630,562	3,690,466	3,760,585	3,839,557	3,920,188
Total Reserves	9,025,657	9,968,245	11,749,042	14,517,531	18,246,998	20,964,474
% of Expense	12.50%	14.61%	16.75%	20.35%	25.11%	28.39%

Note: Kenyon (2021b, p. 137) Public record.

Glossary

- arm's length transaction** A transaction, usually financial, where all parties are independent and are self-interested.
- blended learning** A method of teaching where both in-person instruction and virtual instruction are used.
- charter school** A quasi-private school that is publicly funded but privately run.
- chartering authority** A governmental entity that grants charter schools the authority to operate and which provides oversight. In California, a chartering authority could be a public school district, a county office of education, or the California Department of Education.
- charter management organization (CMO)** "A non-profit organization that operates or manages a network of charter schools (either through a contract or as the charter holder) linked by centralized support, operations, and oversight." ((CA Dept of Education), 2021)
- cross-collateralization** A term from bond financing which indicates that an asset has been used as collateral in two different obligations.
- education management organization (EMO)** "A for-profit entity that operates or manages a network of charter schools (either through a contract or as the charter holder) linked by centralized support, operations, and oversight." ((CA Dept of Education), 2021)
- general obligation bonds** General obligation bonds are tax-exempt bonds backed by an LEA's property revenues. State law limits bond debt to 2.5% of total assessed valuation for unified school district and 1.25% for elementary and high school districts.
- public school** Public schools are funded by taxes and are governed by a publicly elected Board of Trustees. Public schools accept any and all students who wish to enroll, at any time of year, regardless of race, national origin, sexual orientation, gender, religion, or citizenship.
- revenue bonds** Tax-exempt bonds guaranteed by a schools revenue instead of by an LEA's property tax revenue.

1 **typical or neuro-typical children** Children without special needs.

2 **unduplicated pupils** The State of California augments school district revenue on

3 a per pupil basis for every pupil that qualifies for free or reduced price lunch,

4 or is an English language learner, or is a foster youth, but only an

5 unduplicated basis. Notably, children with special needs are not considered

6 *unduplicated pupils*. Neither are homeless children.