

#3



**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)

**Started:** Monday, November 16, 2015 10:57:54 AM

**Last Modified:** Monday, November 16, 2015 12:27:08 PM

PAGE 1

**Q1: Please enter your first and last name.**

First Name	Robert
Last Name	Jones

**Q2: Comment:**

(1) Housing Aid - Please be mindful that for some charter schools, increasing the value of the school with taxpayer funds accrues to private individuals, not the citizens of a community. Note in Florida multiple examples of charter schools closing and having financial issues and the subsequent inability to recoup funds as the sale of assets belong to private people. I would recommend as a compromise attaching a fixed year, straight line depreciation scale agreement to any housing aid given the charters with any remainder payable back to the state if the charter school is no longer operating during the depreciation window. This will not be an issue for charters if they intend to keep operating as a school, but protect taxpayers from the closure of a school by private entities.

(2) Marginal Cost - Please be mindful charter schools always have the option NOT to accept students by opting not to fill any vacancies and often have the flexibility to increase class sizes to handle when they have unused capacity they wish to fill.

(3) Differential Costs - Two comments.

(a) It's been well mentioned about special education and out of district transportation. I would add HS/MS athletics (I don't know any charters HS/MS that participates in RIIL/RIPCOA) as well.

(b) I believe RIGL 16.77 gives charter schools the ability to \*increase\* tuition payments if the sending students have certain characteristics (Free/Reduce lunch eligibility for example) greater than the sending LEA's population percentage. This rule is fair as studies have shown that those students need more resources to achieve equitable educational outcomes. If we are being fair though, why shouldn't sending LEAs be able to \*reduce\* tuition if the charter school is taking students well \*below\* the sending LEA for those same populations.

For example, one charter school is 96% white and less than 10% FRL - that's well below the averages of the districts from which the school is receiving students - so why should that school be funded (tuition) at the same rate as the sending districts are paying internally? If we are being equitable, let's make it both ways.

There is certainly a differential marginal cost for students with different characteristics so the funding formula should acknowledge that from \*both\* perspectives for charter schools.

**Q3: By submitting this comment, you understand and acknowledge that your name and your comment will become available to the public as part of the public record.**

Yes, I understand that my name along with my comment will be part of the public record and will represent me when shared or posted online.