

## **CMO and EMO Public Charter Schools: A Growing Phenomenon in the Charter School Sector**

### **Public Charter Schools Dashboard Data from 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10**

Charter Management Organizations (CMOs) are nonprofit entities that manage two or more charter schools. Widely recognized CMOs include KIPP, Uncommon Schools and Achievement First, but there are many more. CMOs often provide back office functions for charter schools to take advantage of economies of scale, but some also provide a wider range of services—including hiring, professional development, data analysis, public relations and advocacy. Education Management Organizations (EMOs) are for-profit entities that manage charter schools and perform similar functions as CMOs. EMOs generally charge a management fee for their services to charter schools. CMOs and EMOs are different than the wide range of vendors that schools may contract with for specific services, primarily because CMOs and EMOs have considerable influence over the instructional design and operations of their affiliated charter schools.<sup>i</sup>

CMOs and EMOs play an important part in the scalability of the charter school movement by enabling the replication of models that work, creating economies of scale, encouraging collaboration between similar schools, and building support structures for schools.<sup>ii</sup> Philanthropic foundations as well as federal policymakers have promoted the growth of CMO and EMO run schools. Two bills in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress pursued additional funding for the replication and expansion of quality charter schools: the [All Students Achieving through Reform \(All STAR\) Act](#) and the [Empowering Parents Through Quality Charter Schools Act](#). Additionally, the U.S. Department of Education has promoted replication of high-quality models through competitive grant programs: [Race to the Top](#), [Investing in Innovation \(i3\) Fund](#), and the [Replication and Expansion for High-Quality Charter Schools](#) through the Charter Schools Program. As policymakers and the public continue to demand quality education options for our nation's children, it is increasingly important to monitor the growth of CMO and EMO schools as scalable models.

In 2009-2010, roughly 30 percent of public charter schools nationwide were managed by a CMO or EMO. Similarly, over 500,000 students attended public charter schools operated by an EMO or CMO (34.6 percent of students enrolled in charter schools).

The Public Charter School Dashboard ([Dashboard](#)) contains statistics and indicators about the growth and quality of public charter schools at the national, state, district, and school levels. Notably, the Dashboard provides detailed information on every charter school in operation across the country, including CMO or EMO affiliation. According to NAPCS' Dashboard data:

- There has been substantial growth in the number of schools and students enrolled in CMO charter schools over the past three years (see Table 1). The number of schools grew by 25 percent in both 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. The number of students grew by over 35 percent in both years. EMO schools experienced mixed growth. The number of schools and students enrolled in EMOs grew by over 45 percent in 2008-09, but there was considerably less growth for EMOs in 2009-10. EMO schools still enrolled more students than CMOs in 2009-10 (334,822 versus 228,273).
- Texas and California had the most CMOs, while Michigan and Florida had the most EMOs (see Table 2). 74 percent of the CMO-affiliated charter schools were located in four states (TX, CA, AZ, and OH). 77 percent of the EMO-affiliated charter schools were located in four states (MI, FL, AZ, and OH). Ten states (AK, DE, HI, IA, MS, NH, NM, RI, VA, WY) with charter school laws did not have CMO or EMO run schools as of 2009-10 (see Appendix A).

**Table 1: Number of Charter Schools and Students Enrolled in Charter Schools**

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
<i>Total number of charter schools</i>			
CMO	493 (11.5%)	621 (13.4%)	775 (15.8%)
EMO	441 (10.3%)	639 (13.8%)	637 (12.9%)
Freestanding	3,365 (78.3%)	3,380 (72.8%)	3,507 (71.3%)
<i>Growth in the number of charter schools</i>			
CMO		26.0%	24.8%
EMO		44.9%	-0.3%
Freestanding		0.4%	3.8%
<i>Total number of students enrolled in charter schools<sup>iii</sup></i>			
CMO	124,335 (9.6%)	168,632 (11.7%)	228,273 (14.0%)
EMO	205,042 (15.8%)	302,531 (20.9%)	334,822 (20.6%)
Freestanding	957,339 (74.0%)	966,909 (66.9%)	1,054,943 (64.8%)
<i>Growth in the number students enrolled in charter schools</i>			
CMO		35.6%	35.4%
EMO		47.5%	10.7%
Freestanding		1.0%	9.1%

**Table 2: States with the Largest Number of CMOs & EMOs, 2009-10**

# CMO Schools (% of total charters)		# EMO Schools (% of total charters)	
1. TX	288 (53.0%)	1. MI	155 (64.6%)
2. CA	109 (13.5%)	2. FL	142 (34.6%)
3. AZ	104 (20.5%)	3. AZ	103 (20.3%)
4. OH	71 (22.1%)	4. OH	90 (28.0%)
5. IL	44 (43.1%)	5. PA	19 (14.1%)
6. NY	28 (20.0%)	6. CA	17 (2.1%)
7. DC	24 (25.0%)	7. NY, CO	13 (9.3%, 8.2%)
8. MI	17 (7.1%)	8. IN	10 (18.5%)
9. FL, IN	13 (3.2%, 24.1%)	9. TX	8 (1.5%)
10. PA	12 (8.9%)	10. DC, MO	7 (7.3%, 21.2%)
# CMO Students (% of total charters)		# EMO Students (% of total charters)	
1. TX	75,257 (50.8%)	1. MI	81,728 (73.3%)
2. CA	43,832 (13.8%)	2. FL	58,712 (42.6%)
3. AZ	21,811 (18.9%)	3. OH	49,753 (53.8%)
4. IL	13,550 (37.8%)	4. AZ	34,242 (29.7%)
5. OH	12,921 (14.0%)	5. PA	18,706 (23.5%)
6. NY	9,637 (21.6%)	6. CA	15,250 (4.8%)
7. DC	9,281 (33.6%)	7. CO	11,232 (16.8%)
8. MI	7,110 (6.4%)	8. MO	8,722 (47.4%)
9. IN	6,562 (35.3%)	9. NY	5,865 (13.2%)
10. PA	5,427 (6.8%)	10. NV	4,732 (34.2%)

- The largest CMO provider (KIPP Foundation) had nearly twice as many schools and enrolled nearly twice as many students as the next largest provider in 2009-2010 (see Table 3). The EMO provider with the most students (K12 Inc.) enrolled nearly twice as many students as the largest CMO provider (KIPP Foundation). The top ten largest EMO providers enrolled 150,000 more students than the top ten largest CMO providers. The average student enrollment in EMO-affiliated charter schools was 494 students, compared with 306 students in CMO-affiliated charter schools and 301 in freestanding charter schools.

**Table 3: Largest CMO & EMO Providers, 2009-10**

<b>CMO Name</b>	<b># Schools</b>	<b>EMO Name</b>	<b># Schools</b>
1. KIPP Foundation	74	1. Imagine Schools	73
2. Responsive Education Solutions	35	2. National Heritage Academies	60
3. Summit Academy Management	26	3. Leona Group, LLC	59
4. Cosmos Foundation	24	4. Academica	57
5. Aspire Public Schools	21	5. White Hat Management	50
6. Concept Schools	19	6. Mosaica Education	29
7. Constellation Schools, LLC	17	7. Edison Learning, Inc.	23
8. Green Dot Public Schools, Uplift Education	15	8. K12 Inc.	22
9. Shekinah Learning Institute	14	9. Charter Schools USA	19
10. ICEF Public Schools, IDEA Public Schools, Milburn Schools	12	10. Charter School Administrative Services	13

  

<b>CMO Name</b>	<b># Students</b>	<b>EMO Name</b>	<b># Students</b>
1. KIPP Foundation	21,569	1. K12 Inc.	43,331
2. Cosmos Foundation	12,149	2. National Heritage Academies	38,792
3. Aspire Public Schools	6,690	3. Imagine Schools	32,942
4. Green Dot Public Schools	6,486	4. Academica	25,612
5. Innovative Education Management (IEM)	5,864	5. Leona Group, LLC	19,244
6. IDEA Public Schools	5,534	6. White Hat Management	18,167
7. Responsive Education Solutions	5,085	7. Edison Learning, Inc.	16,179
8. Concept Schools	4,936	8. Connections Academy	15,192
9. Alliance College-Ready Public Schools	4,853	9. Charter Schools USA	14,671
10. America CAN!	4,406	10. Altair Learning Management Inc.	9,257

As of the 2009-2010 school year:

- Over 95 percent of CMO and EMO charter schools in existence were created as start-ups, rather than conversions from traditional public schools (see Table 4). In future years, these numbers may change as CMOs and EMOs take on turnarounds of low performing traditional public schools.
- CMO and EMO charter schools were concentrated in urban areas. 65.9 percent of CMOs were located in cities. While 50 percent of EMOs were located in cities, a larger percentage of EMOs were located in suburban areas than CMO or freestanding charter schools.
- Less than 10 percent of unionized charter schools were managed by a CMO or EMO, whereas nearly one third of non-unionized charter schools were managed by a CMO or EMO.
- The percentage of CMO charter schools making adequate yearly progress (AYP) increased from 62.3 percent in 2007-2008 to 66.4 percent in 2009-2010, whereas the percentages of EMO and freestanding charter schools making AYP decreased during the same years (53.4 percent to 50.8 percent for the EMOs and 62.2 percent to 58.9 percent for the freestanding charters).
- The majority of students enrolled in CMOs were Hispanic and Black (40.2 percent and 35.9 percent, respectively). The majority of students enrolled in EMOs were White and Black (40.0 percent and 35.8 percent, respectively).
- A larger percentage of students attending CMOs were eligible for free or reduced price lunch (69.0 percent) than students enrolled in EMOs (56.5 percent) or freestanding charter schools (46.6 percent).

**Table 4: Charter School Demographics by Type, 2009-10**

	<b>CMO</b>	<b>EMO</b>	<b>Freestanding</b>	
<i>Charter School Status</i>				
Start-up	761 (98.2%)	633 (99.4%)	3,103 (88.5%)	
Conversion	14 (1.8%)	4 (0.6%)	404 (11.5%)	
<i>Geographic Location</i>				
City	511 (65.9%)	322 (50.5%)	1,739 (49.6%)	
Suburb	119 (15.3%)	182 (28.6%)	710 (20.2%)	
Town	42 (5.4%)	10 (1.6%)	329 (9.4%)	
Rural	58 (7.5%)	90 (14.2%)	637 (18.2%)	
<i>Authorizer</i>				
State Board	335 (43.2%)	42 (6.6%)	703 (20.0%)	
Independent Charter Board	110 (14.2%)	114 (17.9%)	381 (10.9%)	
School District	254 (32.7%)	229 (35.9%)	2,022 (57.6%)	
Government Municipality	5 (0.6%)	1 (0.2%)	17 (0.5%)	
University	39 (5.0%)	166 (26.1%)	166 (4.7%)	
Non-Profit Organization	30 (3.9%)	79 (12.4%)	137 (3.9%)	
State Board / School District	2 (0.3%)	6 (0.9%)	80 (2.3%)	
<i>Unionized Charter Schools</i>				
	37 (4.8%)	14 (2.2%)	553 (15.8%)	
<i>School Performance</i>				
2007-08	Met AYP	268 (62.3%)	215 (53.4%)	1,900 (62.2%)
	Did Not Meet AYP	162 (37.7%)	188 (46.6%)	1,154 (37.8%)
2008-09	Met AYP	327 (63.6%)	318 (56.3%)	1,911 (63.8%)
	Did Not Meet AYP	187 (36.4%)	247 (43.7%)	1,084 (36.2%)
2009-10	Met AYP	426 (66.4%)	299 (50.8%)	1,745 (58.9%)
	Did Not Meet AYP	216 (33.6%)	290 (49.2%)	1,220 (41.1%)
<i>Student Race/Ethnicity</i>				
Asian	6,327 (2.8%)	7,041 (2.1%)	42,553 (4.0%)	
Black	81,901 (35.9%)	119,720 (35.8%)	278,256 (26.4%)	
Hispanic	91,686 (40.2%)	61,949 (18.5%)	261,752 (24.8%)	
White	42,586 (18.7%)	133,770 (40.0%)	424,683 (40.3%)	
Other	5,040 (2.2%)	10,773 (3.2%)	46,293 (4.4%)	
<i>Students Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch</i>				
	157,524 (69.0%)	189,223 (56.5%)	492,041 (46.6%)	
<i>Average Student Enrollment</i>				
	306	494	301	

Note: Data for 2009-10 school year, unless otherwise indicated.

### Appendix A: Total Number of CMO, EMO, and Freestanding Schools and Students by State

State		Schools			Students		
		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
AK	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	23 (100%)	25 (100%)	26 (100%)	4,772 (100%)	5,207 (100%)	5,365 (100%)
AR	CMO	1 (5%)	4 (15%)	5 (17%)	282 (5%)	1,197 (17%)	1,801 (21%)
	EMO	1 (5%)	2 (8%)	2 (7%)	499 (9%)	826 (12%)	764 (9%)
	Freestanding	18 (90%)	20 (77%)	22 (76%)	4,580 (85%)	4,966 (71%)	6,076 (70%)
AZ	CMO	81 (18%)	97 (21%)	104 (21%)	14,014 (14%)	17,356 (18%)	21,811 (19%)
	EMO	85 (19%)	106 (22%)	103 (20%)	27,548 (27%)	27,084 (28%)	34,242 (30%)
	Freestanding	289 (63%)	271 (57%)	301 (59%)	58,681 (59%)	50,909 (53%)	59,084 (51%)
CA	CMO	98 (14%)	108 (14%)	109 (14%)	32,429 (13%)	37,682 (13%)	43,832 (14%)
	EMO	15 (2%)	17 (2%)	17 (2%)	9,948 (4%)	12,661 (4%)	15,250 (5%)
	Freestanding	577 (84%)	623 (83%)	682 (84%)	211,356 (83%)	235,146 (82%)	258,340 (81%)
CO	CMO	1 (1%)	2 (1%)	11 (7%)	344 (1%)	565 (1%)	4,265 (6%)
	EMO	13 (9%)	15 (10%)	13 (8%)	8,610 (15%)	10,749 (17%)	11,232 (17%)
	Freestanding	127 (90%)	132 (89%)	134 (85%)	47,818 (84%)	50,575 (82%)	51,329 (77%)
CT	CMO	3 (19%)	4 (22%)	4 (22%)	1,108 (28%)	1,564 (33%)	1,969 (38%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	13 (81%)	14 (78%)	14 (78%)	2,912 (72%)	3,132 (67%)	3,246 (62%)
DC	CMO	20 (25%)	21 (22%)	24 (25%)	8,251 (38%)	8,746 (34%)	9,281 (34%)
	EMO	5 (6%)	6 (6%)	7 (7%)	1,809 (8%)	1,705 (7%)	1,916 (7%)
	Freestanding	54 (68%)	68 (72%)	65 (68%)	11,887 (54%)	15,278 (59%)	16,463 (60%)
DE	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	17 (100%)	18 (100%)	18 (100%)	8,512 (100%)	8,626 (100%)	9,173 (100%)
FL	CMO	9 (3%)	14 (4%)	13 (3%)	2,506 (2%)	3,161 (3%)	3,702 (2%)
	EMO	44 (12%)	132 (33%)	142 (35%)	21,976 (21%)	48,473 (41%)	58,712 (43%)
	Freestanding	307 (85%)	250 (63%)	256 (62%)	80,741 (77%)	66,099 (56%)	75,374 (55%)
GA	CMO	2 (3%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	619 (2%)	647 (1%)	639 (1%)
	EMO	8 (11%)	8 (10%)	6 (7%)	3,868 (11%)	4,025 (10%)	3,197 (7%)
	Freestanding	62 (86%)	72 (88%)	81 (91%)	31,352 (87%)	36,716 (89%)	41,867 (92%)
HI	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	28 (100%)	31 (100%)	31 (100%)	6,663 (100%)	7,328 (100%)	7,869 (100%)

State		Schools			Students		
		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
IA	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	9 (100%)	8 (100%)	8 (100%)	943 (100%)	91 (100%)	854 (100%)
ID	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	2 (7%)	3 (10%)	3 (8%)	2,621 (24%)	3,250 (27%)	4,133 (28%)
	Freestanding	28 (93%)	28 (90%)	33 (92%)	8,147 (76%)	8,709 (73%)	10,449 (72%)
IL <sup>iv</sup>	CMO	32 (40%)	40 (42%)	44 (43%)	7,819 (32%)	11,032 (36%)	13,550 (38%)
	EMO	4 (5%)	5 (5%)	5 (5%)	381 (2%)	611 (2%)	550 (2%)
	Freestanding	45 (55%)	50 (53%)	52 (52%)	10,247 (41%)	11,871 (39%)	13,659 (38%)
IN	CMO	10 (25%)	13 (27%)	13 (24%)	3,434 (31%)	5,670 (36%)	6,562 (35%)
	EMO	4 (10%)	9 (18%)	10 (19%)	1,724 (16%)	3,656 (23%)	4,539 (24%)
	Freestanding	26 (65%)	27 (55%)	31 (57%)	5,963 (54%)	6,285 (40%)	7,509 (40%)
KS	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	576 (13%)	1,112 (22%)
	Freestanding	31 (100%)	34 (97%)	35 (97%)	3,384 (100%)	3,961 (87%)	4,138 (78%)
LA	CMO	3 (6%)	5 (8%)	5 (6%)	712 (3%)	1,326 (5%)	1,628 (5%)
	EMO	2 (4%)	4 (6%)	5 (7%)	671 (3%)	1,297 (5%)	2,244 (7%)
	Freestanding	47 (90%)	56 (86%)	67 (87%)	19,774 (91%)	22,869 (88%)	27,677 (88%)
MA	CMO	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	304 (1%)	327 (1%)	352 (1%)
	EMO	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	2,218 (9%)	2,277 (9%)	2,278 (9%)
	Freestanding	58 (95%)	58 (95%)	59 (95%)	22,514 (90%)	23,780 (90%)	24,763 (90%)
MD	CMO	1 (33%)	6 (17%)	7 (20%)	317 (4%)	2,390 (24%)	2,740 (24%)
	EMO	2 (7%)	3 (9%)	3 (8%)	368 (5%)	1,035 (11%)	1,205 (11%)
	Freestanding	27 (90%)	25 (74%)	26 (72%)	6,464 (90%)	6,404 (65%)	7,222 (65%)
MI	CMO	6 (3%)	11 (5%)	17 (7%)	1,845 (2%)	4,057 (4%)	7,110 (6%)
	EMO	130 (58%)	160 (69%)	155 (65%)	64,717 (64%)	81,489 (78%)	81,728 (73%)
	Freestanding	87 (39%)	61 (26%)	68 (28%)	33,922 (34%)	18,506 (18%)	22,657 (20%)
MN	CMO	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	71 (1%)	156 (1%)
	EMO	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	1 (1%)	1,334 (5%)	1,645 (4%)	1,895 (5%)
	Freestanding	141 (99%)	150 (98%)	151 (98%)	26,700 (95%)	31,060 (95%)	33,324 (94%)
MO	CMO	1 (4%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	75 (1%)	115 (1%)	253 (1%)
	EMO	9 (32%)	8 (29%)	7 (21%)	7,689 (52%)	8,986 (52%)	8,722 (47%)
	Freestanding	18 (64%)	19 (68%)	24 (73%)	7,049 (48%)	8,035 (47%)	9,443 (51%)
MS <sup>v</sup>	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	N/A

State		Schools			Students		
		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	Freestanding	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	N/A	375 (100%)	371 (100%)	N/A
NC	CMO	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	689 (2%)	813 (2%)	979 (3%)
	EMO	6 (6%)	5 (5%)	5 (5%)	3,833 (12%)	3,480 (10%)	3,755 (10%)
	Freestanding	90 (92%)	90 (93%)	89 (93%)	28,085 (86%)	31,714 (88%)	34,074 (88%)
NH	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	11 (100%)	489 (100%)	585 (100%)	816 (100%)
NJ	CMO	3 (5%)	3 (5%)	3 (4%)	1,475 (8%)	1,815 (9%)	2,157 (10%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	54 (95%)	59 (95%)	65 (96%)	16,111 (92%)	17,453 (91%)	19,572 (90%)
NM	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	64 (100%)	67 (100%)	72 (100%)	10,324 (100%)	11,735 (100%)	13,090 (100%)
NV	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	3 (14%)	5 (20%)	5 (18%)	1,341 (18%)	3,126 (31%)	4,732 (37%)
	Freestanding	19 (86%)	20 (80%)	23 (82%)	5,981 (82%)	6,885 (69%)	6,626 (52%)
NY	CMO	21 (22%)	26 (23%)	28 (20%)	5,439 (18%)	7,588 (21%)	9,637 (22%)
	EMO	11 (11%)	13 (11%)	13 (9%)	4,455 (14%)	5,621 (15%)	5,865 (13%)
	Freestanding	64 (67%)	76 (66%)	99 (71%)	21,069 (68%)	23,358 (64%)	29,021 (65%)
OH	CMO	66 (20%)	73 (22%)	71 (22%)	10,212 (12%)	12,273 (14%)	12,921 (14%)
	EMO	74 (23%)	94 (29%)	90 (28%)	25,403 (31%)	49,095 (54%)	49,753 (54%)
	Freestanding	183 (57%)	159 (49%)	160 (50%)	45,869 (56%)	29,371 (32%)	29,894 (32%)
OK	CMO	1 (7%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	269 (5%)	277 (5%)	251 (4%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	14 (93%)	15 (94%)	17 (94%)	5,093 (95%)	5,141 (95%)	6,064 (96%)
OR	CMO	6 (8%)	6 (7%)	6 (6%)	703 (6%)	868 (6%)	958 (5%)
	EMO	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1,569 (13%)	2,506 (18%)	2,457 (13%)
	Freestanding	75 (91%)	80 (92%)	95 (93%)	9,554 (81%)	10,781 (76%)	15,046 (82%)
PA	CMO	9 (7%)	11 (9%)	12 (9%)	2,977 (4%)	4,605 (6%)	5,427 (7%)
	EMO	10 (8%)	18 (14%)	19 (14%)	8,862 (13%)	16,876 (23%)	18,706 (24%)
	Freestanding	106 (85%)	98 (77%)	104 (77%)	55,436 (82%)	51,888 (71%)	55,402 (70%)
RI	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	11 (100%)	11 (100%)	13 (100%)	2,996 (100%)	3,141 (100%)	3,452 (100%)
SC	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)



State		Schools			Students		
		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	EMO	0 (0%)	3 (8%)	3 (8%)	0 (0%)	2,190 (25%)	4,048 (31%)
	Freestanding	29 (100%)	33 (92%)	35 (92%)	5,487 (100%)	6,441 (75%)	8,984 (69%)
TN	CMO	1 (8%)	2 (12%)	2 (9%)	153 (6%)	484 (13%)	565 (11%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	11 (92%)	14 (88%)	20 (91%)	2,607 (94%)	3,203 (87%)	4,591 (89%)
TX	CMO	115 (27%)	167 (34%)	288 (53%)	28,359 (26%)	43,982 (34%)	75,727 (51%)
	EMO	4 (1%)	6 (1%)	8 (1%)	1,529 (1%)	3,458 (3%)	4,392 (3%)
	Freestanding	313 (72%)	325 (65%)	247 (46%)	77,279 (72%)	80,833 (63%)	68,951 (46%)
UT	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	6 (9%)	6 (8%)	0 (0%)	3,411 (12%)	3,905 (11%)
	Freestanding	58 (100%)	60 (91%)	66 (92%)	22,196 (100%)	23,958 (88%)	30,261 (89%)
VA	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	3 (100%)	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	240 (100%)	250 (100%)	179 (100%)
WI	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	4 (2%)	5 (2%)	5 (2%)	2,069 (6%)	2,423 (7%)	3,490 (10%)
	Freestanding	225 (98%)	215 (98%)	201 (98%)	33,503 (94%)	33,344 (93%)	32,778 (90%)
WY	CMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	EMO	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Freestanding	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	255 (100%)	304 (100%)	261 (100%)

## Methodological Notes

Data and statistics in this report come from information the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools collected for the [Public Charter Schools Dashboard](#).

### *Charter Management Organizations (CMOs) and Education Management Organizations (EMOs)*

We coded charter schools in our school-level database for the 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 school years as CMO or EMO based on the following reports:

- 2007-08: [CMO](#) & [EMO](#)
- 2008-09: [CMO](#) & [EMO](#)
- 2009-10: [CMO](#) & [EMO](#)

Several schools in the National Education Policy Center (NECP) reports were miscoded as charter schools and some charters in our database were missing from the reports. In these cases we had to investigate the EMO/CMO/freestanding status of the missing schools. As a result, the count of charter schools in this report may differ from the numbers presented in the NECP reports.

### *Charter School Demographics*

*Enrollment, Race/Ethnicity, Eligibility for Free or Reduced Price Lunch.* We collected school-level enrollment, race/ethnicity enrollment breakouts, and eligibility for free or reduced price lunch from official state department of education fall membership files. While some states report enrollment at multiple points during the academic year, we collected the demographic data from the fall count files to maintain consistency across states.

*School Performance.* We collected school-level performance data from state department of education websites. The percent of schools making AYP is out of the total number of charter schools in the category with AYP data. Schools that have been open for two or less years and some schools that serve alternative student populations do not have AYP data.

*Start-up & Conversion.* Start-up and conversion status refer to whether the charter schools are brand new schools or schools that converted from a traditional public school or a private school. We collected this information from state departments of education, charter school support organizations and resource centers, and individual schools.

*Geographic Location.* We used the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data to code the geographic location charter schools in our database. We collapsed the following categories to have four main categories:

- City: city, large; city, mid-size; city, small
- Suburb: suburb, large; suburb, mid-size; suburb, small
- Town: town, fringe; town, distant; town, remote
- Rural: rural, fringe; rural, distant; rural, remote

*Authorizer.* We collected information on each school's authorizer from state departments of education, charter school support organizations, and individual authorizers. We followed the categorization of authorizer type set forth by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA).

*Unionized Charter Schools.* We define a charter school as unionized if it had a collective bargaining agreement with a teachers' union or association. There were additional charter schools without collective bargaining agreements that hired teachers who were members of a teachers' union. These schools were not counted as being unionized. We collected union data for every charter school nationwide from the following sources: state departments of education, charter school support organizations and resource centers, charter school authorizers, national union organizations, and local affiliates of the national union organizations.

<sup>i</sup> There is not wide consensus regarding an official definition for CMOs and EMOs. Moreover, there has been some debate about whether specific providers should be considered CMOs or EMOs, including two of the larger providers, the KIPP Foundation and the Leona Group. The NEPC reports we used to code charter schools consider KIPP a CMO and Leona Group an EMO. However, the CRPE/Mathematica study of CMOs categorizes the KIPP Foundation as a franchise of schools rather than a CMO, primarily because each school has an autonomous school board that makes school-level decisions. The CRPE/Mathematica study categorizes the Leona Group as a school operations manager rather than an EMO, with the distinction that the Leona Group primarily provides back office support, rather than instructional and operational support. While the CRPE/Mathematica classification system makes more sophisticated distinctions between types of providers, the general understanding among educators, policymakers, researchers, and parents is that KIPP is a CMO and the Leona Group is an EMO. Therefore, for the purposes of this report, we present data for KIPP and Leona Group as management organizations.

<sup>ii</sup> Lake, Robin, Brianna Dusseault, Melissa Bowen, Allison Demeritt, and Paul Hill. (June 2010). *The national study of charter management organization (CMO) effectiveness: Report on Interim Findings*. Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education and Mathematica Policy Research.

<sup>iii</sup> The percentages may not add up to 100 percent. The Illinois State Board of Education does not report enrollment for the campuses of charter schools located in Chicago. Several of the charter schools with campuses in Chicago contract with different CMO and EMO providers. Consequently, we were unable to link enrollment to the different CMO and EMO providers at several charter schools and the enrollment percentages will not equal 100 percent.

<sup>iv</sup> See note above about charter school enrollment in IL.

<sup>v</sup> The charter school law in Mississippi was overturned in 2009 and the one charter school at that time converted to a traditional public school. In 2010, the MS state legislature passed a new charter school law. However, there are no charter schools operating in MS.