



# SCHOOL OVERVIEW

## Summit: Atlas

9601 35 <sup>th</sup> Ave SW, Seattle, WA 98104	
School Contact	(253) 987-1535
School Website	<a href="https://summitps.org/our-schools/summit-atlas-west-seattle/">https://summitps.org/our-schools/summit-atlas-west-seattle/</a>
Neighborhood Location	Seattle Public Schools
Leadership	School Leaders: Andrea Klein, Middle School; Dan Effland, High School
School Mission	To prepare a heterogeneous student population for success in a four-year college, and to be thoughtful, contributing members of society.
Education Program Terms & Design Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every Summit student has a dynamic Personalized Learning Plan and is able to access all of the learning tools and resources they need at any time.</li> <li>• Every Summit student has at least one adult mentor and coach, who individually supports them to set goals, make a plan to achieve those goals and develop in their Habits of Success. A mentor also serves as college counselor, coach, family liaison and advocate.</li> <li>• All Summit students engage in real-world experiences that allow them to apply their knowledge and explore their passions.</li> <li>• All Summit students are provided a college prep curriculum that meets or exceeds four-year college entrance requirements.</li> <li>• All teachers are supported to be high-performing with over 30 days of professional development built into the school year.</li> </ul>
Grades Served	6-12
First Year of Operation	2017 - 18
Total Student Enrollment	509 Students

## 2020-21 Student Demographics

### STUDENT GROUPS

Special Education	16.1%
Limited English	0%
Low Income	42.6%

### GENDER

Male	60.9%
Female	38.7%
Gender X	0.4%

### RACE / ETHNICITY

American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.6%
Asian	2.6%
Black / African American	28.9%
Hispanic / Latino of any race(s)	16.2%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.4%
Two or More Races	12.6%
White	38.7%

## INTRODUCTION

Charter renewal marks a critical juncture for a school, and the renewal decision is one of the Charter School Commission's most important responsibilities as a charter school authorizer. At renewal, the Commission must determine whether a school has met its public commitments to the children and families it serves, as well as to the community. The renewal process requires thorough analyses of a comprehensive body of quantitative and qualitative data based on annual performance reviews over the charter term; the school's renewal application; and a renewal site visit. It culminates in a Commission decision to renew or non-renew the charter.

This performance report constitutes the first stage of the renewal process which begins in the spring of the year before the contract expires. This report summarizes the school's performance record to date based on data required by the charter contract and the Commission's school performance standards. The report identifies weaknesses and concerns that might adversely impact the Commission's renewal decision or the length of a renewal term. This report *does not* contain a recommendation regarding charter renewal because the Commission does not yet have all information relevant to that decision. The school has thirty days to respond to this report.<sup>1</sup>

The school may respond to the performance report. In reviewing responses, the Commission will give particular attention and weight to factual corrections, clarifications, and updates for which the school provides documentation. In addition, the school must submit a renewal application. The renewal application provides an opportunity to go beyond the data contained in the performance report in supporting the school's case for renewal. It is also an opportunity to describe improvements that the school has undertaken or plans to undertake. The renewal application will also ask the school to articulate plans for the coming charter term, particularly with respect to plans that would require material changes to the existing contract terms.<sup>2</sup>

In the fall of the school's renewal year, the Commission will conduct a renewal site visit. The site visit provides an important opportunity for the Commission to experience a school's day-to-day operation, to observe the culture, and to gather qualitative and quantitative evidence that helps to document and illuminate school performance. When charter renewal is at stake, the visit plays a particularly important role in providing context for the school's overall record of performance and its plans for a new charter term.

Following completion of the renewal visit, the Commission will prepare a renewal inspection report followed by a renewal recommendation report. The renewal recommendation will present a recommendation for renewal or non-renewal and will summarize the evidence basis for the recommendation including relevant evidence from the performance report, the school's renewal application, the renewal visit, and any additional relevant performance information. The Commission is tentatively scheduled to make all renewal decisions before the end of the

---

<sup>1</sup> See R.C.W. § 28A.710.190(2).

<sup>2</sup> See R.C.W. § 28A.710.190(3).

calendar year.<sup>3</sup> Schools will have an opportunity to respond; to present testimony and supporting documents at a public meeting; to have legal representation; and to call witnesses. The Commission will document all decisions in writing with the reasons for the decision.<sup>4</sup>

Renewal Process Timeline		
Date	Timeframe	Activity
March - May of School's 4 <sup>th</sup> Year of Operation (2021)	March - May	Authorizer staff meets with each charter school to discuss the school's charter contract renewal, including the school's performance in comparison to the expectations established in the authorizer's performance frameworks
May 21	May 21 of charter school's 4 <sup>th</sup> year of operation	Authorizer issues performance report and contract renewal application guidance to charter school and posts performance report to authorizer's website <b>OR</b> Authorizer notifies charter school that it is ineligible for renewal based on reason(s) outlined in WAC 108-40-090; school may appeal this decision within 20 days of notice issuance; a public proceeding and authorizer action (per WAC 108-40-100) would replace the remainder of this timeline.
June 21	Within 30 days <sup>5</sup> of receipt of authorizer issued performance report	Charter school may submit a response to the performance report
July 12	July 12 - November 30	Public comment period opens
July 12	June 12 of charter school's 4 <sup>th</sup> year of operation	Charter school deadline to notify authorizer of intent to apply (NOI) for renewal of charter contract or cease operations at the expiration of charter contract term
August 6	August 6	Charter school renewal application deadline
September 3	August 16-September 3	Authorizer and charter school staff meet and develop renewal inspection priorities
October 15	October 15	Charter school renewal inspection deadline
November 1	Within 14 days of renewal inspection	Authorizer issues renewal inspection report
November 15	Within 10 days of receipt of renewal inspection report	Charter School may submit to the authorizer a written response to the renewal inspection report
November 30	November 30	Public comment deadline
November 19	November 19	Authorizer staff recommendation reports released to authorizing body (CSC or district board)
December 10	Within 20 Days of receipt of recommendation report	Charter school request to respond to recommendation report deadline
December 16	December authorizer meeting	Authorizer resolution meeting
June 30, 2022	December 17 – June 30	Establish the terms for the next charter contract; authorizing board and charter board both vote in public meetings to ratify new contract

<sup>3</sup> The sequencing and timeline for each stage of the renewal process will be based on the Commission's published Renewal Application Timeline (dated 5/21/21); however, the Commission will adapt this schedule based on school and Commission operational constraints in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

<sup>4</sup> See R.C.W. § 28A.710.190(3)-(4).

<sup>5</sup> Any reference to days (30, 20, 14, and 10) are defined as calendar days, excluding holidays, not working days.

## REPORT LAYOUT

The report is structure in alignment with the three Performance Frameworks: Academic, Organizational and Financial. The school’s performance is summarized by framework, including the Commission’s assessment of that performance. The last section of the report contains information regarding concerns the Commission has regarding a charter school’s performance that, if not remedied, may jeopardize the school’s position in seeking renewal.

## ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

The school’s academic performance is based on the standards and targets established in the Academic Performance Framework (APF) consistent with the requirements of Washington’s charter school law. The APF contains measures and metrics for student academic proficiency, student academic growth, achievement gaps, attendance, high school graduation rates and postsecondary readiness, and school-specific measures where applicable.<sup>6</sup>

The APF contains measures that have been grouped according to:

- 1. STATE AND FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY RESULTS answering the question:**  
Is the charter school meeting performance expectations based on the Washington School Improvement Framework?
- 2. GEOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS answering the question:**  
How are charter school students performing compared to the schools that students would otherwise attend?
- 3. COMPARISON TO SCHOOLS SERVING SIMILAR STUDENTS answering the question:**  
How are charter school students performing compared to schools serving similar students?
- 4. SCHOOL SPECIFIC ACADEMIC GOALS answering the question:**  
Did the school meet its school specific academic goals?

## ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE RATINGS

The APF measures combine or “roll up” to an overall academic rating. The overall rating is based on the school’s cumulative record of academic performance; however, the Commission gives particular attention to performance trends and weighs recent performance more heavily.<sup>7</sup> The overall rating helps provide clarity to schools and the public about the school’s academic performance and standing. It helps to ensure consistency in Commission decision-making and support parents as they navigate their public school options. Following are the rating tiers:

## RATINGS

Tier	Rating	Performance
1	<b>Exceeds Standard</b>	School is exceeding performance expectations and is on par with the highest-performing schools in the state.
2	<b>Meets Standard</b>	School is consistently meeting performance expectations.
3	<b>Does Not Meet Standard</b>	School shows weakness in one or more academic areas. Possible intervention.
4	<b>Falls Far Below Standard</b>	School is consistently failing to meet academic performance expectations. Likely intervention; possible revocation.

NOTE: If a school does not have at least one year of SBA data or if more than one of the four indicators is missing, an overall tier rating will not be calculated.

<sup>6</sup> See R.C.W. § 28A.710.170 (requiring school performance provisions based on a performance framework and specifying categories for measures and metrics).

<sup>7</sup> As mentioned above and below, the impact that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on performance data is a critical consideration for the Commission for this year’s renewal process.

## RENEWAL TIERS

Based upon the most current data combined with trend data from the life cycle of the current charter contract term, charter schools whose Academic Performance Framework scores result in:

- A Tier 1 or 2 are presumed to be renewed;
- A Tier 3 rating, renewal is in question; and
- A Tier 4 rating, non-renewal is presumed.

Data for academic performance derive primarily from results of the state's annual public school assessments. State assessment results from a school year are typically available in the fall of the following school year. The academic performance section of this report is based on data from the first three years of the school's operation. The Commission will incorporate data from the fourth year, 2020-21, as part of the renewal recommendation in the fall of 2021. To the extent that 2020-21 state accountability data are not available due to the COVID19 pandemic, the renewal recommendation will be based on data through the 2018-19 school year supplemented with more recent interim and qualitative data as the Commission deems necessary and appropriate.

# ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE RESULTS

## SUMMIT: ATLAS

	INDICATOR	MEASURE	Weight	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
1a	WSIF Score	All Students	50%	N/A	M	N/A
		Subgroups		N/A	M	N/A
2a1	Proficiency Geographic Comparison	ELA		D	M	N/A
		Math		D	E	N/A
		Science		N/A	N/A	N/A
2a2	Proficiency Subgroup Geog. Comparison	ELA		M	M	N/A
		Math		M	M	N/A
		Science		N/A	N/A	N/A
2b1	Student Growth Geog. Comparison	ELA		N/A	D	N/A
		Math		N/A	E	N/A
2b2	Student Subgroup Growth Geog. Comparison	ELA		N/A	D	N/A
		Math		N/A	E	N/A
2c1	Grad Rate Geog. Comparison	All	20%	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Subgroup		N/A	N/A	N/A
2d	EL Progress Geog. Comparison	All		F	M	N/A
		Subgroups		N/A	N/A	N/A
2e	Reg. Attendance Geog. Comparison	All		D	M	N/A
		Subgroups		D	M	N/A
2f	9th graders on track Geog. Comparison	All		M	D	N/A
		Subgroups		M	M	N/A
2g	Dual Credit Geog. Comparison	All		F	F	N/A
		Subgroups		F	F	N/A
3a	Proficiency Regression	ELA		M	D	N/A
		Math		E	E	N/A
		Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	
3b	Grad Rate Regression		N/A	N/A	N/A	
4a	School Specific Goals	#1	15%	M	E	N/A
		#2		N/A	N/A	N/A
Overall Tier Rating				N/A	2	N/A

E	Exceeds Standard
M	Meets Standard
D	Does Not Meet Standard
F	Falls Far Below Standard



## PERCEIVED WEAKNESSES OR CONCERNS:

For this year's charter contract renewal process, it is critical that the Commission consider the impact that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on students, families, schools and data systems. While schools responded admirably to the crisis by ensuring students and families were supported, the assessment and data systems that the state and Commission use to determine a school's impact on student academic achievement were not so responsive. The primary assessment (Smarter Balanced Assessment) that the state and the Commission uses to measure student academic outcomes was not administered during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 school-years.

Summit: Atlas has two years of academic performance data that reflect improved performance between its first and second year of operation. In 2017-18, the school's first year of operation and the first for which academic performance information is available, the school did not receive a Washington School Improvement Index (WSIF) rating (Indicator 1 in the APF) and had mixed performance across the rest of the APF indicators. It earned unsatisfactory ratings (Does Not Meet or Falls Far Below) in student proficiency ratings for math and English Language Arts (ELA), English Learning Program, Regular Attendance and Dual Credit Attainment based on the geographic comparison to schools' students would have otherwise attended. However, it reached satisfactory ratings (Meets) in Subgroup Proficiency and 9<sup>th</sup> Grade on Track on geographic comparisons and ELA proficiency outcomes based on regression analysis that considers performance of similar students statewide. For math proficiency outcomes based on regression analysis, Summit: Atlas received an "Exceeds" rating.

In 2018-19, the vast majority of Summit: Atlas' academic outcome data improved resulting in an overall Tier Rating of 2. This rating reflects, among other things, movement from "Does Not Meet" to "Meets" in ELA proficiency and movement from "Does Not Meet" to "Meets" on Regular Attendance. Summit: Atlas' student subgroup proficiency rating in both ELA and math remained at the "Meets" rating and received an "Exceeds" rating for both student growth in math and subgroup growth in math compared to schools students would have otherwise attended. Summit: Atlas also received its first Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) score and received a "Meets" rating from the Commission

Notwithstanding the school's progress from 2017-18 to 2018-19, there remain some academic performance categories in which the school is still falling short of expectations. Of particular note:

- Student growth, at both the aggregate and subgroup categories, in ELA earned a Does Not Meet rating based on Commission expectations in relation to schools students would otherwise attend.
- Student proficiency rating for ELA proficiency outcomes based on regression analysis that considers performance of similar students statewide.
- Dual credit attainment continues to earn a Falls Far Below rating based on Commission expectations in relation to schools the students would otherwise attend.

Overall, Summit: Atlas is meeting academic performance expectations based on 2018-19 outcomes; however, the COVID-19 pandemic prevented the assessment (Smarter Balanced Assessment) that the state and the Commission use to measure student academic outcomes from being administered during the 2019-20 and 2020-21 school-years. This lack of data presents both an opportunity and a challenge for both the Commission and Summit: Atlas regarding up to date outcome data regarding the impact Summit: Atlas is having on student academic outcomes. Summit: Atlas' ability to work with Commission staff to provide additional qualitative and quantitative information regarding student academic outcomes will be critical to the Commission's ability to fully assess Summit: Atlas' academic programming.

Commission staff look forward to working with Summit: Atlas throughout the renewal process to ensure that Summit: Atlas' impact is collectively understood.

## ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

“Organizational performance” refers to the school’s outcomes with respect to its legal obligations. The organizational performance standards measure the school’s compliance with legal and ethical requirements that are common to all charter schools. By focusing on common legal requirements, the organizational performance standards maximize each school’s operational autonomy consistent with the legislature’s intent for charter schools to serve as public school alternatives to traditional common schools.<sup>8</sup> This framework articulates these obligations in six categories: Education Program; Financial Management & Oversight; Governance & Reporting; Students, Parents & Employees; School Environment; and Other Obligations. Each category has subcategories aligned to the school’s obligations as articulated in the charter contract.

The Commission uses a binary rating system to assess organizational performance. The school either “meets” or “does not meet” the requirement. This binary system is consistent with the notion that the school either meets or does not meet minimum expectations for the various requirements such as reporting deadlines or health and safety or procedural obligations for students with disabilities.

## ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE RATINGS

No school or organization is perfect, and the existence of one or more “does not meet” ratings does not, in and of itself, indicate unsatisfactory organizational performance. The Commission looks for organizational performance that is predominantly compliant with no areas of repeated non-compliance. Based upon the most current data combined with trend data analysis from the life cycle of the current charter contract term:

- **Renewal is presumed** if a charter school’s performance meets the established expectations or whose actions demonstrates that remedies regarding deficiencies were successfully implemented.
- **Nonrenewal is presumed** if a charter school’s performance does not meet expectations or whose actions did not demonstrate that remedies were implemented regarding identified deficiencies.

The Commission rates organizational performance based primarily on data and results from the State Auditor’s Accountability Audit. This report is typically available 18 months following completion of the school’s July 1 to June 30 fiscal year. Thus, this section of the renewal report is based on results from the school’s first two years of operation (2017-18 and 2018-19). Where the state Accountability Audit raises concerns, the Commission will update with more current, unaudited compliance information. In addition, the Commission’s final renewal recommendation will incorporate organizational performance information from the school’s 2018-19 Accountability Audit.

Where there have been instances of non-compliance, the Commission staff will consider the following in the organizational performance analysis:

- 1) **Seriousness of the compliance issue.** For example, breach of health and safety requirements would generally be a more serious issue than the late filing of a report.
- 2) **Number and duration of non-compliance issues (non-communication or inability to work with Commission).** The Commission staff will weigh repeated non-compliance more heavily in its overall assessment.

---

<sup>8</sup> See R.C.W. § 28A.710.020.

- 3) **Timeliness of the remedy.** If the school has remedied the issue promptly on its own initiative or following notification from the Commission, the Commission staff will weigh the violation less severely than if the school has not remedied the issue promptly.
- 4) **Current status.** Although the Commission considers the school's complete performance history relevant and applicable, it will generally weigh recent performance and current compliance status more heavily than past performance.

# ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE RESULTS

## SUMMIT: ATLAS

	INDICATOR	MEASURE	2017-18	2018-19
1a	Education Program	Material Terms of Charter Contract	M	M
1b		Education Requirements	M	M
1c		Students with Disabilities Rights	M	M
1d		English Language Learner Rights	M	M
2a	Financial Management & Oversight	Financial Reporting and Compliance	M	M
2b		Generally Accepted Accounting Principles	M	M
3a	Governance & Reporting	Governance Requirements	M	M
3b		Management Accountability	M	M
3c		Reporting Requirements	D	M
4a	Students, Parents & Employees Rights	Rights of Students	M	M
4b		Recurrent Enrollment	N/A	M
4c		Teacher and Staff Credentials	M	M
4d		Employee Rights	M	M
4e		Background Checks	M	M
5a	School Environment	Facilities and Transportation	M	M
5b		Health and Safety	M	M
5c		Information Management	M	M
6a	School Specific Goals	#1	M	D
6b		#2	N/A	N/A

## PERCEIVED WEAKNESSES OR CONCERNS:

Summit: Atlas has predominantly met the Commission’s expectations for organizational performance in the two years in which audited data are available. In 2017-18, the school met the standard for 17 of 18 applicable organizational performance subcategories. The school did not meet expectations for the subcategory of Reporting Requirements for the Governance and Reporting indicator. The school was late on 3 of 28 submission requirements. The school remedied this issue and meet expectations for in this category the following school-year.

In 2018-19, the school again met the standard for 17 of 18 organizational performance subcategories. The school did not meet expectations for their school specific goal. The school established a goal that 85% of students would respond neutrally or positively to the question, “there is an adult at school that I trust.” The result was a reported 82% of students responding neutrally or positively to this question with a 100% response rate.

While audit data is not currently available for 2019-20, the Commission did issue Corrective Action to Summit: Atlas. Summit: Atlas worked cooperatively during the investigation process, which resulted in a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). A CAP is designed to return the school to compliance and prevent non-compliance in the future. Summit: Atlas will have successfully completed all elements of the CAP as of the end of the 2020-2021 school year and will no longer be subject to corrective action.

In sum, Summit: Atlas has had few organizational performance issues, is in process of remediation of the issues, and is currently in good standing. Therefore, the school’s overall record to date does not raise any concerns that would affect the school’s meeting the organizational performance criteria for contract renewal.

## FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

“Financial performance” refers to an assessment of a charter school’s financial health and viability. The Commission’s financial performance framework summarizes a school’s financial health based on two types of measures: “near term” indicators (measuring current viability) and “sustainability” indicators (measuring longer-term viability). The near-term indicators include Current Ratio, Unrestricted Days’ Cash, and Debt Default. The sustainability indicators include Total Margin, Debt-to-Asset Ratio, and Cash Flow. The Commission also considers enrollment variance as an informational measure but does not rate performance on this indicator. The measures incorporate historical (three-year) trends, current status, and future prospects in a way that, taken together, the measures provide an overall picture of financial health and identify areas of potential concern.

## FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE RATINGS

For each of the measures, the Commission has based targets on industry standards for not-for-profit financial management and authorizer best practices. The Commission uses data from the school’s year-end audited financial statements along with more current financial data from unaudited quarterly financial reports. The calculations are based on *all* school funds, not just the general fund. Some financial measures have different targets for the early years of operation (years 1-2) from subsequent years (years 3 and beyond) to reflect the realities of start-up financial operations. Thus, the ratings for years 1-2 are based on slightly different criteria from the ratings beginning in year 3.

The Commission rates financial performance based on the school’s audited financials as conducted either by the State Auditor’s Office or by an independent financial audit consistent with the requirements of the charter contract and charter school law. This financial performance review is based on the three years of audited financials that are currently available. The Commission reviews but does not formally evaluate the school’s unaudited financials for the current school year unless it has identified a prior cause for concern. The final renewal recommendation will incorporate findings from the school’s 2019-20 audited financials.

### Renewal Presumptions

Based upon the most current data combined with trend data analysis from life cycle of the current charter contract term:

- **Renewal is presumed** if a charter school’s financial performance demonstrates historic and future viability. In other words, a school who has demonstrated an ability to generate sufficient income to meet operating expenses and debt commitments is presumed to be renewed.
- **Nonrenewal is presumed** if a charter school’s financial performance demonstrates historic and future financial insolvency. In other words, a school that has demonstrated and/or is projecting an inability to pay its debts is presumed to be nonrenewed.

# FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE RESULTS

## SUMMIT: ATLAS

	INDICATOR	MEASURE	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
1a	Near Term Indicators	Current Ratio	M	M	M
1b		Unrestricted Days Cash	M	M	M
1c		Debt Default	M	M	M
2a	Sustainability Indicators	Total Margin	M	M	M
2b		Debt to Asset Ratio	M	M	M
2c		Cash Flow	N/A	M	M
	Info Only	Enrollment Variance	M	D	D

### PERCEIVED WEAKNESSES OR CONCERNS:

Over its first three years of operation, Summit: Atlas has met the Commission’s standard on every measure used to evaluate overall financial performance.

The only shortcoming is that it did not meet expectations for enrollment variance in 2018-19 and 2019-20; however, the Commission uses this measure for informational purposes only. Enrollment variance indicates whether or not the school is meeting its enrollment projections. As enrollment is a key driver of revenue, the variance information is a useful leading indicator to track the reliability of the revenue projections in the board-approved budget. In two of its first three years, Summit: Atlas’ enrollment variance fell below the Commission’s threshold of 95%. It is noteworthy, however, that the variance was 91.66% in 2018-19 and 85.56% in 2019-20.

Given that the school has met all of the Commission’s standards for financial performance, there are currently no concerns that would affect Summit: Atlas’ meeting the Commission’s financial performance criteria for charter renewal.





**MAILING ADDRESS**

P.O. Box 40996, Olympia, WA 98504-0996

**STREET ADDRESS**

1068 Washington Street SE, Olympia, WA 98501

[CHARTERSCHOOL.WA.GOV](http://CHARTERSCHOOL.WA.GOV)

**PHONE**

(360) 725-5511

**EMAIL**

[charterschoolinfo@k12.wa.us](mailto:charterschoolinfo@k12.wa.us)

