

# AGENDA

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

9300 Imperial Highway, Downey, CA 90242

Phone (562) 922-6128 Fax (562) 469-4399

### Board Member Remote Participation:

TO LISTEN BY TELEPHONE: (669) 900-9128

Meeting ID: 822 2518 9839

Passcode: 241814

TO LISTEN TO THE AUDIO STREAM ONLINE: <https://tinyurl.com/LACOEBoardMeeting>

Meeting ID: 822 2518 9839

Passcode: 241814

No. 24: 2024-2025

The full Board agenda will only be accessible through the LACOE Board of Education website at the following link: <https://www.lacoe.edu/Board-of-Education>. Procedure for addressing the Board is posted on the LACOE Board of Education [website](#). To request a disability-related accommodation under the ADA, please call Ms. Beatrice Robles at 562 922-6128 at *least* 24 hours in advance.

## Board Meeting

April 1, 2025

3:00 p.m.

### I. PRELIMINARY ACTIVITIES – 3:00 p.m.

- |                   |                            |
|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Dr. Johnson       | A. Call to Order           |
| Mrs. Foggy-Paxton | B. Pledge of Allegiance    |
| Dr. Duardo        | C. Ordering of the Agenda  |
| Dr. Johnson       | D. Approval of the Minutes |
|                   | 1. March 18, 2025          |

### II. COMMUNICATIONS: BOARD OF EDUCATION / SUPERINTENDENT / ASSOCIATIONS / PUBLIC

### III. PRESENTATIONS (None)

### IV. HEARINGS (None)

### V. REPORTS / STUDY TOPICS (None)

### VI. CONSENT CALENDAR RECOMMENDATIONS (None)

### VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Ms. Andrade | A. Adopt the Superintendent's Recommendation to Deny the Petition for <i>KIPP Sol Academy, Grades 5-8</i> : Appeal of a Renewal Petition Denied by the Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education with Attached Report |
| Ms. Andrade | B. Adopt the Superintendent's Recommendation to Authorize the Renewal Petition for <i>Jardin de la Infancia, Grades TK-1</i> : Renewal Petition with Attached Report   |
| Ms. Andrade | C. Approval of First Reading of Board Policy (BP) 3320 (Claims Against LACOE), Board Bylaw (BB) 9010 (Public Statements), and BB 9012 (Board Member Electronic Communications) (Enclosure)   |
| Ms. Andrade | D. Approval of Extension for County Board Action on the <i>Alma Fuerte Public School, Grades TK-8</i> : Renewal Petition to the Los Angeles County Office of Education   |
| Dr. Duardo  | E. Approval of Position Recommendation Report PRR 1.0 – April 2025   |

**VIII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

Dr. Duardo  
Dr. Duardo

- A. Governmental Relations
- B. Los Angeles County Board of Education Meeting Schedule, Establishment of Meeting Times, Future Agenda Items, Follow up

**IX. INTERDISTRICT AND EXPULSION APPEAL HEARINGS**

Dr. Johnson

- A. Los Angeles County Board of Education’s Decision on Interdistrict Attendance Appeals (Closed Session) (Enclosure)
  - 1. Thiago S. v. Mountain View SD
  - 2. Lexi S. v. Mountain View SD
  - 3. Sofia A. v. Mountain View SD
  - 4. Milan A. P. v. Castaic Union SD

Dr. Johnson

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

**MINUTES  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION  
9300 Imperial Highway  
Downey, California 90242-2890  
Tuesday, March 18, 2025**

A meeting of the Los Angeles County Board of Education was held on Tuesday, March 18, 2025, at the Los Angeles County Office of Education Board Room.

**PRESENT:** Ms. Michele Breslauer, Dr. Yvonne Chan, Mr. James Cross, Mrs. Andrea Foggy-Paxton, Ms. Betty Forrester, Dr. Theresa Montano, and Dr. Stanley Johnson, Jr.; Student Board Members: Ms. Jimena and Ms. Sanai.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Dr. Debra Duardo, Superintendent; Administrative Staff: Ms. Beatrice Robles, Principal Executive Assistant.

**PRELIMINARY ACTIVITIES**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Dr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Dr. Johnson read the LACOE Land Acknowledgement.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Dr. Chan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ORDERING OF THE AGENDA**

Dr. Duardo indicated that there were no changes to the Board agenda.

It was **MOVED** by Dr. Chan, **SECONDED** by Ms. Forrester, and **CARRIED** to approve the Board agenda as presented.

***Yes vote:** Ms. Jimena, Ms. Breslauer, Dr. Chan, Mr. Cross, Mrs. Foggy-Paxton, Ms. Forrester, Dr. Montano, and Dr. Johnson.*

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES -**

- March 4, 2025 - *The minutes were approved as presented.*

It was **MOVED** by Ms. Forrester, **SECONDED** by Dr. Chan, and **CARRIED** to approve March 4, 2025 minutes as presented.

***Yes vote:** Ms. Jimena, Dr. Chan, Mr. Cross, Mrs. Foggy-Paxton, Ms. Forrester, and Dr. Johnson.  
**Abstained:** Ms. Breslauer and Dr. Montano.*

## COMMUNICATIONS: BOARD / SUPERINTENDENT

Ms. Jimena said that she traveled to the Capitol last Tuesday to join the Governmental Relations staff on the hearing for legislative bill AB 320. She said it was a good visit and that she was happy to learn how the legislature approves the various bills.

Dr. Chan said met with Dr. Monte Perez last week regarding Dual Enrollment. Dr. Chan invited the County Board to participate in the upcoming ACCBE free events and webinars.

Mrs. Foggy Paxton mentioned that previously in another board meeting, Dr. Duardo had mentioned donations from the Greater LA Education Foundation going towards staff and families impacted by the fires and that in addition to this, there are new funds to replace the 3,000 chrome books that were destroyed in the fires and that efforts continue to support both the employees, families, and students who have been impacted by the fire. Mrs. Foggy Paxton said she attended the Civic Week event at Hoover Institution at Stanford in the last couple of weeks. She said that more than ever, students need to learn how our Government works and how it works for us. She said that this is really important for our County schools as well as for our local education agencies to really examine how we are preparing students to engage and participate in our communities and to improve civic engagement.

Mrs. Forrester called for a moment of silence and recognition of the escalation of violence in the Middle East, where she said millions of children are without basic needs, food, medicine, water, housing and safety. Ms. Forrester said it bothers her that at the County level, that the Board does not have any impact on decisions on this matter. However, she said that what we do have impact on is on the children in the Los Angeles County and what is going on with hundreds of educators receiving reduction in force notification and hundreds of families who are being impacted because of the loss of jobs to educators and support staff, especially in the Pasadena area. She is aware that there are regulations and that we have seen a trend in loss of enrollment, but that the Board should think about other ways that we can bridge or help as the need for educators, counselors and social workers are needed in our schools more than ever. Ms. Forrester said that RIF notices are going to cause a real disruption in communities as well as possible school closures. Ms. Forrester asked that the County Board think about how we can help at the county level to support districts as they are going through this.

Dr. Johnson indicated that through LACOE's CIS Diversity and Equity division, he served on a panel entitled, *From Beyond the Schoolhouse to Supporting the African American Learner to the Equity Lead Grant*. He said it was a great opportunity to represent the County Board and work with other counties and scale the work where we can really focus on African American families.

Dr. Debra Duardo, Superintendent, provided the following highlights to the County Board:

### History Day LA

- LACOE's Curriculum & Instructional Services hosted History Day LA on March 1, 2025, at San Gabriel High School.
- 548 students from 35 schools across 27 districts participated, including 5 private schools.
- Judges selected 65 projects to advance to California History Day in May, representing 12 school districts, including first-time competitor Compton Unified.
- Demographic data was collected and will be presented to the Board in May.

- The Center for History-Social Science remains committed to ensuring the competition reflects LA County’s diversity.

### **Cycle of Improvement Series**

- The Center for District Capacity Building is enhancing support for Differentiated Assistance districts and charter schools through a four-day Cycle of Improvement series. This training helps LEAs apply Improvement Science to strengthen systems and practices for better student outcomes.

### **Universal Prekindergarten (UPK) Institute**

- On March 4, 2025, 450 early educators gathered at Luminarias in Monterey Park for LACOE’s third quarterly UPK Institute, Shaping Young Minds: Igniting Curiosity and Inspiring Innovation. These institutes support local educational agencies in implementing transitional kindergarten for all four-year-olds by 2025-26.
- Keynote speaker Dr. Denisha Jones spoke on reclaiming the early years through joy and play. Breakout sessions covered self-regulation, inquiry science, classroom environment, and fostering creativity.
- The final UPK Institute of the year, set for June 3, will focus on hands-on learning to spark curiosity and lifelong engagement.

### **Quality Start Los Angeles (QSLA) – 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary**

- On March 8, nearly 400 early learning professionals celebrated a decade of quality improvement through QSLA at Quiet Cannon in Montebello. Since 2015, QSLA has served 1,235 early learning providers—770 centers and 465 family child homes—impacting 44,442 children. Nearly 150 providers, engaged since QSLA’s inception, received certificates of appreciation signed by their County Supervisor.
- On March 4, 2025, the L.A. County Board of Education recognized QSLA’s six consortium partners for a decade of advancing early childhood education. A week later, the L.A. County Board of Supervisors commended enrolled providers for their commitment to high-quality early learning.

### **Meeting with Probation (Dr. Perez attended along with department heads that serve Probation schools).**

- I attended a half-day meeting with Probation on March 10 to discuss the coordination and implementation of the Global/Facility Plan presented to the Board of Supervisors.
- Working group meetings will begin soon, and we will provide updates as progress is made.

### **COMMUNICATIONS: HEAD START POLICY COUNCIL**

Ms. Elizabeth Norbut provided a Head Start Policy Council report to the County Board.

### **COMMUNICATIONS: PUBLIC**

Mr. David Olivares, Teacher at Los Padrinos addressed the County Board.

### **PRESENTATIONS**

## **RECOGNITION OF THE 2024-25 VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS COMPETITION AND EVENTS**

Ms. Jeannine Flores, STEAM Coordinator and Mrs. Dotti Ysais, Director of Online Learning Project provided highlights and accomplishments in the Arts over the past school year through the Center for Distance and Online Learning, including Funding for the Arts from the BOS, and the approval of Board Resolution No. 41 which reaffirm equitable access.

The County Board and Superintendent recognized the 2024-25 Visual and Performing Arts program and student participation in the Poetry Out Loud event. Ms. Jeannine Flores, Arts and Steam Coordinator provided a presentation to the County Board, including video of winning student, Selah Johnson from Archer School for Girls in Los Angeles. The runner up was Sonia Carrillo from Crescenta Valley high School in Glendale Unified School District. Ms. Flores indicated that students competed in the regional Poetry Out Loud competition on February 5, 2025.

Ms. Flores also highlighted a new student event that took place this year: the Scholastic Art and Writing Awards, which is presented by the Alliance for Young Artists and Writers. Over 7,000 students submitted visual art, media art or writing in 28 different categories.

Ms. Flores also recognized March as Arts Education Month and the one year of implementation of Proposition 28 (Arts and Music in Schools Funding and Accountability Act, approved by voters.) Ms. Flores reported that submissions show many districts had not utilized the funding yet. She said that districts are struggling with many implementation factors including hiring, space, declining enrollment, and confusion on the funding and she encouraged the County Board to be an advocate for policy language change for Prop. 28.

Ms. Ysais invited the County Board to the April 4, 2025 event at the campus of Poly High School in the LBUSD.

The County Board thanked Ms. Jeannine Flores and team for their presentation and especially the video, which are inspiring and encouraging to see. Dr. Johnson congratulated all students, families and educators who have given their time and talent to participate and support in these LACOE programs and events.

**Ms. Sanai arrived at 4:00 p.m.**

## **HEARINGS**

### **PUBLIC HEARING ON *CRETE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL, GRADES TK-6*: APPEAL OF A PETITION TO RENEW A CHARTER PREVIOUSLY DENIED BY LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION**

Education Code Section 47607 and 47605(b) provides that within 60 days after receiving a request for a charter petition, the County Board shall hold a public hearing on the provisions of the charter of Crete Academy Charter School, Grades TK-6, and the Board shall consider the level of support for the charter renewal by teachers employed by the districts, other employees of the district, and parents.

The County Board had questions on this matter.

Mr. Brett Mitchell, Executive Director and Chief Business Officer, and Dr. Crystal Tung, Principal addressed the County Board in support of the Public Hearing on the charter petition renewal of Crete Academy Charter School.

The County Board had questions regarding this Board item.

Ms. Sarah Ziegenhorn spoke in opposition of Crete Academy Charter School.

The following individuals spoke in support of Crete Academy Charter School: Kaylie Cortez, Ramon Williams, Ramses Williams, Andrea Palmer, Nya Lewis, Stephanie Moore, David Ritcherson, Margaret White, Arcella White, and Raul Mayem.

The County Board took a brief recess: 5:10-5:25 p.m.

## **REPORTS / STUDY TOPICS**

### **UPDATE ON THE BUSINESS ENHANCEMENT SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION (BEST) PROJECT**

Mr. Jose R. Gonzalez, Chief Technology Officer, introduced Ms. Yumeka Seabrooks, Director of the BEST Project, who provided the report to the County Board.

The County Board had questions related to this item.

There were no public speakers on this item.

The County Board and Superintendent thanked Mr. Gonzalez and Ms. Seabrooks for the presentation and for their work on the BEST Project.

## **CONSENT CALENDAR RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **ADOPTION OF BOARD RESOLUTION NO. 47: DECLARING APRIL AS “SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH” AND APRIL 30, 2025, AS “DENIM DAY” AT THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION**

The Superintendent recommended that the County Board approve Board Resolution No. 47.

### **ADOPTION OF BOARD RESOLUTION NO. 48: RECOGNIZING DOLORES HUERTA DAY ON APRIL 10, 2025**

The Superintendent recommended that the County Board approve Board Resolution No. 48.

### **ADOPTION OF BOARD RESOLUTION NO. 49: RECOGNIZING ARMENIAN GENOCIDE REMEMBRANCE DAY ON APRIL 24, 2025**

The Superintendent recommended that the County Board approve Board Resolution No. 49.

### **ADOPTION OF BOARD RESOLUTION NO. 50: RECOGNIZING NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH IN APRIL 2025**

The Superintendent recommended that the County Board approve Board Resolution No. 50.

### **ADOPTION OF BOARD RESOLUTION NO. 51: RECOGNIZING EARTH DAY AS APRIL 22, 2025**

The Superintendent recommended that the County Board approve Board Resolution No. 51.

### **ADOPTION OF BOARD RESOLUTION NO. 52: TO RECOGNIZE APRIL 2025, AS NATIONAL ARAB AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH**

The Superintendent recommended that the County Board approve Board Resolution No. 52.

**ACCEPTANCE OF PROJECT FUNDS NO. 49**

The Superintendent recommended that the County Board approve the Acceptance of Project Funds No. 49.

**APPROVAL OF RESCISSION AND REVERSION OF OUTDATED BOARD POLICIES AND BOARD BYLAWS**

The Superintendent recommended that the County Board approve the Rescission and Reversion of Outdated Board Policies and Board Bylaws.

There were no public speakers on this item.

It was **MOVED** by Dr. Chan, **SECONDED** by Dr. Montano, and **CARRIED** to approve the Consent Calendar Recommendations.

*Yes vote: Ms. Jimena, Ms. Sanai, Ms. Breslauer, Dr. Chan, Mr. Cross, Mrs. Foggy-Paxton, Ms. Forrester, Dr. Montano, and Dr. Johnson.*

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**APPROVAL OF HEAD START/EARLY HEAD START 2025-26 CONSOLIDATED FUNDING APPLICATION WITH ATTACHED STAFF REPORT**

The Superintendent recommended that the County Board approve the Head Start/Early Head Start 2025-26 Consolidated Funding Application.

It was **MOVED** by Dr. Chan, **SECONDED** by Dr. Montano, and **CARRIED** to approve the Head Start/Early Head Start 2025-26 Consolidated Funding Application.

Mr. Luis Bautista and Dr. Ana Campos provided the report to the County Board.

The County Board did not have any questions regarding this item.

There were no public speakers on this item.

*Yes vote: Ms. Jimena, Ms. Sanai, Ms. Breslauer, Dr. Chan, Mr. Cross, Mrs. Foggy-Paxton, Ms. Forrester, Dr. Montano, and Dr. Johnson.*

**APPROVAL OF LACOE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL AND POSITION RECOMMENDATION REPORT PRR 2.0 – MARCH 2025**

The Superintendent recommended that the County Board approve the LACOE Legislative Proposal and Position Recommendation Report PRR 2.0 for March 2025.

It was **MOVED** by Dr. Chan, **SECONDED** by Ms. Forrester, and **CARRIED** to approve the LACOE Legislative Proposal and Position Recommendation Report for March 2025.

The County Board did not have any questions regarding this item.

There were no public speakers on this item.

*Yes vote: Ms. Jimena, Ms. Sanai, Ms. Breslauer, Dr. Chan, Mr. Cross, Mrs. Foggy-Paxton, Ms. Forrester, Dr. Montano, and Dr. Johnson.*



## **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

### **GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS**

Ms. Pam Gibbs, Director of Governmental Relations, provided a report to the County Board.

### **LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING SCHEDULE, ESTABLISHMENT OF MEETING TIMES, FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS, AND BOARD FOLLOW UP**

Dr. Perez indicated that the next Board meeting would be on April 1, 2025.

### **LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION'S DECISION ON INTERDISTRICT AND ATTENDANCE APPEALS**

#### **~~ISABELLA E. V. CLAREMONT USD~~ – *Abandonment***

##### **AXEL A V. AZUSA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

The proceedings were conducted in closed session to reach a decision on the interdistrict attendance appeal. Ms. Vibiana Andrade, General Counsel represented the Los Angeles County Board of Education. Ms. Alicia Garoupa, Chief Wellness and Support Services Officer, and Dr. Sonya Smith, Director III for Student Support Services, Los Angeles County Office of Education, were also present.

The appellant was not present but was represented by his guardian, Ms. Kensy Hernandez. Ms. Erin Kremer, Administrator of Student Support Services and Special Education, represented Azusa Unified School District.

Four affirmative votes of the Board are required for an interdistrict appeal to be granted. A roll call vote was taken. Voting yes were: Dr. Chan, Mrs. Foggy-Paxton, Ms. Forrester, Dr. Montañaño, Ms. Breslauer, and Dr. Johnson. The appeal was granted.

##### **GRACE T. V. MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT**

The proceedings were conducted in closed session to reach a decision on the interdistrict attendance appeal. Ms. Vibiana Andrade, General Counsel represented the Los Angeles County Board of Education. Ms. Alicia Garoupa, Chief Wellness and Support Services Officer, and Dr. Sonya Smith, Director III for Student Support Services, Los Angeles County Office of Education, were also present.

The appellant was not present but was represented by her mother, Mrs. Mei Cai. Mr. George Schonborn, Director of Pupil Personnel Services, represented Mountain View School District.

Four affirmative votes of the Board are required for an interdistrict appeal to be granted. A roll call vote was taken. Voting yes were: Dr. Chan, Mrs. Foggy-Paxton, Ms. Forrester, Dr. Montañaño, Ms. Breslauer, and Dr. Johnson. The appeal was granted.

##### **CADENCE H. V. BONITA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

The proceedings were conducted in closed session to reach a decision on the interdistrict attendance appeal. Ms. Vibiana Andrade, General Counsel represented the Los Angeles County Board of Education. Ms. Alicia Garoupa, Chief Wellness and Support Services Officer, and Dr. Sonya Smith, Director III for Student Support Services, Los Angeles County

Office of Education, were also present.

The appellant was not present but was represented by her parents, Mr. David Herrera and Mrs. Antoinette Herrera. Mr. Steven Patterson, Senior Director of Student Services, represented Bonita Unified School District.

Four affirmative votes of the Board are required for an interdistrict appeal to be granted. A roll call vote was taken. Voting yes were: Dr. Chan, Mrs. Foggy-Paxton, Ms. Forrester, Dr. Montaña, Ms. Breslauer, and Dr. Johnson. The appeal was granted.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

It was **MOVED** by Dr. Chan, **SECONDED** by Ms. Breslauer, and **CARRIED** to adjourn the Board meeting.

*Yes vote: Ms. Breslauer, Dr. Chan, Mr. Cross, Mrs. Foggy-Paxton, Ms. Forrester, Dr. Montano, and Dr. Johnson.*

This meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Item VII. Recommendation / Public Hearing

A. Adopt the Superintendent’s Recommendation to Deny the Petition for *KIPP Sol Academy, Grades 5-8: Appeal of a Renewal Petition Denied* by the Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education with Attached Report

a. Staff Findings on the Renewal Petition for *KIPP Sol Academy, Grades 5-8*, Pursuant to Education Code Sections 47605, 47607 and 47607.2

The KIPP Sol Academy (KIPP Sol) appeal of a renewal petition is presented to the Los Angeles County Board of Education (County Board) pursuant to Education Code (EC) sections 47605, 47607, and 47607.2. The renewal process requires the authorizer to evaluate both the past performance of the charter school and whether the renewal petition meets the criteria for approval. KIPP Sol is currently authorized by the Los Angeles County Board of Education.

Charter renewal is governed by EC 47605, 47607, and 47607.2 and the California Code of Regulations, Title 5 (5 CCR) sections 11966.4 and 11966.5. The California Department of Education has designated KIPP Sol as a middle performing school. As such, EC 47607(c)(2) and 47607.2(a) do not apply. Critical components of the applicable laws are as follows:

**EC 47607(c)(1)** sets an additional criterion for determining whether to grant a charter renewal, the charter authority shall consider the performance of the charter school on the state and local indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5.

**EC 47607(e)** Notwithstanding subdivisions (c) and subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 47607.2, the chartering authority may deny renewal of a charter school upon finding that the school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial fiscal or governance factors or is not serving all pupils who wish to attend, as documented pursuant to subdivision (d).

**EC 47607.2(b)** states, in relevant part:

- (1) for all charter schools for which paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of Section 47607 and subdivision (a) of this section do not apply, the chartering authority shall consider the schoolwide performance and performance of all subgroups of pupils served by the charter school on the state indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5 and the performance of the charter school on the local indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5.
- (2) The chartering authority shall provide greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.
- (3) In addition to the state and local indicators, the chartering authority shall consider clear and convincing evidence showing either of the following:
  - (A) The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year’s progress for each year in school.
  - (B) Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.
- (4) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) shall be demonstrated by verified data, as defined in subdivision (c).

Verified data is defined as data derived from nationally recognized, valid, peer-reviewed, and reliable sources that are externally produced.

**5 CCR 11966.5(c)(1-2)** provides the considerations and criteria to be used by a county board for making a determination as to whether to renew a charter:

- (1) When considering a petition for renewal, the county board of education shall consider the past performance of the school’s academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement, if any.
- (2) The county board of education may deny a petition for renewal of a charter school only if [it] makes written factual findings, specific to the particular petition, setting forth facts to support one or more of the grounds for denial set forth, as applicable, in **EC 47605(c) or failure to meet one of the criteria set forth in EC section 47607**. (Emphasis added)

**EC 47607(a)(5)(b)** states that renewals of charters are governed by the standards and criteria in 47605, and shall include, but not be limited to, a reasonably comprehensive description of any new requirement of charter schools enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.

**EC 47605(c)** requires a governing board to be guided by the intent of the legislature that charter schools should become an integral part of the education system and that a charter be granted if the governing board is satisfied that granting the charter is consistent with sound educational practice.

**EC 47605(c)** further states that a governing board may only deny a petition if it provides written factual findings specific to the petition that supports one or more of the following findings:

- (1) The charter school presents an unsound educational program.
- (2) The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program.
- (3) The petition does not contain the required number of signatures.  
*(Not applicable to a renewal petition)*
- (4) The petition does not contain an affirmation of specified assurances.
- (5) The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of 15 required elements of a charter.
- (6) The petition does not contain a declaration of whether or not the charter school shall be deemed the exclusive public employer of the employees of the charter school for purpose of Chapter 10.7.

The County Board shall evaluate the petition according to the criteria and procedures established in law and may only deny the petition if it provides written findings addressing the reasons for the denial.

A summary of key findings is presented through the table on the following page.

The complete Report of the Findings of Fact on the renewal petition for *KIPP Sol Academy, Grades 5-8*, is attached.

| KIPP Sol Academy Charter School Petition for Renewal  |  |  | Meets Requirements* |
|---|--|--|---------------------|
| <b>EC 47607(c), EC 47607.2(a) and EC 47607.2(b): Academic performance level</b>   |  |  |                     |
| <b>Finding 1</b>  | The charter school provided evidence it met one of the statutory criteria for renewal. |  | No                  |
| <b>EC 47605(c): Failure to meet the criteria under Findings 2-5 is grounds for denial.</b>  |  |  |                     |
| <b>Finding 2</b>  | Sound Educational Practice   |  | Yes                 |
| <b>Finding 3</b>  | Ability to Successfully Implement Intended Program                                     |  | No                  |
| <b>Finding 4</b>  | Affirmation of Specified Conditions  |  | Yes                 |
| <b>Finding 5:</b><br>The charter petition contains a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements.   | 1  | Description of Educational Program   | Yes*                |
|   | 2  | Measurable Pupil Outcomes  | Yes*                |
|   | 3  | Method for Measuring Pupil Progress  | Yes                 |
|   | 4  | Governance Structure   | Yes*                |
|   | 5  | Employee Qualifications  | Yes*                |
|   | 6  | Health and Safety Procedures   | Yes                 |
|   | 7  | Racial and Ethnic Balance  | Yes*                |
|   | 8  | Admission Requirements   | Yes                 |
|   | 9  | Annual Independent Financial Audits  | Yes*                |
|   | 10   | Suspension and Expulsion Procedures  | Yes                 |
|   | 11   | Retirement Coverage  | Yes                 |
|   | 12   | Public School Attendance Alternatives  | Yes                 |
|   | 13   | Post-employment Rights of Employees  | Yes                 |
|   | 14   | Dispute Resolution Procedures  | Yes                 |
|   | 15   | Closure Procedures   | Yes                 |
| <b>Finding 6:</b>   | Serving All Students Without Fiscal or Governance Concerns                             |  | Yes                 |
| <b>Finding 7:</b><br>The charter petition meets the additional statutory requirements EC 47605 (d), (f) – (i), (l) – (n)  | (d)  | Standards, Assessments and Parent Consultation   | Qualifies           |
|   | (f)  | Employment is Voluntary  | Qualifies           |
|   | (g)  | Pupil Attendance is Voluntary  | Qualifies           |
|   | (h)  | Effect on Authorizer and Financial Projections<br>Facilities, Administrative Services, Civil Liability and Financial Statements,<br>Nonprofit Board Member Information | Qualifies           |
|   | (i)  | Targets Academically Low Achieving Pupils**  | Qualifies           |
|   | (l)  | Teacher Credentialing  | Qualifies           |
|   | (m)  | Transmission of Audit Report   | Qualifies           |
|   | (n)  | Parent Involvement is Voluntary  | Qualifies           |
| <p>*Elements marked as meeting requirements may need further explanation, adjustment or technical changes; however, they are reasonably comprehensive and/or substantively comply with regulatory guidance and the LACOE standard of review described in Board Policy and the Superintendent’s Administrative Regulations.</p> <p>**Charters created to target academically low achieving pupils are given priority for authorization.</p> <p>^There are indicators of potential civil liability effects upon the authorizer.</p> |  |  |                     |

b. The County Board evaluated the petition according to the criteria and procedures established in law, including providing greater weight to the measures of academic performance, and may deny the renewal petition if it provides written findings of fact addressing the reasons for denial. The recommendation to deny the KIPP Sol renewal petition is in accordance with *EC 47607.2(b)* and *EC 47605(c)(2)*:

1. KIPP Sol failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to pupils of the school.
2. Closure of the charter school is in the best interest of pupils.
3. The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.

LACOE staff will present the report to the County Board.

Los Angeles County Office of Education  
Charter School Office  
Date: April 1, 2025

Staff Findings on the *KIPP Sol Academy Charter School*, Grades 5-8  
Appeal of a Renewal Petition Denied by the Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The petition for *KIPP Sol Academy* (KIPP Sol) is to renew the charter for a grades 5-8 school with a current enrollment of approximately 461 students. The school is located at 4800 E. Cesar Chavez Avenue, Los Angeles, CA, 90022 within the geographic boundary of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). KIPP Sol was originally authorized by the LAUSD Board of Education on October 4, 2011. On November 15, 2016, the charter school was renewed for a five-year term.

On October 17, 2024, the petition to renew KIPP Sol was submitted to the LAUSD Charter Schools Division as a Middle-performing charter school, seeking a five-year charter term from July 1, 2025, to June 30, 2030. On January 14, 2025, the LAUSD Board of Education denied the renewal petition for KIPP Sol and adopted the District's Findings of Fact in Support of Denial. On January 21, 2025, KIPP Sol submitted its renewal petition on appeal to the Los Angeles County Board of Education (County Board).

KIPP Sol is operated by KIPP SoCal Public Schools (KIPP SoCAL), a California nonprofit public benefit corporation. At its February 1, 2024, board meeting, KIPP SoCal voted to close three (3) of its schools: KIPP Pueblo Unido and KIPP Generations both authorized by LAUSD and KIPP Poder authorized by the County Board. KIPP SoCal currently operates 17 charter schools, 15 of which are authorized by LAUSD, one (1) authorized by San Diego Unified School District and one (1) by the Compton Unified School District.

**Mission and Vision:** The petition states the charter school's mission as:

“Together with families and communities, Sol and KIPP SoCal will create a joyful, academically excellent school that prepares students with the skills and confidence to pursue the paths they choose — college, career and beyond — so they can lead fulfilling lives and create a more just world.”

The school's vision states, “Sol and KIPP SoCal believe in a world where every child can grow up free to create the future they want for themselves and their community.”

**Students Served by the School:** KIPP Sol serves students in grades 5-8, and the petition states enrollment is drawn mainly from East Los Angeles and surrounding communities.

Per California Department of Education Census Day enrollment data, the 2023-24 enrollment at KIPP Sol was 488 students, with the following demographics: 99% Hispanic or Latino; 0.4% African American or Black; 0% Two or More Races; 0.2% Asian and 0.4% White; 86.7% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students (SED); 12.9% Students with Disabilities (SWD); 19.5% English Learners (ELs); 1.4% Homeless Youth (HY) and 0.6% Foster Youth (FY).



Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table 1: KIPP Sol 2023-2024  
Enrollment by Ethnicity**

| Student Groups  | Number Enrolled | Percent of Total Enrollment |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| All             | 488             | 100                         |
| AA/Black        | 2               | 0.4                         |
| American Indian | 0               | 0.0                         |
| Asian           | 1               | 0.2                         |
| Filipino        | 0               | 0.0                         |
| Hispanic        | 483             | 99.0                        |
| Pac Islander    | 0               | 0.0                         |
| Two or more     | 0               | 0.0                         |
| White           | 2               | 0.4                         |

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp> Retrieved 1-29-25

**Table 2: KIPP Sol 2023-2024  
Enrollment by Student Group**

| Student Groups | Number Enrolled | Percent of Total Enrollment |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| EL             | 95              | 19.5                        |
| Foster         | 3               | 0.6                         |
| Homeless       | 7               | 1.4                         |
| Migrant        | 2               | 0.4                         |
| SED            | 423             | 86.7                        |
| SWD            | 63              | 12.9                        |

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp> Retrieved 1-29-25

**Table 3: KIPP Sol Enrollment by Year and Grade**

| Year    | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Total |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| 2017-18 | 133     | 127     | 122     | 122     | 504   |
| 2018-19 | 134     | 131     | 123     | 118     | 506   |
| 2019-20 | 130     | 127     | 128     | 118     | 503   |
| 2020-21 | 129     | 134     | 124     | 126     | 513   |
| 2021-22 | 133     | 124     | 126     | 118     | 501   |
| 2022-23 | 128     | 126     | 119     | 121     | 494   |
| 2023-24 | 120     | 126     | 125     | 117     | 488   |

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp> CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Enrollment by School (1981-2022) <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesistenr8122.asp> Retrieved 1-29-25

**Reason for Denial by the Local District**

The Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education (LAUSD Board) denied the renewal petition for KIPP Sol based on written findings of fact taking into account *Education Code (EC)* sections EC 47605, EC 47607, and EC 47607.2 and the *California Code of Regulations, Title 5 (5 CCR)* that govern charter renewal.

**EC 47607.2 (b)(1)** - For all charter schools for which paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of Section 47607 and subdivision (a) of this section do not apply, the chartering authority shall consider the schoolwide performance and performance of all subgroups of pupils served by the charter school on the state indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5 and the performance of the charter school on the local indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5.

(2) The chartering authority shall provide greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.

## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

(3) *In addition to the state and local indicators, the chartering authority shall consider clear and convincing evidence showing either of the following:*

- (A) *The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school.*
- (B) *Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.*

LAUSD Board Finding of Fact: As a Middle performing charter school, KIPP Sol Academy failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to pupils of the charter school.

- KIPP Sol did not attain measurable increases in academic achievement schoolwide and for numerically significant student groups based on the California School Dashboard (ELA and Math).
- The charter school provided one year of verified data disaggregated by grade levels; however, the verified data was not clear and convincing. The data indicated that the majority of grade levels and student groups met one year's progress in ELA. However, the data also indicated that the majority of grade levels and student groups did not meet one year's progress in Math. Therefore, considering the limited data provided, as well as the noted results, the charter school did not provide clear and convincing evidence showing the charter school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school.
- The charter school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to the pupils of the charter school.
- Following consideration of KIPP Sol's schoolwide performance and performance of its numerically significant student groups on the California Dashboard, while providing greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance, and considered the lack of clear and convincing evidence showing the charter school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, defined as one year's progress for each year in school, and further analysis considering the performance of resident schools where students may otherwise attend, the LAUSD Board found that closure of the charter school is in the best interests of students.

**EC 47605(c)(2)** - *The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.*

LAUSD Board Finding of Fact: Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.

- KIPP Sol experienced continued declines in ELA and Math, and the charter school's actions did not yield higher academic outcomes for all students, and the majority of numerically significant student groups.
- In its renewal application documents KIPP SoCal provided information that included an explanation that the charter school's low performance on the 2023 Dashboard was in part due to "post-pandemic teacher and leader staffing challenges." KIPP SoCal further reported that, "During the 2022-2023 school year, every member of Sol's leadership team was new to their role, and more than 50% of classroom positions were either vacant or held by teachers in their first

## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

year of teaching.” The turnover raises concerns that the instability has impacted the school's academic progress, therefore leading the LAUSD Charter Schools Division to determine the charter school is unlikely to successfully implement the program.

Any of the above findings may be cause for denial of a renewal petition.

### Response from the Petitioner

The petitioner provided a written response to the findings adopted by the LAUSD Board and submitted it as part of the petition package. The response was considered during the review process.

### Appeal to the Los Angeles County Board of Education

The County Board held a Public Hearing to determine support for the renewal petition on February 11, 2025. At the Public Hearing, six (6) people spoke in support of the school: two (2) parents; two (2) teachers; one (1) counselor; and one (1) student. One (1) representative from the LAUSD Charter Schools Division spoke in opposition of the renewal petition.

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION REVIEW PROCESS

**Review Criteria:** The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Charter School Review Team (Review Team) considered the petition according to the requirements of the *Education Code* and other pertinent laws, guidance established in the *California Code of Regulations* Title 5, County Board Policy and the Superintendent’s Administrative Regulations.<sup>1</sup>

LACOE has adopted the petition review criteria established in 5 CCR section 11967.5.1(a-g) except where LACOE determined that the regulations provide insufficient direction or where they are not applicable because the structure or responsibility of the County Board and LACOE differ from those of the State Board of Education (SBE) and the California Department of Education (CDE). In these instances, LACOE developed its own local review criteria or added criteria to those developed by CDE to reflect the needs of the County Board as the authorizer and LACOE as the monitoring and oversight agency. These local criteria do not conflict with statute.

A more detailed description of the LACOE petition renewal process can be found in Appendix A.

## CHARTER RENEWAL ELIGIBILITY

### Statutory Framework and Criteria for Renewal<sup>2</sup>

All charter schools requesting renewal must clearly show that they meet eligibility requirements set forth in the Charter Schools Act and further defined in AB 1505. Depending on the findings adopted by the County Board, a charter may be renewed or denied renewal based on these criteria found in *EC* 47605, 47607 and 47607.2:

1. Does the petition and the supporting documentation reflect a sound educational program for pupils? Are the petitioners likely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition? Does the petition contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements and affirm the conditions of *EC* 47605(e)?

<sup>1</sup> Words in italics indicate a direct reference to the language in these documents.

<sup>2</sup> The full renewal criteria can be found in Appendix B.

## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

2. Is the charter eligible for renewal under the High, Middle, or Low performing category and has the charter provided an argument with sufficient evidence that it has attained the criteria for renewal under that category? Has the charter attained measurable increases in academic achievement schoolwide and for numerically significant subgroups served by the charter school, and if applicable, does the school have strong postsecondary outcomes?
3. Does the charter school have discriminatory enrollment or dismissal practices? Does the charter have substantial fiscal or governance issues?

**KIPP Sol is designated as a Middle Performing Charter School under EC 47607.2(b) for Evaluation Purposes.<sup>3</sup>**

### **Middle Performing EC 47607.2(b)**

The school was not found eligible for high performing under EC 47607(c) nor low performing under EC 47607.2(a); therefore, the chartering authority shall:

- A. Consider schoolwide performance and performance of all subgroups on the Dashboard, while providing greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal
- B. Also consider clear and convincing evidence with verified data showing either:
  1. The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in schoolOR
  2. Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.

Note: An Authorizer may only deny pursuant to EC 47607.2(b) upon making written findings that:

- (1) The charter school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to pupils of the charter school;  
AND
- (2) Closure is in the best interest of the pupils;  
AND
- (3) The decision provided greater weight to the performance on measurements of academic performance.

Written factual findings specific to this petition along with supporting facts are presented in the next section of this report.

### **LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION FINDINGS OF FACT**

**Finding 1: The charter school did not meet the renewal criteria specified in EC 47607.2(b).**

---

<sup>3</sup> Source: CDE Charter Schools Performance Category Data Files  
<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/performcategorydf.asp> Retrieved 11-16-24

## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

KIPP Sol was placed in the Middle performance category by the California Department of Education (CDE). As such, the schoolwide performance and performance of all student groups on state indicators were considered along with the school’s performance on local indicators [EC 47607.2(b)(1)]. In addition, verified data submitted by the charter school were reviewed in alignment with [EC 47607.2(c)].

In reviewing the schoolwide performance and performance of all numerically significant student groups on the California School Dashboard and verified data provided by the charter school, KIPP Sol has not attained measurable increases in academic achievement and has failed to provide clear and convincing evidence that the school is making one year’s progress for each year in school.

As a grades 5-8 charter school, the California School Dashboard for KIPP Sol consists of the following indicators: Academic performance on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics (Math); English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI); Chronic Absenteeism Indicator; Suspension Rate Indicator; and Local Indicators.

KIPP Sol uses the i-Ready K-8 *Diagnostic Growth* report (i-Ready) by Curriculum Associates as its source of verified data. Extensive data tables for the California School Dashboard indicators and i-Ready verifiable data are available in Appendix C.

### **KIPP Sol Performance on California School Dashboard Indicators Compared to the State**

In 2022, the school’s performance in ELA outpaced the state with higher Distances from Standard (DFS) for all students and all numerically significant student groups with data available. However, in 2023, the school’s performance in ELA declined as evidenced by a DFS that was lower than the state schoolwide and for one (1) of four (4) student groups with available data. In 2024, KIPP Sol’s performance in ELA continued to decline resulting in a lower DFS than the state schoolwide and for four (4) of five (5) numerically significant student groups.

**Table 4: KIPP Sol ELA Distance From Standard Compared to the State**

|  | 2022                   | 2023   | 2024   |
|--|------------------------|--------|--------|
| Indicator  | ELA                    |        |        |
| Status Metric  | Distance from Standard |        |        |
| All Students   | Higher                 | Lower  | Lower  |
| Numerically Significant Student Groups   |                        |        |        |
| Hispanic or Latino   | Higher                 | Higher | Lower  |
| English Learner  | Higher                 | Lower  | Lower  |
| Long-Term English Learners   | -                      | -      | Higher |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged  | Higher                 | Higher | Lower  |
| Students with Disabilities   | Higher                 | Higher | Lower  |
| Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or above the state metric?   | YES                    | NO     | NO     |
| <small>(-) = Data for Long-Term English Learners was not reported on the California Dashboard prior to 2024<br/>                     Comprehensive ELA Dashboard data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C</small> |                        |        |        |

In 2022, the school’s DFS in Math was lower than the state for all students and one (1) of four (4) numerically significant student groups. In 2023, the Math DFS was lower than the state for all students

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

and two (2) of four (4) numerically significant student groups. In 2024, the school’s DFS in Math was lower than the state for all students and four (4) of five (5) numerically significant student groups.

**Table 5: KIPP Sol Math Distance From Standard Compared to the State**

|  | 2022                   | 2023   | 2024   |
|--|------------------------|--------|--------|
| Indicator  | Math                   |        |        |
| Status Metric  | Distance from Standard |        |        |
| All Students   | Lower                  | Lower  | Lower  |
| Numerically Significant Student Groups   |                        |        |        |
| Hispanic or Latino   | Higher                 | Higher | Lower  |
| English Learner  | Lower                  | Lower  | Lower  |
| Long-Term English Learners   | -                      | -      | Higher |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged  | Higher                 | Higher | Lower  |
| Students with Disabilities   | Higher                 | Lower  | Lower  |
| Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or above the state metric?   | NO                     | NO     | NO     |
| (-) = Data for Long-Term English Learners was not reported on the California Dashboard prior to 2024<br>Comprehensive Math Dashboard data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C |                        |        |        |

KIPP Sol had a higher ELPI percentage than the state in 2022, 2023 and 2024.

**Table 6: KIPP Sol ELPI Percentage Compared to the State**

|   | 2022                                      | 2023   | 2024   |
|---|---|--------|--------|
| Indicator   | English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) |        |        |
| Status Metric   | Percent Making Progress                   |        |        |
| English Learners  | Higher                                    | Higher | Higher |
| Comprehensive ELPI data including state comparison is available in Appendix C |   |        |        |

**Academic Engagement, School Conditions and School Climate Indicators on the California Dashboard Compared to the State**

To demonstrate measurable increases for renewal in areas of chronic absenteeism and suspension rate, outcomes for all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups must be the same or lower than the state.

In 2022, the rate of chronic absenteeism at KIPP Sol was higher than the state rate for all students and three (3) of four (4) student groups. In 2023, the rate of chronic absenteeism at KIPP Sol was higher than the state rate for all students and three (3) of four (4) student groups. In 2024, the rate of chronic absenteeism at KIPP Sol was higher than the state rate for all students and four (4) of five (5) student groups.

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table 7: KIPP Sol Chronic Absenteeism Compared to the State**

|   | 2022                              | 2023   | 2024   |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|
| Indicator   | <b>Chronic Absenteeism</b>        |        |        |
| Status Metric   | <b>Percent Chronically Absent</b> |        |        |
| All Students  | Higher                            | Higher | Higher |
| Numerically Significant Student Groups  |                                   |        |        |
| Hispanic or Latino  | Higher                            | Higher | Higher |
| English Learner   | Higher                            | Higher | Lower  |
| Longterm English Learner  | -                                 | -      | Higher |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | Lower                             | Lower  | Higher |
| Students with Disabilities  | Higher                            | Higher | Higher |
| Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or below the state average?   | NO                                | NO     | NO     |
| (-) = Data for Long-Term English Learners was not reported on the California Dashboard prior to 2024<br>Comprehensive Chronic Absenteeism data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C |                                   |        |        |

In 2022, the rate of suspension at KIPP Sol was lower than the state rate for all students and all four (4) student groups. In 2023, the rate of suspension at KIPP Sol was lower than the state rate for all students and all four (4) student groups. In 2024, the rate of suspension at KIPP Sol was lower than the state rate for all students and all five (5) student groups.

**Table 8: KIPP Sol Suspension Rate Compared to the State**

|  | 2022  | 2023  | 2024  |
|--|---|-------|-------|
| Indicator  | <b>Suspension Rate</b>                                |       |       |
| Status Metric  | <b>Percent of Students Suspended at Least One Day</b> |       |       |
| All Students   | Lower   | Lower | Lower |
| Numerically Significant Student Groups   |   |       |       |
| Hispanic or Latino   | Lower   | Lower | Lower |
| English Learner  | Lower   | Lower | Lower |
| Longterm English Learner   | -   | -     | Lower |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged  | Lower   | Lower | Lower |
| Students with Disabilities   | Lower   | Lower | Lower |
| Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or below the state average?  | YES   | YES   | YES   |
| (-) = Data for Long-Term English Learners was not reported on the California Dashboard prior to 2024<br>Comprehensive Suspension data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C |   |       |       |

## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

All Local Indicators<sup>4</sup> were met each year.

**Table 9: KIPP Sol Local Indicators**

|   | 2022                    | 2023         | 2024         |
|---|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|
|   | <b>Local Indicators</b> |              |              |
| Basics: teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilities   | Standard Met            | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Implementation of Academic Standards  | Standard Met            | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Parent & Family Engagement  | Standard Met            | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Local Climate Survey  | Standard Met            | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Access to a Broad Course of Study   | Standard Met            | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Source: CA School Dashboard <a href="https://www.caschooldashboard.org/">https://www.caschooldashboard.org/</a> Retrieved 2-18-25 |                         |              |              |

### **KIPP Sol Performance on Verified Data**

KIPP Sol failed to demonstrate clear and convincing evidence for charter renewal through the school’s comparison to state data on the California Dashboard Indicators, having given greater weight to measurements of academic performance, and also considering local indicator data. As a result, the school’s verified data was reviewed for renewal consideration. The i-Ready Diagnostic Growth report includes the Typical Annual Growth metric which was adopted by the California State Board of Education to provide a means for charter schools to demonstrate one year’s progress for each year in school, indicating a school having met California charter school growth expectations. The i-Ready data provides a normed view of growth showing how students are growing academically relative to their peers. The i-Ready data submitted by KIPP Sol for renewal consideration was disaggregated by grade level for all students tested and numerically significant student groups, defined by the publisher as 10 or more students for both Reading and Math.

In addition to reviewing i-Ready data, student participation rates on benchmark assessments were considered. The participation rates of students taking i-Ready assessments falls within the acceptable range when compared to the school's total enrollment.

KIPP Sol submitted verifiable data for only the 2023-24 school year. During the capacity interview the petitioners stated that the school had only begun administering both i-Ready assessments that year. The i-Ready Reading data showed the majority of grade levels and majority of student groups meeting the publisher prescribed Median Progress to Typical Growth Targets. However, the i-Ready Math data showed the majority of grade levels and three (3) of four (4) student groups not meeting Median Progress to Typical Growth Targets.

**Table 10: KIPP Sol i-Ready Reading and Math Progress to Typical Annual Growth**

|                                 | 2023-24   |  | 2023-24   |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
|                                 | <b>i-Ready Reading</b>                            |  | <b>i-Ready Math</b>                               |
|                                 | <b>Grade Levels Meeting Typical Annual Growth</b> |  | <b>Grade Levels Meeting Typical Annual Growth</b> |
| All Students                    | 3 of 4  |  | 1 of 4  |
|                                 | <b>Numerically Significant Student Groups</b>     |  |   |
| English Learner                 | 4 of 4  |  | 1 of 4  |
| Hispanic or Latino              | 3 of 4  |  | 1 of 4  |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 2 of 4  |  | 1 of 4  |

<sup>4</sup> Per EC 52064.5, local indicators are self-assessed and self-reported by LEAs.



## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

|   |        |  |        |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| Students with Disabilities  | 3 of 4 |  | 3 of 4 |
| Participation Rate Met  | YES    |  | YES    |
| Are all grade levels and a majority of student group grade levels meeting Typical Annual Growth?  | YES    |  | NO     |
| <small>Source: Summary of i-Ready 2023-24 Diagnostic Growth reports submitted by KIPP Sol<br/>         Note: Data reflects grade levels with ten or more students in that student group.<br/>         A comprehensive list of i-Ready data is available in Appendix C</small> |        |  |        |

### **KIPP Sol Comparison to Resident Schools**

The i-Ready verified data submitted by KIPP Sol did not demonstrate clear and convincing evidence that the charter school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by students achieving at least one year’s progress for each year in school. Additional analysis was considered in the comparison of KIPP Sol performance to the performance of resident schools where students would otherwise attend.

The process of identifying resident schools for comparison is in alignment with LACOE Charter School Office procedures. The list of resident schools was developed from a student roster submitted by KIPP Sol listing the schools students would have otherwise attended based on address, and the percentages of KIPP Sol students that would have attended each school. Only schools where a minimum of 2% of KIPP Sol students would otherwise attend were included. The resident schools list used for comparison comprises 15 schools, inclusive of nine (9) of ten resident schools considered by the LAUSD Charter Schools Division, and the five (5) schools indicated by KIPP Sol as school’s accounting for where more than 50% of current KIPP Sol students would otherwise attend. The comparison was based on each school’s DFS on the California Dashboard Academic Indicators.

In 2022, KIPP Sol had a higher DFS than all fifteen resident schools in ELA, a higher Math DFS than twelve of fifteen resident schools, and an ELPI percentage higher than thirteen of fifteen resident schools. In 2023 , KIPP Sol had a higher ELA DFS than fourteen of fifteen resident schools, a higher Math DFS than nine (9) of fifteen resident schools, and a higher percentage on the ELPI indicator than nine (9) of fifteen residents schools. However, in 2024, KIPP Sol’s DFS in ELA was lower than fourteen of fifteen resident schools and the school’s Math DFS was lower than eleven of fifteen resident schools. The KIPP Sol ELPI percentage in 2024 was higher than eight of fifteen resident schools.

While the chart below summarizes KIPP Sol’s comparison to resident schools, it also depicts a two-year decline in KIPP Sol’s ranking amongst resident schools across all three academic indicators, inclusive of a significant drop in ELA performance comparison from 2023 to 2024. This continued decline in ELA is a trend that began in 2017, as noted below in Finding 3. Of note, in 2024 , the five (5) schools where more than 50% of current KIPP Sol students would otherwise attend outperformed the charter school in ELA. In addition, four (4) of those five (5) schools also outperformed the charter school in math.

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table 11: KIPP Sol Resident Schools Comparison on Dashboard Academic Indicators**

|   | 2021-22  | 2022-23  | 2023-24 |
|---|----------|----------|---------|
| English-Language Arts   | 15 of 15 | 14 of 15 | 1 of 15 |
| Math  | 12 of 15 | 9 of 15  | 4 of 15 |
| ELPI  | 13 of 15 | 9 of 15  | 8 of 15 |
| Is the charter school outperforming Resident Schools on the California Dashboard Academic Indicators? | YES      | YES      | NO      |
| Comprehensive Resident Schools data is available in Appendix C  |          |          |         |

**Summary of Analysis of KIPP Sol Renewal Data**

Based on the review of KIPP Sol renewal data, having given greater weight to measurements of academic performance, the Review Team found that the charter school does not meet the criteria for renewal as a Middle performing charter school. The school failed to make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to pupils of the school, and closure of the charter school is in the best interest of the pupils.

**Finding 2: The petition provides a sound educational program for students to be enrolled in the school.** [EC 47605(c)(1)]

Based on the guidance established in 5 CCR section 11967.5.1(a), the charter petition as written is *consistent with sound educational practice* based on evidence that *it is likely to be of educational benefit to pupils who attend. A charter school need not be designed or intended to meet the educational needs of every student who might possibly seek to enroll in order for the charter to be granted.*

**Finding 3: The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the proposed educational program.** [EC 47605(c)(2)]

5 CCR 11967.5.1(c) provides four (4) indicators that a petitioner may be unlikely to implement the proposed educational program. Based on the review of the petition, supporting documents and information obtained through the capacity interview with the school’s petitioner, evidence of one (1) of the four (4) indicators is present.

*The petitioners have presented an unrealistic operational plan for the proposed charter school.*

**A. Declines in Student Achievement Across the Charter Term**

A review of available California Dashboard data shows declines in ELA and math proficiency across the charter term, including prior to the pandemic. During the capacity interview the petitioner acknowledged that the school was not alarmed by the drops in student achievement prior to the pandemic due to the school still outpacing the state and LAUSD. Unfortunately, the declines continued resulting in the school now having lower DFS than both the state and LAUSD in both ELA and math.

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table 12: KIPP Sol 2024 California Dashboard Comparison to LAUSD and the State**

|          | 2024                       |                             |
|----------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|          | ELA Distance From Standard | Math Distance From Standard |
| KIPP Sol | -62.3                      | -90.8                       |
| LAUSD    | -28.2                      | -60.4                       |
| State    | -13.2                      | -47.6                       |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-18-25

Academic outcomes for KIPP Sol schoolwide, for the three (3) years prior to the pandemic, as reported on the 2017, 2018, 2019 California Dashboards show an overall decline in ELA DFS and ELPI percentage. Post-pandemic, the charter school had overall declines in ELA, math, and ELPI percentage as reflected on the 2022, 2023, and 2024 California Dashboards.

**Table 13: KIPP Sol Schoolwide Distances From Standard 2017-2024**

|   | 2017  | 2018 | 2019  | 2022 | 2023  | 2024  |
|---|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| <b>Academic Indicators Distance From Standard</b> |       |      |       |      |       |       |
| ELA   | 39.2  | 29.5 | 28.6  | -9.4 | -21.4 | -62.3 |
| Math  | 4.2   | -2.5 | 5.5   | -65  | -73.4 | -90.8 |
| ELPI  | 79.2% | -    | 44.3% | 63%  | 52.9% | 54.3% |

(-) = California transitioned to a new English proficiency assessment. The CDE did not produce Status or Change for the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) in the 2018 Dashboard.  
Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-18-25

In the three years prior to the pandemic (2017-2019), overall DFS in ELA for KIPP Sol student groups declined for all student groups including Hispanic students, English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students, and Students with Disabilities. The declines for each student group continued post-pandemic as reflected on the 2022, 2023, and 2024 California Dashboards.

In the three years prior to the pandemic (2017-2019), overall DFS in math for KIPP Sol student groups increased for all student groups; however, as reflected on the 2022, 2023, and 2024 California Dashboards, all student groups experienced declines in math DFS post-pandemic.

**Table 14: KIPP Sol Student Group Distances From Standard 2017-2024**

|                                    | 2017   | 2018   | 2019  | 2022   | 2023   | 2024   |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| <b>ELA Distance From Standard</b>  |        |        |       |        |        |        |
| Hispanic                           | 39.6   | 29.7   | 29.1  | -9.3   | -20.9  | -62.1  |
| EL                                 | 20.2   | 4.0    | 4.3   | -51.4  | -68.5  | -87.2  |
| SED                                | 33.6   | 24.2   | 24.4  | -16.2  | -25.3  | -68.8  |
| SWD                                | -59.4  | -79.7  | -72.4 | -76.6  | -87.7  | -123.0 |
| <b>Math Distance From Standard</b> |        |        |       |        |        |        |
| Hispanic                           | 4.8    | -1.7   | 6.8   | -65.1  | -73.2  | -91    |
| EL                                 | -17.5  | -27.5  | -11   | -101.2 | -113.7 | -123.6 |
| SED                                | -0.7   | -8.9   | 0.5   | -71.2  | -76.5  | -95.7  |
| SWD                                | -105.9 | -118.8 | -89.7 | -126.6 | -143.6 | -162.2 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-18-25

**B. The KIPP Sol Action Plan Does not Adequately Address Declines in Student Achievement**

- The action plan submitted as a part of the renewal petition is limited in scope focusing only on declines in student achievement occurring in the 2022-23 school year. As indicated herein, the charter school has had consistent declines in schoolwide ELA DFS from 2017 to 2024

## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

and in schoolwide DFS in math (except for the 2018-19 school year). During the capacity interview the petitioners did not offer evidence of analysis of declines in KIPP Sol achievement prior to the pandemic.

- The action plan includes two charts labeled Measurable Goal to Improve Sol’s ELA Performance and Measurable Goal to Improve Sol’s Math Performance. Both charts include 2023 baseline DFS data and project increases in DFS on the 2028 California Dashboard; however, the goals lack annual benchmarks to support measuring progress. This data is essential in establishing annual data driven instructional plans to meet longer term goals for students.

### **C. Despite Supports from the KIPP SoCal School Success Team KIPP Sol Student Achievement Has Not Improved**

- During the capacity interview the petitioner described several supports provided by the KIPP SoCal School Success Team including but not limited to once per month professional development for school leaders, weekly leadership coaching differentiated for school leaders, monthly content area meetings, and professional development through Research for Better Teaching. KIPP Sol specifically was designated by the organization as receiving Tier 3 supports prior to 2023-24 due to its “unique and significant needs.” Additional targeted support for KIPP Sol included:
  - Weekly support for school leaders focusing on instructional coaching, co-observations, and walk-throughs
  - Daily support from the Director of Schools which included modeling of instructional and operational practices

Despite receiving both universal and targeted supports from the KIPP SoCal School Success Team, the KIPP Sol action plan identifies “inconsistent instructional coaching” as a root cause contributing to declines in student achievement during the 2022-23 school year. Page 3 of the action plan states, “In both frequency and quality, instructional coaching was inconsistent and fell short of providing a differentiated approach that was well-matched to the quantity of new teachers on staff.” It should be noted that the KIPP Sol ELA DFS declined 12 points in 2023; and declined 40.9 points in 2024. The school’s DFS in math declined 8.3 points in 2023; and declined 17.4 points in 2024. The disconnect between support provided by the School Success Team and the outcomes for KIPP Sol both operationally and academically indicate that the petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the proposed educational program.

*The petitioners have not presented an unrealistic financial plan for the proposed charter school. The following fiscal analysis was used in making the determination and is provided for County Board consideration.*

### **Finance and Operations**

KIPP SoCal operates seventeen (17) charter schools including KIPP Sol. **Tables 15 and 16** illustrate a summary of KIPP SoCal’s and KIPP Sol’s financial performance over the last five (5) years (2019-20 through 2023-24). The tables highlight financial metrics, including **Cash, Net Cash Flow, Net Assets, Operating Results, Liabilities, and Average Daily Attendance (ADA)**. These figures provide insights into KIPP SoCal’s and KIPP Sol’s fiscal health and operational trends during the specified period.

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table 15** illustrates the last five (5) years of financial performance (FY 2019-20 through 2023-24) for KIPP SoCal and affiliated organizations.

| Year of Operation | Cash          | Net Cash Flow  | Net Assets    | Operating Results | Liabilities   | Annual Report ADA |
|-------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 2019-20           | \$70,648,900  | (\$23,844,437) | \$95,335,110  | \$6,407,230       | \$189,331,408 | 7,832.49          |
| 2020-21           | \$94,422,685  | \$23,773,785   | \$107,405,841 | \$12,070,731      | \$232,421,876 | 7,832.49          |
| 2021-22           | \$110,622,702 | \$16,200,017   | \$141,577,843 | \$34,172,002      | \$251,094,715 | 8,500.73          |
| 2022-23           | \$127,736,291 | \$17,113,589   | \$156,642,619 | \$15,064,776      | \$276,148,912 | 8,784.93          |
| 2023-24           | \$120,546,505 | (\$7,189,786)  | \$158,546,786 | \$1,904,167       | \$276,844,515 | 8,991.20          |

Source: Kipp SoCal's Annual Independent Auditor's Report and Consolidating Financial Statements (FY 2019-20 through FY 2023-24)

**Table 16** illustrates the last five (5) years of financial performance (FY 2019 through FY 2024) for KIPP Sol

| Year of Operation | Cash        | Net Cash Flow | Net Assets  | Operating Results | Liabilities  | P-2 ADA |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|---------|
| 2019-20           | \$2,874,215 | \$244,418     | \$3,499,193 | \$130,686         | \$269,162    | 489.79  |
| 2020-21           | \$3,365,747 | \$491,532     | \$4,502,592 | \$1,003,399       | \$921,585    | 489.79  |
| 2021-22           | \$5,586,044 | \$2,220,297   | \$6,081,485 | \$1,578,893       | \$1,564,719  | 448.86  |
| 2022-23           | \$7,376,172 | \$1,790,128   | \$6,390,543 | \$309,058         | \$14,596,949 | 446.88  |
| 2023-24           | \$7,314,130 | (\$62,042)    | \$6,491,196 | \$100,653         | \$13,881,304 | 445.19  |

Source: Kipp SoCal's Annual Independent Auditor's Report and Consolidating Financial Statements (FY 2019-20 through FY 2023-24), and KIPP Sol's P-2 Charter School LCFF Calculation (FY 2019-20 through FY 2023-24)

**Prior Year Audit Reports:**

The petition included audit reports for fiscal years 2019-20 through 2023-24 which provide an overview of the financial position and compliance of KIPP SoCal. These audits consistently resulted in an unmodified opinion, reflecting that the financial statements fairly represent KIPP SoCal's financial position in all material respects. The audits confirm that KIPP SoCal and KIPP Sol ended 2023-24 with a positive fund balance of \$158.55M and \$6.49M, respectively. A finding related to state awards was noted in the fiscal year 2021-22 audit for KIPP Sol.

**Table 17 KIPP SoCal Academy Annual Audit Reports**

| Entity           | Fiscal Year | Auditing Firm          | Opinion            | Findings                  | Ending Fund Balance per Audit – June 30 |
|------------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Kipp Sol Academy | 2019-20     | CliftonLarsonAllen LLP | Unmodified Opinion | None                      | \$3,499,193                             |
| Kipp Sol Academy | 2020-21     | CliftonLarsonAllen LLP | Unmodified Opinion | None                      | \$4,502,592                             |
| Kipp Sol Academy | 2021-22     | CliftonLarsonAllen LLP | Unmodified Opinion | Independent Study Program | \$6,081,485                             |
| Kipp Sol Academy | 2022-23     | CliftonLarsonAllen LLP | Unmodified Opinion | None                      | \$6,390,543                             |
| Kipp Sol Academy | 2023-24     | CliftonLarsonAllen LLP | Unmodified Opinion | None                      | \$6,491,196                             |

Source: Kipp SoCal's Annual Independent Auditor's Report and Consolidating Financial Statements (FY 2019-20 through FY 2023-24)

## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

### Audit Findings

| Finding Detail                           | Finding Description  |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
|--|--|------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|------|----------|----------|--------------------------|------|--------|-------|----------------------|------|--------|-------|------------------------|------|--------|-------|---------------------|------|--------|--------|--------------------------|------|--------|--------|-------------------|------|--------|-----|----------------------|------|--------|-------|----------------------|------|--------|-------|----------------------|------|--------|-------|------------------|------|--------|--------|----------------|------|--------|-------|----------------|------|--------|-------|----------------|------|--------|-------|--------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>                       | <b>FY 2021-22</b>  |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Finding</b>                           | <b>2022-001 Independent Study Program</b>  |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Code</b>                              | <b>40000</b>   |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Finding Type</b>                      | <b>Independent Study Program</b>   |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Criteria or Specific Requirements</b> | Written agreements were obtained and contained all the elements required by Education Code section 51747(c)  |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Conditions</b>                        | <p>We noted that of the 29 samples that were required to be tested, we noted exceptions in 14 of the independent study agreements for one or more of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written agreement exists for each pupil</li> <li>• Every written agreement contained all the elements required by Education Code section 51747(c)</li> <li>• Signatures of student, parent (unless student is 18 or over), and certificated employee no later than 30 days after the first day of independent study instruction or October 15, whichever comes later</li> </ul>   |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Questioned Cost</b>                   | <p>ADA generated by these exception amounts was 8.32 ADA. Estimated questioned costs as follows:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">School:</th> <th style="text-align: right;">ADA</th> <th style="text-align: right;">Funding Rate</th> <th style="text-align: right;">Questioned Cost</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>KIPP Academy of Opportunity</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.60</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$11,371</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 6,823</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Compton Community S</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.28</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,228</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3,424</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Empower Academy</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.80</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,346</td> <td style="text-align: right;">9,877</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Illuminar Academy</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.78</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,279</td> <td style="text-align: right;">9,578</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Ignite Academy</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.81</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,365</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10,015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Peder Public School</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1.00</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,162</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,162</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Promesa Prep</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.01</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,249</td> <td style="text-align: right;">122</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Pueblo Unido ES</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.36</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,320</td> <td style="text-align: right;">4,435</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Pueblo Unido ES</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.73</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,320</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8,993</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Scholar Academy</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.68</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,367</td> <td style="text-align: right;">8,410</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Sol Academy</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.84</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,253</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10,293</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Vida Prep</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.55</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,422</td> <td style="text-align: right;">6,832</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Vida Prep</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.27</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,422</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3,354</td> </tr> <tr> <td>KIPP Vida Prep</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.61</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,422</td> <td style="text-align: right;">7,578</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>8.32</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>\$171,526</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>\$101,895</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | School:          | ADA              | Funding Rate | Questioned Cost | KIPP Academy of Opportunity | 0.60 | \$11,371 | \$ 6,823 | KIPP Compton Community S | 0.28 | 12,228 | 3,424 | KIPP Empower Academy | 0.80 | 12,346 | 9,877 | KIPP Illuminar Academy | 0.78 | 12,279 | 9,578 | KIPP Ignite Academy | 0.81 | 12,365 | 10,015 | KIPP Peder Public School | 1.00 | 12,162 | 12,162 | KIPP Promesa Prep | 0.01 | 12,249 | 122 | KIPP Pueblo Unido ES | 0.36 | 12,320 | 4,435 | KIPP Pueblo Unido ES | 0.73 | 12,320 | 8,993 | KIPP Scholar Academy | 0.68 | 12,367 | 8,410 | KIPP Sol Academy | 0.84 | 12,253 | 10,293 | KIPP Vida Prep | 0.55 | 12,422 | 6,832 | KIPP Vida Prep | 0.27 | 12,422 | 3,354 | KIPP Vida Prep | 0.61 | 12,422 | 7,578 | <b>Total</b> | <b>8.32</b> | <b>\$171,526</b> | <b>\$101,895</b> |
| School:                                  | ADA  | Funding Rate     | Questioned Cost  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Academy of Opportunity              | 0.60   | \$11,371         | \$ 6,823         |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Compton Community S                 | 0.28   | 12,228           | 3,424            |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Empower Academy                     | 0.80   | 12,346           | 9,877            |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Illuminar Academy                   | 0.78   | 12,279           | 9,578            |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Ignite Academy                      | 0.81   | 12,365           | 10,015           |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Peder Public School                 | 1.00   | 12,162           | 12,162           |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Promesa Prep                        | 0.01   | 12,249           | 122              |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Pueblo Unido ES                     | 0.36   | 12,320           | 4,435            |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Pueblo Unido ES                     | 0.73   | 12,320           | 8,993            |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Scholar Academy                     | 0.68   | 12,367           | 8,410            |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Sol Academy                         | 0.84   | 12,253           | 10,293           |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Vida Prep                           | 0.55   | 12,422           | 6,832            |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Vida Prep                           | 0.27   | 12,422           | 3,354            |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| KIPP Vida Prep                           | 0.61   | 12,422           | 7,578            |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Total</b>                             | <b>8.32</b>  | <b>\$171,526</b> | <b>\$101,895</b> |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Effect</b>                            | ADA generated by the exceptions is disallowed.   |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Cause</b>                             | The charter school implemented an independent study program pursuant to a requirement that schools offer independent study for the 2021-22 school year only (EC Section 51745). This requirement expired on June 30, 2022.   |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Recommendation</b>                    | We recommend that the charter schools develop procedures to ensure program compliance.   |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Repeat Finding (Yes or No)</b>        | No   |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Management Response</b>               | Less than three percent of KIPP SoCal Public Schools students participated in the independent study program offered in response to COVID-19. KIPP SoCal created procedures and trained staff to ensure compliance with the new Independent Study Program requirements. Procedures were followed in all areas with some exceptions for obtaining written agreements with all the elements required by Education Code section 51747(c). Effective July 2022 KIPP SoCal established procedures to ensure multiple reviews of the agreements including a final review by the Resident In-House Counsel before and after the execution of the agreements. We established filing procedures to securely store both electronic and hard files. We also established internal controls for periodic audits to ensure all documentation is in place and is in line with established procedures and governing laws.   |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |
| <b>Status</b>                            | Implemented.<br>(BAS BSC Notes: KIPP Sol Academy was not listed in the 2022-23 Prior Year Findings)  |                  |                  |              |                 |                             |      |          |          |                          |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                        |      |        |       |                     |      |        |        |                          |      |        |        |                   |      |        |     |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                      |      |        |       |                  |      |        |        |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |                |      |        |       |              |             |                  |                  |

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Budget Projections**

**Table 18** provides a summary of the charter’s proposed budget for the fiscal years 2024-25 through 2027-2028. It includes projected **ADA, Net Assets, Net Income, and Ending Cash Balance for the four (4) years**. The positive Ending Cash Balance for FY 2024-25 through 2027-28 is contingent upon achieving the school’s targeted enrollment and ADA.

| Table 18 (KIPP SOL Proposed Budget Overview) |              |              |              |              |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Budget Plan                                  | FY 2024-2025 | FY 2025-2026 | FY 2026-2027 | FY 2027-2028 |
| ADA  | 433.40       | 451.10       | 451.10       | 451.10       |
| Net Assets                                   | \$6,492,754  | \$6,532,581  | \$6,688,544  | \$6,884,296  |
| Net Income Projections                       | \$1,558      | \$39,827     | \$155,963    | \$195,752    |
| Projected Ending Cash Balance                | \$6,094,846  | \$6,493,555  | \$6,748,953  | \$6,998,062  |

To be fiscally solvent, the Budget Plan requires that the school (1) meets its enrollment projections; and (2) meets its ADA projections.

**Finding 4:** The petition contains an affirmation of all specified assurances. [EC 47605(c)(4); EC 47605(e)]

**Finding 5:** The petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements. [EC 47605(c)(5)(A)-(O)]

Based on the guidance established in *Education Code*, California Code of Regulations, the requirements set forth in the Superintendent’s Administrative Regulations (AR) and other requirements of law, nine (9) of the 15 required elements are comprehensive as written and six (6) reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies. The findings of the Review Team are as follows:

**Element 1: Description of the Educational Program.** *Reasonably comprehensive with a specific deficiency*

The petition lacks a description, for the charter school, of annual goals for State Priorities 1, 2, 7 and 8, for all pupils and for each subgroup of pupils identified pursuant to Section 52052, to be achieved in the state priorities, as described in subdivision (d) of Section 52060, that apply for the grade levels served and specific annual actions to achieve those goals. While the school’s 2024-25 LCAP identifies annual goals and actions for all 8 State Priorities, the annual goals listed in Element 1 are incomplete.

**Element 2: Measurable Pupil Outcomes.** *Reasonably comprehensive with a specific deficiency*

The expected growth for all students and each student group included in the annual goals for ELA and math is 5% per year. A flat 5% growth rate for all student groups that begin at different levels promotes achievement gaps in student outcomes. The charter school needs to align the goals and expected outcomes listed in the petition with those listed in the school’s 2024-25 LCAP which take into account the varying baseline data starting points of each student group, and project differing rates of growth needed for each group to close achievement gaps.

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Element 3: Method for Measuring Pupil Progress.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 4: Governance Structure.** *Reasonably comprehensive with a specific deficiency*

The charter petition does not include *an organizational chart that accurately reflects the reporting structure of each category of school employee.*

**Element 5: Employee Qualifications.** *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

- While the petition includes a list of general qualifications for all School Success Team positions, Element 5 does not *specify the additional qualifications expected of each Director position listed under the School Success Team.*
- The petition includes a Director of Special Education; however, per the minimum requirements for all School Success Team staff listed in the petition, this staff position is not required to hold a special education credential.

**Element 6: Health and Safety Procedures.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 7: Racial, Ethnic, Special Education, and English Learners Balance.** *Reasonably comprehensive with a specific deficiency*

The charter petition is missing benchmarks that measure whether the charter school is *achieving a balance of racial and ethnic pupils, special education pupils, and English learner pupils, including redesignated fluent English proficient pupils that is reflective of the general population residing within the territorial jurisdiction of the school district to which the charter petition is submitted.* LACOE staff created the following chart representing this information:

**Table 19: Racial, Ethnic, Special Education and English Learner Composition of KIPP Sol and Local Community**

| Student Groups             | Percent of Total Enrollment of School 2023-2024 | Community*<br>Zip code 90022 |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|
|                            |   | Percent of Total Community   |
| African American or Black  | 0.4%  | 0.5%                         |
| American Indian            | 0%  | 2.5%                         |
| Asian                      | 0.1%  | 1.0%                         |
| Filipino                   | 0%  | 0.2%                         |
| Hispanic or Latino         | 99%   | 96.6%                        |
| Pacific Islander           | 0%  | 0%                           |
| Two or more Races          | 0%  | 19.6%                        |
| White                      | 0.4%  | 21.7%                        |
| English Learners           | 19.5%   | 21.2%                        |
| Students with Disabilities | 12.9%   | 15.4%                        |

"—" = no data  
 Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data  
<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/files/enrcensus.asp> Retrieved 1-28-25  
 \*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2019-2023 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates  
<https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDP5Y2023.DP05?g=860XX00US90022>

**Element 8: Admission Requirements.** *Reasonably comprehensive*



## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Element 9: Annual Independent Financial Audits.** *Reasonably comprehensive with a specific deficiency*

The petition does not include the statement that *financial reporting to charter agency would be carried out pursuant to EC 47604.33.*

**Element 10: Suspension and Expulsion Procedures.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 11: STRS, PERS, and Social Security.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 12: Public School Attendance Alternatives.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 13: Post-Employment Rights of Employees.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 14: Dispute Resolution Procedures.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 15: Closure Procedures.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Finding 6:** The petitioners **are not** *demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial fiscal or governance factors or not serving all pupils who wish to attend, as documented pursuant to EC 47607(e).*

**Finding 7:** The petition **does satisfy all of the Required Assurances of Education Code section 47605(d), (f) through (i), (l), and (m)** as follows:

**Standards, Assessments and Parent Consultation.** [EC 47605(d)] *Meets the condition*

**Employment is Voluntary.** [EC 47605(f)] *Meets the condition*

**Pupil Attendance is Voluntary.** [EC 47605(g)] *Meets the condition*

**Effect on the Authorizer and Financial Projections.** [EC 47605(h)] *Provides the necessary evidence*

**Preference to Academically Low Performing Students.** [EC 47605(i)] *Qualifies*

**Teacher Credentialing Requirement.** [EC 47605(l)] *Meets the condition*

**Transmission of Audit Report.** [EC 47605(m)] *Meets the condition*

**Parent Involvement is Voluntary** [EC 47605(n)] *Meets the condition*

**Appendix A**

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Review Criteria:** The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Charter School Review Team (Review Team) considered the petition according to the requirements of the *Education Code* and other pertinent laws, guidance established in the *California Code of Regulations (5 CCR)*, Title 5, County Board Policy and Superintendent’s Administrative Regulations.<sup>5</sup>

LACOE has adopted the petition review criteria established in 5 CCR section 11967.5.1(a-g) except where LACOE determined that the regulations provide insufficient direction or where they are not applicable because the structure or responsibility of the County Board and LACOE differ from those of the State Board of Education (SBE) and the CDE. In these instances, LACOE developed its own local review criteria or added criteria to those developed by CDE to reflect the needs of the County Board as the authorizer and LACOE as the monitoring and oversight agency. These local criteria do not conflict with statute.

**Reasonably Comprehensive:** In addition to the regulatory guidance that specifies the components of each required element, 5 CCR section 11967.5.1(g) states a “reasonably comprehensive” description of the required petition elements shall include, but not be limited to, information that:

- (1) *Is substantive and is not, for example, a listing of topics with little elaboration.*
- (2) *For elements that have multiple aspects, addresses essentially all aspects the elements, not just selected aspects.*
- (3) *Is specific to the charter petition being proposed, not to charter schools or charter petitions generally.*
- (4) *Describes, as applicable among the different elements, how the charter school will:*
  - (A) *Improve pupil learning.*
  - (B) *Increase learning opportunities for its pupils, particularly pupils who have been identified as academically low achieving.*
  - (C) *Provide parents, guardians, and pupils with expanded educational opportunities.*
  - (D) *Hold itself accountable for measurable, performance-based pupil outcomes.*
  - (E) *Provide vigorous competition with other public school options available to parents, guardians, and students.*

**Reasonably Comprehensive with Deficiencies:** An element may be reasonably comprehensive but lacks specific critical information or contains an error important enough to warrant correction. These elements are described as “reasonably comprehensive” with a specific “deficiency” or “deficiencies.” Correcting the deficiency or deficiencies would not be a material revision (as defined in statute and County Board Policy) to the charter.

**Technical Adjustments:** Three circumstances may require a “technical adjustment” to the petition:

- Adjustments necessary to reflect the County Board as the authorizer as required by statute. These adjustments are necessary because the petition was initially submitted to a local district and contains specific references to and/or language required by that district and/or the petition does not reflect the structure of the County Office.

---

<sup>5</sup> Words in italics indicate a direct reference to the language in these documents.

## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

- Adjustments needed to bring the petition current with changes made to law since the petition was submitted to the district as required by statute.
- Adjustments necessary to address clerical errors or inconsistencies where making the adjustment would not be a material revision (as defined in statute and County Board Policy) to the charter.

**Affirmations and Assurances:** The petition shall contain a clear, unequivocal affirmation of each requirement, not a general statement of intention to comply. Neither the charter nor any of the supporting documents shall include any evidence that the charter will fail to comply with the conditions described in *EC* section 47605(c)(4).

**Reviewers:** The Review Team included staff from Business Advisory Services, Facilities and Construction, Risk Management, Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education, Student Support Services, Human Resources, Office of General Counsel, the Division of Accountability, Support and Monitoring, and the Charter School Office.

**Scope of Review:** Findings are based on a review of the same petition and supporting documents considered by the local district, information obtained through the Capacity Interview and other communications with the petitioner(s) and representatives of the school, and other publicly available information.

### **Legislative Intent**

The Review Team considered whether the petition complies with *EC* section 47601 of the *Charter Schools Act*, which states:

*It is the intent of the Legislature, in enacting this part, to provide opportunities for teachers, parents, pupils, and community members to establish and maintain schools that operate independently from the existing school district structure, as a method to accomplish all of the following:*

- (a) Improve pupil learning.*
- (b) Increase learning opportunities for all pupils, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for pupils who are identified as academically low achieving.*
- (c) Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods.*
- (d) Create new professional opportunities for teachers, including the opportunity to be responsible for the learning program at the school site.*
- (e) Provide parents and pupils with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system.*
- (f) Hold the schools established under this part accountable for meeting measurable pupil outcomes and provide the schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance-based accountability systems.*
- (g) Provide vigorous competition within the public school system to stimulate continual improvements in all public schools.*

### **Additional Review Criteria Specific to a Renewal Petition**

The renewal of a charter authorized by the County Board is governed by *EC* sections 47607 and 47605 or 47605.6 and 5 *CCR* section 11966.5, which provides the requirements for a renewal submission to a county board of education.

## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

***EC 47607(b)*** states that renewals *are governed by the standards and criteria in section 47605* (the requirements to establish a charter), and shall include, but not be limited to, *a reasonably comprehensive description of any new requirement of charter schools enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.*

This language varies slightly from the requirement under 5 CCR 11966.4(a)(2), which requires the district to determine whether the renewal petition includes *a reasonably comprehensive description of how the charter school has met all new charter school requirements enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.* (Emphasis added)

The Review Team determined whether each required element complies with current legal requirements and whether the petitioners showed they are familiar with current legal requirements through the Capacity Interview. If the petition did not comply or the petitioners were unfamiliar with current law, the Review Team noted the deficiency through the applicable finding.

***EC 47607(e) Notwithstanding subdivision (c) and subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 47607.2, the chartering authority may deny renewal of a charter school upon finding that the school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial fiscal or governance factors, or it not serving all pupils who wish to attend.***

**5 CCR 11966.5(b)** provides the timelines, process and requirements for reviewing a renewal petition:

*A petition for renewal, whether submitted to the county board of education as the chartering authority or on appeal from denial of the renewal petition by the local governing board, shall be considered by the county board of education upon receipt of the petition with all of the requirements set forth in this subdivision.*

- (1) Documentation that the charter school meets at least one of the criteria specified in Education Code section 47607(b).*
- (2) A copy of the renewal charter petition, as denied by the local board, including a reasonably comprehensive description of how the charter school has met all new charter school requirements enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.
  - (A) The signature requirement set forth in Education Code section 47605(a) is not applicable to a petition for renewal.**
- (3) When applicable, a copy of the governing board's denial and supporting written factual findings, if available.*
- (4) A description of any changes to the renewal petition necessary to reflect the county board of education as the chartering entity.*

County staff may provide a description of whether the petitioner met submission requirements.

**5 CCR 11966.5(c)** provides the areas to be considered to make a determination as to whether a charter should be renewed and provides the conditions under which a county board may deny a renewal petition:

- (1) When considering a petition for renewal, the county board of education shall consider the past performance of the school's academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement, if any.*

Any concerns regarding the past performance of the school are addressed under **Finding 3 (Demonstrably Unlikely....)** Plans for future improvement, if provided, would be addressed as applicable under the appropriate petition requirement.

## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

- (2) *The county board of education may deny a petition for renewal of a charter school only if [it] makes written factual findings, specific to the particular petition, setting forth facts to support one or more of the grounds for denial set forth, as applicable, in Education Code 47605(c) or failure to meet one of the criteria set forth in Education Code section 47607(b).*

**Appendix B**

**RENEWAL CRITERIA**

**Statutory Framework and Criteria for Renewal**

All charter schools requesting renewal must clearly show that they meet eligibility requirements set forth in Charter Schools Act and further defined in AB 1505. Depending on the findings adopted by the County Board, a charter may be renewed or denied renewal based on these criteria found in *EC 47605*, *47607* and *47607.2*:

1. Do the petition and supporting documentation reflect a sound educational program for pupils? Are the petitioners likely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition? Does the petition contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements and affirm the conditions of *EC 47605(e)*?
2. Is the charter eligible for renewal under the High, Middle, or Low performing category and has the charter provided an argument with sufficient evidence that it has attained the criteria for renewal under that category? Has the charter attained measurable increases in academic achievement schoolwide and for numerically significant subgroups served by the charter school, and if applicable, does the school have strong postsecondary outcomes?
3. Does the charter school have discriminatory enrollment or dismissal practices? Does the charter have substantial fiscal or governance issues?

**High Performing *EC 47607(c)***

A charter school that for two (2) consecutive years immediately preceding renewal:

- A. Received the two highest performance levels [green or blue] schoolwide on all state indicators on the Dashboard

OR

- B. For all measurements of academic performance, the school received levels schoolwide that are the same or higher than the state average, and for a majority of subgroups performing statewide below the state average in each respective year, received levels that are higher than the state average.

**Middle Performing *EC 47607.2(b)***

For charter schools not designated under either the High or Low Performing criteria, the chartering authority:

- A. Shall consider schoolwide performance and performance of all subgroups on the Dashboard, while providing greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal
- B. Shall also consider clear and convincing evidence with verified data showing either:
  1. The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school

## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

OR

2. Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.

Note: MAY DENY ONLY upon making written findings that:

- (1) The charter school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to pupils of the school;

AND

- (2) Closure is in the best interest of the pupils;

AND

- (3) The decision provided greater weight to the performance on measurements of academic performance.

### **Low Performing EC 47607.2(a)**

A charter school that for two consecutive years immediately preceding renewal:

- A. Received the two (2) lowest performance levels [red or orange] schoolwide on all state indicators on the Dashboard

OR

- B. For all measures of academic performance, the school received performance levels schoolwide that are the same or lower than the state average, and for a majority of subgroups performing statewide below the state average in each respective year, received levels that are lower than the state average.

Note: Renewal for a 2-year term may occur only if the following written factual findings are both made

1. The charter school is taking meaningful steps to address the underlying causes of low performance, and those steps are/will be reflected in a written plan adopted by the school's governing body

AND

2. There is a clear and convincing evidence, demonstrated by verified data showing either:
  - a. The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school

OR

- b. Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peer

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Appendix C**

**KIPP SOL ACADEMY  
CALIFORNIA DASHBOARD INDICATORS, VERIFIED DATA, AND RESIDENT SCHOOLS COMPARISON**

**California Dashboard Tables**

| <b>Table Legend for All California Dashboard Tables</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| “**”   | - The student group has fewer than 11 students and is not reported for privacy reasons  |
| “***”  | - Student groups must have at least 30 or more students in both the current and prior year status denominator of the state indicator to receive a Performance Level (color) |
| “—”  | - No data available   |
| “NPL”  | - No Performance Level available  |
| “NPC”  | - No Performance Color available  |
| “N/A”  | - Non-Applicable  |
| Data for Long-Term English Learners was not reported on the California Dashboard prior to 2024 |   |

**Table A: KIPP Sol California Dashboard**

| Year | ELA    | Math   | ELPI   | CCI | Graduation Rate | Chronic Absenteeism | Suspension Rate |
|------|--------|--------|--------|-----|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 2022 | Low    | Low    | High   | N/A | N/A             | Very High           | Very Low        |
| 2023 | Orange | Orange | Orange | N/A | N/A             | Yellow              | Blue            |
| 2024 | Orange | Orange | Yellow | N/A | N/A             | Yellow              | Blue            |

2022 California Dashboard reporting was Status Only  
Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 1-29-25

**Table B: KIPP Sol 2022 ELA Indicator Compared to the State**

| Student Groups  | Participation Rate | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | Distance From Standard | State Distance From Standard | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All   | 98                 | Low             | 485                | -9.4                   | -12.2                        | 2.8                           | Higher          |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 98                 | Low             | 484                | -9.3                   | -38.6                        | 29.3                          | Higher          |
| English Learners  | 98                 | Low             | 127                | -51.4                  | -61.2                        | 9.8                           | Higher          |
| Foster Youth  | 67                 | *               | 3                  | *                      | -85.6                        | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Homeless Youth  | 100                | *               | 1                  | *                      | -62.9                        | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | 98                 | Low             | 407                | -16.2                  | -41.4                        | 25.2                          | Higher          |
| Students With Disabilities  | 99                 | Very Low        | 65                 | -76.6                  | -97.3                        | 20.7                          | Higher          |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average? |                    |                 | YES                |                        | All Students                 | YES                           |                 |
|   |                    |                 |                    |                        | Student Groups               | YES<br>4 of 4                 |                 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 1-29-25



Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table C: KIPP Sol 2023 ELA Indicator Compared to the State**

| Student Groups  | Participation Rate | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | Distance From Standard | Change | State Distance From Standard | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All   | 99                 | Orange          | 471                | -21.4                  | -12    | -13.6                        | -7.8                          | Lower           |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 99                 | Orange          | 468                | -20.9                  | -11.7  | -40.2                        | 19.3                          | Higher          |
| White   | 100                | *               | 1                  | *                      | N/A    | 20.8                         | N/A                           | N/A             |
| English Learners  | 99                 | Orange          | 114                | -68.5                  | -17.1  | -67.7                        | -0.8                          | Lower           |
| Foster Youth  | 100                | *               | 1                  | *                      | N/A    | -89.2                        | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Homeless Youth  | 100                | *               | 3                  | *                      | N/A    | -67.9                        | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | 99                 | Orange          | 395                | -25.3                  | -9.1   | -42.6                        | 17.3                          | Higher          |
| Students With Disabilities  | 97                 | Red             | 65                 | -87.7                  | -11.1  | -96.3                        | 8.6                           | Higher          |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average? |                    |                 |                    |                        | NO     | All Students                 | NO                            |                 |
|   |                    |                 |                    |                        |        | Student Groups               | YES<br>3 of 4                 |                 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 1-29-25

**Table D: KIPP Sol 2024 ELA Indicator Compared to the State**

| Student Groups  | Participation Rate | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | Distance From Standard | Change | State Distance From Standard | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All   | 99                 | Orange          | 470                | -62.3                  | -40.9  | -13.2                        | -49.1                         | Lower           |
| Asian   | 100                | *               | 1                  | *                      | N/A    | 60.7                         | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 99                 | Orange          | 467                | -62.1                  | -41.2  | -39.3                        | -22.8                         | Lower           |
| White   | 100                | *               | 2                  | *                      | N/A    | 19.2                         | N/A                           | N/A             |
| English Learners  | 100                | Red             | 129                | -87.2                  | -18.7  | -67.6                        | -19.6                         | Lower           |
| Long-Term English Learners  | 100                | Red             | 50                 | -105                   | -29.6  | -109.6                       | 4.6                           | Higher          |
| Homeless  | 100                | *               | 9                  | *                      | N/A    | -70.4                        | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | 99                 | Orange          | 406                | -68.8                  | -43.6  | -40.9                        | -27.9                         | Lower           |
| Students With Disabilities  | 98                 | Red             | 64                 | -123                   | -35.3  | -95.6                        | -27.4                         | Lower           |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average? |                    |                 |                    |                        | NO     | All Students                 | NO                            |                 |
|   |                    |                 |                    |                        |        | Student Groups               | NO<br>1 of 5                  |                 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 1-29-25

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table E: KIPP Sol 2022 Math Indicator Compared to the State**

| Student Groups                  | Participation Rate | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | Distance From Standard | State Distance From Standard | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All                             | 98                 | Low             | 485                | -65                    | -51.7                        | -13.3                         | Lower           |
| Hispanic or Latino              | 98                 | Low             | 484                | -65.1                  | -83.4                        | 18.3                          | Higher          |
| English Learners                | 97                 | Very Low        | 125                | -101.2                 | -92                          | -9.2                          | Lower           |
| Foster Youth                    | 67                 | *               | 3                  | *                      | -126.3                       | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Homeless Youth                  | 100                | *               | 1                  | *                      | -101.8                       | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 98                 | Low             | 407                | -71.2                  | -84                          | 12.8                          | Higher          |
| Students With Disabilities      | 97                 | Very Low        | 64                 | -126.6                 | -130.8                       | 4.2                           | Higher          |

|   |    |                |               |
|---|----|----------------|---------------|
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average? | NO | All Students   | NO            |
|   |    | Student Groups | YES<br>3 of 4 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 1-29-25

**Table F: KIPP Sol 2023 Math Indicator Compared to the State**

| Student Groups                  | Participation Rate | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | Distance From Standard | Change | State Distance From Standard | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All                             | 99                 | Orange          | 469                | -73.4                  | -8.3   | -49.1                        | -24.3                         | Lower           |
| Hispanic or Latino              | 99                 | Orange          | 466                | -73.2                  | -8.1   | -80.8                        | 7.6                           | Higher          |
| White                           | 100                | *               | 1                  | *                      | N/A    | -11.1                        | N/A                           | N/A             |
| English Learners                | 99                 | Red             | 114                | -113.7                 | -12.5  | -93.4                        | -20.3                         | Lower           |
| Foster Youth                    | 100                | *               | 1                  | *                      | N/A    | -127.4                       | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Homeless Youth                  | 100                | *               | 3                  | *                      | N/A    | -101.3                       | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | 99                 | Orange          | 393                | -76.5                  | -5.3   | -80.8                        | 4.3                           | Higher          |
| Students With Disabilities      | 97                 | Red             | 65                 | -143.6                 | -17    | -127.3                       | -16.3                         | Lower           |

|   |    |                |              |
|---|----|----------------|--------------|
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average? | NO | All Students   | NO           |
|   |    | Student Groups | NO<br>2 of 4 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 1-29-25

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table G: KIPP Sol 2024 Math Indicator Compared to the State**

| Student Groups  | Participation Rate | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | Distance From Standard | Change | State Distance From Standard | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All   | 99                 | Orange          | 471                | -90.8                  | -17.4  | -47.6                        | -43.2                         | Lower           |
| Asian   | 100                | *               | 1                  | *                      | N/A    | 49.5                         | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Hispanic or Latino  | 99                 | Orange          | 468                | -91                    | -17.8  | -79.2                        | -11.8                         | Lower           |
| White   | 100                | *               | 2                  | *                      | N/A    | -10.3                        | N/A                           | N/A             |
| English Learners  | 100                | Red             | 129                | -123.6                 | -9.9   | -93.4                        | -30.2                         | Lower           |
| Long-Term English Learners  | 100                | Red             | 50                 | -142.5                 | -15.5  | -163.5                       | 21                            | Higher          |
| Foster Youth  | 100                | *               | 3                  | *                      | N/A    | -125.1                       | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Homeless Youth  | 100                | *               | 9                  | *                      | N/A    | -106                         | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | 99                 | Red             | 407                | -95.7                  | -19.2  | -78.2                        | -17.5                         | Lower           |
| Students With Disabilities  | 98                 | Red             | 64                 | -162.2                 | -18.5  | -124.3                       | -37.9                         | Lower           |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average? |                    |                 |                    |                        | NO     | All Students                 | NO                            |                 |
|   |                    |                 |                    |                        |        | Student Groups               | NO<br>1 of 5                  |                 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 1-29-25

**Table H: KIPP Sol English Learner Progress Indicator Compared to the State**

| Year | Dashboard Color | Participation Rate | Number of Students | School Percent | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| 2022 | High            | 98.7               | 73                 | 63.0%          | 50.3%         | 12.7%                         | Higher          |
| 2023 | Orange          | 100                | 87                 | 52.9%          | 48.7%         | 4.2%                          | Higher          |
| 2024 | Yellow          | 100                | 92                 | 54.3%          | 45.7%         | 8.6%                          | Higher          |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 1-29-25

**Table I: KIPP Sol Local Indicators**

|   | 2022         | 2023         | 2024         |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Local Indicators                                      |              |              |              |
| Basics: Teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilities | Standard Met | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Implementation of Academic Standards                  | Standard Met | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Parent & Family Engagement                            | Standard Met | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Local Climate Survey                                  | Standard Met | Standard Met | Standard Met |
| Access to a Broad Course of Study                     | Standard Met | Standard Met | Standard Met |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-18-25

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table J: KIPP SOL 2022 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator Compared to the State**

| Student Groups  | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | State Percent  | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All   | Very High       | 501                | 37.9           | 30             | 7.9                           | Higher          |
| AA/Black  | *               | 1                  | *              | 42.9           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Hispanic or Latino  | Very High       | 499                | 37.9           | 35.8           | 2.1                           | Higher          |
| Two or more   | *               | 1                  | *              | 25.1           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| English Learner   | Very High       | 80                 | 43.8           | 33.6           | 10.2                          | Higher          |
| Foster Youth  | *               | 3                  | *              | 42.1           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Homeless Youth  | *               | 1                  | *              | 45.1           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | Very High       | 420                | 37.1           | 37.4           | -0.3                          | Lower           |
| Students With Disabilities  | Very High       | 69                 | 55.1           | 39.6           | 15.5                          | Higher          |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average?               |                 |                    | NO             | All Students   | NO                            |                 |
|   |                 |                    |                | Student Groups | NO<br>1 of 4                  |                 |
| Source: CA School Dashboard <a href="https://www.caschooldashboard.org/">https://www.caschooldashboard.org/</a> Retrieved 1-29-25 |                 |                    |                |                |                               |                 |

**Table K: KIPP Sol 2023 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator Compared to the State**

| Student Groups  | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change         | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All   | Yellow          | 499                | 29.7           | -8.3           | 24.3          | 5.4                           | Higher          |
| Hispanic or Latino  | Yellow          | 495                | 29.5           | -8.4           | 28.4          | 1.1                           | Higher          |
| Two or more   | *               | 3                  | *              | N/A            | 21.6          | N/A                           | N/A             |
| White   | *               | 1                  | *              | N/A            | 18.5          | N/A                           | N/A             |
| English Learners  | Orange          | 91                 | 29.7           | -14.1          | 26.3          | 3.4                           | Higher          |
| Foster Youth  | *               | 2                  | *              | N/A            | 33.6          | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Homeless Youth  | *               | 3                  | *              | N/A            | 38.7          | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | Yellow          | 417                | 29.5           | -7.6           | 29.9          | -0.4                          | Lower           |
| Students With Disabilities  | Orange          | 67                 | 40.3           | -14.8          | 33.1          | 7.2                           | Higher          |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average?               |                 |                    | NO             | All Students   | NO            |                               |                 |
|   |                 |                    |                | Student Groups | NO<br>1 of 4  |                               |                 |
| Source: CA School Dashboard <a href="https://www.caschooldashboard.org/">https://www.caschooldashboard.org/</a> Retrieved 1-29-25 |                 |                    |                |                |               |                               |                 |

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table L: KIPP Sol 2024 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator Compared to the State**

| Student Groups  | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent  | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All   | Yellow          | 489                | 25.6           | -4.1   | 18.6           | 7                             | Higher          |
| AA/Black  | *               | 2                  | *              | N/A    | 31.3           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Asian   | *               | 1                  | *              | N/A    | 7.5            | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Hispanic or Latino  | Yellow          | 484                | 25.2           | -4.3   | 21.7           | 3.5                           | Higher          |
| White   | *               | 2                  | *              | N/A    | 13.5           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| English Learners  | Yellow          | 95                 | 18.9           | -10.7  | 20.1           | -1.2                          | Lower           |
| Long-Term English Learners  | Orange          | 51                 | 25.5           | 12.6   | 23.9           | 1.6                           | Higher          |
| Foster Youth  | *               | 3                  | *              | *      | 30.5           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Homeless Youth  | *               | 9                  | *              | *      | 32.7           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | Yellow          | 424                | 25.9           | -3.6   | 23.4           | 2.5                           | Higher          |
| Students With Disabilities  | Orange          | 67                 | 32.8           | -7.5   | 26.3           | 6.5                           | Higher          |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? |                 |                    |                | NO     | All Students   |                               | NO              |
|   |                 |                    |                |        | Student Groups |                               | NO<br>1 of 5    |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 1-29-25

**Table M: KIPP Sol 2022 Suspension Indicator Compared to the State**

| Student Groups  | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent  | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All   | Very Low        | 506                | 0              | *      | 3.1            | -3.1                          | Lower           |
| AA/Black  | *               | 1                  | *              | *      | 7.9            | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Hispanic or Latino  | Very Low        | 504                | 0              | *      | 3.3            | -3.3                          | Lower           |
| Two or more   | *               | 1                  | *              | *      | 2.9            | N/A                           | N/A             |
| English Learners  | Very Low        | 81                 | 0              | *      | 3.2            | -3.2                          | Lower           |
| Foster Youth  | *               | 3                  | *              | *      | 12.4           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Homeless  | *               | 1                  | *              | *      | 5.5            | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | Very Low        | 424                | 0              | *      | 4              | -4.0                          | Lower           |
| Students With Disabilities  | Very Low        | 71                 | 0              | *      | 5.4            | -5.4                          | Lower           |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? |                 |                    |                | YES    | All Students   |                               | YES             |
|   |                 |                    |                |        | Student Groups |                               | YES<br>4 of 4   |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 1-29-25

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table N: KIPP Sol 2023 Suspension Indicator Compared to the State**

| Student Groups  | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent  | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All   | Blue            | 501                | 0.2            | 0.2    | 3.5            | -3.3                          | Lower           |
| Hispanic or Latino  | Blue            | 497                | 0.2            | 0.2    | 3.8            | -3.6                          | Lower           |
| Two or more   | *               | 3                  | *              | N/A    | 3.3            | N/A                           | N/A             |
| White   | *               | 1                  | *              | N/A    | 2.9            | N/A                           | N/A             |
| English Learners  | Blue            | 91                 | 0              | 0      | 3.7            | -3.7                          | Lower           |
| Foster Youth  | *               | 2                  | *              | N/A    | 13.6           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Homeless  | *               | 3                  | *              | N/A    | 6.5            | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | Blue            | 418                | 0.2            | 0.2    | 4.5            | -4.3                          | Lower           |
| Students With Disabilities  | Blue            | 67                 | 0              | 0      | 5.9            | -5.9                          | Lower           |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? |                 |                    |                | YES    | All Students   | YES                           |                 |
|   |                 |                    |                |        | Student Groups | YES<br>4 of 4                 |                 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 1-29-25

**Table O: KIPP Sol 2024 Suspension Indicator Compared to the State**

| Student Groups  | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent  | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All   | Blue            | 497                | 0.4            | 0.2    | 3.2            | -2.8                          | Lower           |
| AA/Black  | *               | 2                  | *              | N/A    | 8.4            | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Asian   | *               | 1                  | *              | N/A    | 1              | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Hispanic or Latino  | Blue            | 492                | 0.4            | 0.2    | 3.4            | -3                            | Lower           |
| White   | *               | 2                  | *              | N/A    | 2.6            | N/A                           | N/A             |
| English Learners  | Yellow          | 97                 | 1              | 1      | 3.4            | -2.4                          | Lower           |
| Long-Term English Learners  | Blue            | 51                 | 0              | 0      | 8.1            | -8.1                          | Lower           |
| Foster Youth  | *               | 3                  | *              | N/A    | 13.2           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Homeless Youth  | *               | 9                  | *              | N/A    | 5.7            | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | Blue            | 431                | 0.5            | 0.2    | 4              | -3.5                          | Lower           |
| Students With Disabilities  | Blue            | 69                 | 0              | 0      | 5.4            | -5.4                          | Lower           |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? |                 |                    |                | YES    | All Students   | YES                           |                 |
|   |                 |                    |                |        | Student Groups | YES<br>5 of 5                 |                 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 1-29-25

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Report Data**

| <b>Table Legend for i-Ready Data Tables</b>  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables are a Summary of the i-Ready Reading and Math Diagnostic Growth Reports</li> <li>• One year's growth in Reading for Grades K-5 is met by attaining median progress to typical growth of 75%</li> <li>• One year's growth in Reading for Grades 6-8 is met by attaining median progress to typical growth of 45%</li> <li>• One year's growth in Math for Grades K-5 is met by attaining median progress to typical growth of 80%</li> <li>• One year's growth in Math for Grades 6-8 is met by attaining median progress to typical growth of 60%</li> <li>• Green cell indicates the student group met the minimum requirement for one year's growth</li> <li>• Red cell indicates student group has not met the minimum requirement for one year's growth</li> <li>• Gray cell indicates the number is less than 10 students, the minimum size for reporting</li> <li>• Data reflects grade levels with ten or more students in that student group.</li> </ul> |

**Table P: KIPP Sol Student Groups i-Ready Reading**

| <b>2023-24 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Reading</b> |                                  |                             |  |  |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Student Groups</b>                            | <b>Number of students tested</b> | <b>Target Growth Median</b> | <b>Student Group Progress to Growth Median</b> | <b>One Year's Progress Met/Not Met</b> |
| <b>Grade 5</b>                                   | 118                              | 75%                         | 103%   | Met                                    |
| English Learner                                  | 23                               | 75%                         | 81%  | Met                                    |
| Latino   | 116                              | 75%                         | 105%   | Met                                    |
| SED  | 101                              | 75%                         | 105%   | Met                                    |
| SWD  | 22                               | 75%                         | 179%   | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 6</b>                                   | 120                              | 45%                         | 60%  | Met                                    |
| English Learner                                  | 26                               | 45%                         | 99%  | Met                                    |
| Latino   | 119                              | 45%                         | 53%  | Met                                    |
| SED  | 100                              | 45%                         | 43%  | Not Met                                |
| SWD  | 17                               | 45%                         | 42%  | Not Met                                |
| <b>Grade 7</b>                                   | 118                              | 45%                         | 171%   | Met                                    |
| English Learner                                  | 29                               | 45%                         | 253%   | Met                                    |
| Latino   | 118                              | 45%                         | 171%   | Met                                    |
| SED  | 100                              | 45%                         | 173%   | Met                                    |
| SWD  | 16                               | 45%                         | 191%   | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 8</b>                                   | 115                              | 45%                         | 33%  | Not Met                                |
| English Learner                                  | 15                               | 45%                         | 67%  | Met                                    |
| Latino   | 115                              | 45%                         | 33%  | Not Met                                |
| SED  | 102                              | 45%                         | 12%  | Not Met                                |
| SWD  | 11                               | 45%                         | 67%  | Met                                    |

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table Q: KIPP Sol Student Groups i-Ready Reading**

| <b>2023-24 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Reading</b> |                                  |                             |  |  |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>All Students</b>                              | <b>Number of students tested</b> | <b>Target Growth Median</b> | <b>Student Group Progress to Growth Median</b> | <b>One Year's Progress Met/Not Met</b> |
| <b>Grade 5</b>                                   | 118                              | 75%                         | 103%   | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 6</b>                                   | 120                              | 45%                         | 60%  | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 7</b>                                   | 118                              | 45%                         | 171%   | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 8</b>                                   | 115                              | 45%                         | 33%  | Not Met                                |

**Table R: KIPP Sol Student Groups i-Ready Reading**

| <b>2023-24 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Reading</b> |                                  |                             |  |  |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>English Learners</b>                          | <b>Number of students tested</b> | <b>Target Growth Median</b> | <b>Student Group Progress to Growth Median</b> | <b>One Year's Progress Met/Not Met</b> |
| <b>Grade 5</b>                                   | 23                               | 75%                         | 81%  | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 6</b>                                   | 26                               | 45%                         | 99%  | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 7</b>                                   | 29                               | 45%                         | 253%   | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 8</b>                                   | 15                               | 45%                         | 67%  | Met                                    |

**Table S: KIPP Sol Student Groups i-Ready Reading**

| <b>2023-24 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Reading</b> |                                  |                             |  |  |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Latino</b>                                    | <b>Number of students tested</b> | <b>Target Growth Median</b> | <b>Student Group Progress to Growth Median</b> | <b>One Year's Progress Met/Not Met</b> |
| <b>Grade 5</b>                                   | 116                              | 75%                         | 105%   | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 6</b>                                   | 119                              | 45%                         | 53%  | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 7</b>                                   | 118                              | 45%                         | 171%   | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 8</b>                                   | 115                              | 45%                         | 33%  | Not Met                                |



Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table T: KIPP Sol Student Groups i-Ready Reading**

| <b>2023-24 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Reading</b> |                                  |                             |  |  |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>SED</b>                                       | <b>Number of students tested</b> | <b>Target Growth Median</b> | <b>Student Group Progress to Growth Median</b> | <b>One Year's Progress Met/Not Met</b> |
| <b>Grade 5</b>                                   | 101                              | 75%                         | 105%   | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 6</b>                                   | 100                              | 45%                         | 43%  | Not Met                                |
| <b>Grade 7</b>                                   | 100                              | 45%                         | 173%   | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 8</b>                                   | 102                              | 45%                         | 12%  | Not Met                                |

**Table U: KIPP Sol Student Groups i-Ready Reading**

| <b>2023-24 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Reading</b> |                                  |                             |  |  |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>SWD</b>                                       | <b>Number of students tested</b> | <b>Target Growth Median</b> | <b>Student Group Progress to Growth Median</b> | <b>One Year's Progress Met/Not Met</b> |
| <b>Grade 5</b>                                   | 22                               | 75%                         | 179%   | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 6</b>                                   | 17                               | 45%                         | 42%  | Not Met                                |
| <b>Grade 7</b>                                   | 16                               | 45%                         | 191%   | Met                                    |
| <b>Grade 8</b>                                   | 11                               | 45%                         | 67%  | Met                                    |

**Table V: KIPP Sol Student Groups i-Ready Math**

| <b>2023-24 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Math</b> |                                  |                             |  |  |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Student Groups</b>                         | <b>Number of students tested</b> | <b>Target Growth Median</b> | <b>Student Group Progress to Growth Median</b> | <b>One Year's Progress Met/Not Met</b> |
| <b>Grade 5</b>                                | 117                              | 80%                         | 22%  | Not Met                                |
| English Learner                               | 23                               | 80%                         | 0%   | Not Met                                |
| Latino  | 115                              | 80%                         | 22%  | Not Met                                |
| SED   | 100                              | 80%                         | 13%  | Not Met                                |
| SWD   | 22                               | 80%                         | 35%  | Not Met                                |
| <b>Grade 6</b>                                | 120                              | 60%                         | 80%  | Met                                    |
| English Learner                               | 26                               | 60%                         | 90%  | Met                                    |
| Latino  | 119                              | 60%                         | 80%  | Met                                    |

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

|                 |     |     |     |         |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|---------|
| SED             | 100 | 60% | 80% | Met     |
| SWD             | 17  | 60% | 71% | Met     |
| <b>Grade 7</b>  | 118 | 60% | 17% | Not Met |
| English Learner | 29  | 60% | 0%  | Not Met |
| Latino          | 118 | 60% | 17% | Not Met |
| SED             | 100 | 60% | 15% | Not Met |
| SWD             | 16  | 60% | 61% | Met     |
| <b>Grade 8</b>  | 115 | 60% | 56% | Not Met |
| English Learner | 15  | 60% | 33% | Not Met |
| Latino          | 115 | 60% | 56% | Not Met |
| SED             | 102 | 60% | 44% | Not Met |
| SWD             | 11  | 60% | 60% | Met     |

Table W: KIPP Sol Student Groups i-Ready Math

| 2023-24 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Math |                           |                      |   |                                 |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| All Students                           | Number of students tested | Target Growth Median | Student Group Progress to Growth Median | One Year's Progress Met/Not Met |
| Grade 5                                | 117                       | 80%                  | 22%                                     | Not Met                         |
| Grade 6                                | 120                       | 60%                  | 80%                                     | Met                             |
| Grade 7                                | 118                       | 60%                  | 17%                                     | Not Met                         |
| Grade 8                                | 115                       | 60%                  | 56%                                     | Not Met                         |

Table X: KIPP Sol Student Groups i-Ready Math

| 2023-24 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Math |                           |                      |   |                                 |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| English Learners                       | Number of students tested | Target Growth Median | Student Group Progress to Growth Median | One Year's Progress Met/Not Met |
| Grade 5                                | 23                        | 80%                  | 0%                                      | Not Met                         |
| Grade 6                                | 26                        | 60%                  | 90%                                     | Met                             |
| Grade 7                                | 29                        | 60%                  | 0%                                      | Not Met                         |
| Grade 8                                | 15                        | 60%                  | 33%                                     | Not Met                         |

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table Y: KIPP Sol Student Groups i-Ready Math**

| <b>2023-24 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Math</b> |                                  |                             |  |  |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Latino</b>                                 | <b>Number of students tested</b> | <b>Target Growth Median</b> | <b>Student Group Progress to Growth Median</b> | <b>One Year's Progress Met/Not Met</b> |
| <b>Grade 5</b>                                | 115                              | 80%                         | 22%  | <b>Not Met</b>                         |
| <b>Grade 6</b>                                | 119                              | 60%                         | 80%  | <b>Met</b>                             |
| <b>Grade 7</b>                                | 118                              | 60%                         | 17%  | <b>Not Met</b>                         |
| <b>Grade 8</b>                                | 115                              | 60%                         | 56%  | <b>Not Met</b>                         |

**Table Z: KIPP Sol Student Groups i-Ready Math**

| <b>2023-24 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Math</b> |                                  |                             |  |  |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>SED</b>                                    | <b>Number of students tested</b> | <b>Target Growth Median</b> | <b>Student Group Progress to Growth Median</b> | <b>One Year's Progress Met/Not Met</b> |
| <b>Grade 5</b>                                | 100                              | 80%                         | 13%  | <b>Not Met</b>                         |
| <b>Grade 6</b>                                | 100                              | 60%                         | 80%  | <b>Met</b>                             |
| <b>Grade 7</b>                                | 100                              | 60%                         | 15%  | <b>Not Met</b>                         |
| <b>Grade 8</b>                                | 102                              | 60%                         | 44%  | <b>Not Met</b>                         |

**Table AA: KIPP Sol Student Groups i-Ready Math**

| <b>2023-24 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth Math</b> |                                  |                             |  |  |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>SWD</b>                                    | <b>Number of students tested</b> | <b>Target Growth Median</b> | <b>Student Group Progress to Growth Median</b> | <b>One Year's Progress Met/Not Met</b> |
| <b>Grade 5</b>                                | 22                               | 80%                         | 35%  | <b>Not Met</b>                         |
| <b>Grade 6</b>                                | 17                               | 60%                         | 71%  | <b>Met</b>                             |
| <b>Grade 7</b>                                | 16                               | 60%                         | 61%  | <b>Met</b>                             |
| <b>Grade 8</b>                                | 11                               | 60%                         | 60%  | <b>Met</b>                             |

## Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

### Resident Schools Comparison Data

| Table Legend for Resident Schools Tables |  |
|--|--|
| •  | Tables are a Summary of Resident Schools Performance Data    |
| •  | Green cell indicates KIPP Sol outperforming Resident Schools |
| •  | Red cell indicates Resident Schools outperforming KIPP Sol   |

**Table AB: KIPP Sol Resident Schools Comparison on Dashboard Academic Indicators**

|  | 2021-22  | 2022-23  | 2023-24 |
|--|----------|----------|---------|
| English-Language Arts  | 15 of 15 | 14 of 15 | 1 of 15 |
| Math   | 12 of 15 | 9 of 15  | 4 of 15 |
| ELPI   | 13 of 15 | 9 of 15  | 8 of 15 |
| Is the charter school outperforming resident schools on Dashboard Academic Indicators? | YES      | YES      | NO      |

**Table AC: 2022 Resident Schools Comparison on Dashboard Academic Indicators**

| KIPP Sol Academy<br>2022 Dashboard Indicators Compared to Resident Schools |                   |                 |          |          |            |                      |                              |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| All Students   |                   |                 |          |          |            |                      |                              |
| Indicator  | Miles from School | 2022 Enrollment | ELA      | Math     | ELPI       | Chronic Absenteeism  | Suspension Rate              |
| Status Metric  | —                 | —               | DFS      | DFS      | % Progress | % Chronically Absent | % suspended at least one day |
| KIPP Sol Academy (5-8)   | —                 | 501             | -9.4     | -65      | 63%        | 37.9%                | 0%                           |
| State  | —                 | —               | -12.2    | -51.7    | 50.3%      | 30%                  | 3.1%                         |
| Resident District Schools  |                   |                 |          |          |            |                      |                              |
| Brooklyn Avenue School   | 0.3               | 475             | -18.7    | -59.5    | 51.1%      | 37.9%                | 0%                           |
| Griffith STEAM Magnet Middle School  | 0.8               | 1,199           | -12.8    | -96.2    | 60.0%      | 35.3%                | 0%                           |
| Belvedere Middle School (6-8)  | 1.3               | 690             | -39      | -100.8   | 67.0%      | 30.5%                | 0.1%                         |
| Fourth Street Elementary School (2-5)                                      | 1.3               | 302             | -50      | -77.7    | 52.7%      | 39.7%                | 0%                           |
| Humphreys Avenue Elementary School   | 1.4               | 433             | -40.3    | -50.5    | 50.9%      | 48.9%                | 0%                           |
| William R. Anton Elementary School   | 1.6               | 459             | -63.1    | -76.1    | 51.7%      | 55.7%                | 0%                           |
| Eastmont Intermediate School   | 2                 | 644             | -40.6    | -114     | 56.2%      | 21.0%                | 1.7%                         |
| Ford Boulevard Elementary  | 2.2               | 829             | -43.4    | -56.3    | 55.8%      | 40.3%                | 0%                           |
| Robert Louis Stevenson Middle School                                       | 2.8               | 914             | -45      | -113.7   | 54.7%      | 40.1%                | 0.1%                         |
| Montebello Intermediate School   | 3.8               | 864             | -43.5    | -115.7   | 53.5%      | 29.8%                | 3.3%                         |
| Hollenbeck Middle School   | 3.9               | 955             | -24.9    | -66.8    | 61.2%      | 31.9%                | 0.2%                         |
| Resident Charter Schools   |                   |                 |          |          |            |                      |                              |
| Animo Ellen Ochoa Charter Middle School                                    | 0.7               | 312             | -47.9    | -117.1   | 69.4%      | 37.1%                | 0%                           |
| Arts in Action Community Elementary (K-5)                                  | 1.0               | 385             | -63.4    | -87.3    | 38.5%      | 24.9%                | 0%                           |
| Arts in Action Community Middle School                                     | 1.4               | 255             | -67.5    | -117.3   | 45.6%      | 26.0%                | 0.8%                         |
| Alliance College-Ready Middle Academy 8                                    | 1.9               | 426             | -37.4    | -90.9    | 59.3%      | 34.0%                | 1.4%                         |
| Is the charter performing equal to or better than the resident schools?    |                   |                 | 15 of 15 | 12 of 15 | 13 of 15   | 6 of 15              | 15 of 15                     |

Staff Findings on KIPP Sol Academy Renewal Appeal

**Table AD: 2023 Resident Schools Comparison on Dashboard Academic Indicators**

| KIPP Sol Academy<br>2023 Dashboard Indicators Compared to Resident Schools |                   |                 |          |         |            |                      |                              |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|----------|---------|------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| All Students   |                   |                 |          |         |            |                      |                              |
| Indicator  | Miles from School | 2023 Enrollment | ELA      | Math    | ELPI       | Chronic Absenteeism  | Suspension Rate              |
| Status Metric  | —                 | —               | DFS      | DFS     | % Progress | % Chronically Absent | % suspended at least one day |
| KIPP Sol Academy (5-8)   | —                 | 494             | -21.4    | -73.4   | 52.9%      | 29.7%                | 0.2%                         |
| State  | —                 | —               | -13.6    | -49.1   | 48.7%      | 24.3%                | 3.5%                         |
| Resident District Schools  |                   |                 |          |         |            |                      |                              |
| Brooklyn Avenue School   | 0.3               | 465             | -17.2    | -52.2   | 61.4%      | 19.1%                | 0%                           |
| Griffith STEAM Magnet Middle School  | 0.8               | 1,189           | -31.2    | -94.1   | 58.6%      | 30.4%                | 0%                           |
| Belvedere Middle School (6-8)  | 1.3               | 727             | -51.9    | -91.2   | 43.4%      | 30.0%                | 0%                           |
| Fourth Street Elementary School (2-5)                                      | 1.3               | 295             | -44.9    | -70     | 39.0%      | 28.2%                | 0%                           |
| Humphreys Avenue Elementary School   | 1.4               | 408             | -31.8    | -43.9   | 45.8%      | 32.3%                | 0%                           |
| William R. Anton Elementary School   | 1.6               | 477             | -65.3    | -78     | 45.6%      | 36.7%                | 0%                           |
| Eastmont Intermediate School   | 2.0               | 618             | -42.3    | -105.9  | 59.9%      | 18.0%                | 5.4%                         |
| Ford Boulevard Elementary  | 2.2               | 841             | -58.1    | -64.1   | 51.9%      | 34.7%                | 0%                           |
| Robert Louis Stevenson Middle School                                       | 2.8               | 876             | -44.8    | -103.1  | 61.1%      | 32.6%                | 0%                           |
| Montebello Intermediate School   | 3.8               | 796             | -49.7    | -116.4  | 45.2%      | 26.8%                | 3.7%                         |
| Hollenbeck Middle School   | 3.9               | 1007            | -41.9    | -73.2   | 55.3%      | 27.8%                | 0.5%                         |
| Resident Charter Schools   |                   |                 |          |         |            |                      |                              |
| Animo Ellen Ochoa Charter Middle School                                    | 0.7               | 306             | -25.2    | -81.9   | 66.7%      | 28.2%                | 0%                           |
| Arts in Action Community Elementary (K-5)                                  | 1.0               | 385             | -62.9    | -68.2   | 52.5%      | 22.7%                | 0%                           |
| Arts in Action Community Middle School                                     | 1.4               | 255             | -66.9    | -116.8  | 52.2%      | 0%                   | 4.5%                         |
| Alliance College-Ready Middle Academy 8                                    | 1.9               | 407             | -51.1    | -102.1  | 40.2%      | 29.6%                | 2.1%                         |
| Is the charter performing equal to or better than the resident schools?    |                   |                 | 14 of 15 | 9 of 15 | 9 of 15    | 6 of 15              | 5 of 15                      |

**Table AE: 2024 Resident Schools Comparison on Dashboard Academic Indicators**

| KIPP Sol Academy<br>2024 Dashboard Indicators Compared to Resident Schools |                   |                                      |                 |         |         |            |                      |                              |
|--|-------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---------|---------|------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| All Students   |                   |                                      |                 |         |         |            |                      |                              |
| Indicator  | Miles from School | % of KIPP Sol Enrollment Represented | 2024 Enrollment | ELA     | Math    | ELPI       | Chronic Absenteeism  | Suspension Rate              |
| Status Metric  | —                 | —                                    | —               | DFS     | DFS     | % Progress | % Chronically Absent | % suspended at least one day |
| KIPP Sol Academy (5-8)   | —                 | —                                    | 488             | -62.3   | -90.8   | 54.3%      | 25.6%                | 0.4%                         |
| State  | —                 | —                                    | —               | -13.2   | -47.6   | 45.7%      | 18.6%                | 3.2%                         |
| Resident District Schools  |                   |                                      |                 |         |         |            |                      |                              |
| Brooklyn Avenue School (K-8)   | 0.3               | 9%                                   | 505             | -4.1    | -36.6   | 36.8%      | 5%                   | 0%                           |
| Griffith STEAM Magnet Middle School (6-8)                                  | 0.8               | 21.1%                                | 1,079           | -23     | -83     | 59.3%      | 25.5%                | 0.2%                         |
| Belvedere Middle School (6-8)  | 1.3               | 10.6%                                | 727             | -52.9   | -90.7   | 47.0%      | 25.9%                | 0.3%                         |
| Fourth Street Elementary School (2-5)                                      | 1.3               | 2.5%                                 | 287             | -43     | -69.9   | 50.0%      | 19.4%                | 0%                           |
| Humphreys Avenue Elementary School (K-5)                                   | 1.4               | 2.7%                                 | 378             | -29.2   | -41.3   | 41.8%      | 25.4%                | 0%                           |
| William R. Anton Elementary School (K-6)                                   | 1.6               | 2.5%                                 | 456             | -37.3   | -54.9   | 61.0%      | 28.2%                | 0%                           |
| Eastmont Intermediate School (6-8)   | 2.0               | 3.3%                                 | 615             | -46.7   | -113.9  | 44.2%      | 15.8%                | 5.5%                         |
| Ford Boulevard Elementary (K-5)  | 2.2               | 2.7%                                 | 789             | -50     | -37.2   | 54.5%      | 19.8%                | 0%                           |
| Robert Louis Stevenson Middle School (6-8)                                 | 2.8               | 9%                                   | 806             | -42     | -95.5   | 44.9%      | 23.8%                | 0.5%                         |
| Montebello Intermediate School (6-8)                                       | 3.8               | 2.3%                                 | 792             | -39.4   | -112.5  | 57.1%      | 19.5%                | 0.3%                         |
| Hollenbeck Middle School (6-8)   | 3.9               | 4%                                   | 1,022           | -32.3   | -57.3   | 56.8%      | 23.8%                | 0.2%                         |
| Resident Charter Schools   |                   |                                      |                 |         |         |            |                      |                              |
| Animo Ellen Ochoa Charter Middle School (6-8)                              | 0.7               | N/A                                  | 298             | -4.4    | -60     | 65.6%      | 16.9%                | 0%                           |
| Arts in Action Community Elementary (K-5)                                  | 1.0               | N/A                                  | 383             | -58.8   | -53.7   | 52.2%      | 31.1%                | 0.2%                         |
| Arts in Action Community Middle School (6-8)                               | 1.4               | N/A                                  | 259             | -74.4   | -129.3  | 51.5%      | 24%                  | 3.0%                         |
| Alliance College-Ready Middle Academy 8 (6-8)                              | 1.9               | N/A                                  | 392             | -29.9   | -76.7   | 58.0%      | 21.1%                | 0.2%                         |
| Is the charter performing equal to or better than the resident schools?    |                   |                                      |                 | 1 of 15 | 4 of 15 | 8 of 15    | 3 of 15              | 3 of 15                      |

Board Meeting – April 1, 2025

Item VII. Recommendation / Public Hearing

B. Adopt the Superintendent’s Recommendation to Authorize the Renewal Petition for *Jardin de la Infancia, Grades TK-1*: Renewal Petition with Attached Report

a. Staff Findings on the Renewal Petition for *Jardin de la Infancia, Grades TK-1*, Pursuant to Education Code Sections 47605, 47607 and 47607.2

The Jardin de la Infancia (Jardin) renewal petition is presented to the Los Angeles County Board of Education (County Board) pursuant to Education Code (EC) sections 47605, 47607, and 47607.2. The renewal process requires the authorizer to evaluate both the past performance of the charter school and whether the renewal petition meets the criteria for approval. Jardin is currently authorized by the Los Angeles County Board of Education.

Charter renewal is governed by EC 47605, 47607, and 47607.2 and the California Code of Regulations, Title 5 (5 CCR) sections 11966.4 and 11966.5. The California Department of Education has designated Jardin as a middle performing school. As such, EC 47607(c)(2) and 47607.2(a) do not apply. Critical components of the applicable laws are as follows:

**EC 47607(c)(1)** sets an additional criterion for determining whether to grant a charter renewal, the charter authority shall consider the performance of the charter school on the state and local indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5.

**EC 47607(e)** Notwithstanding subdivisions (c) and subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 47607.2, the chartering authority may deny renewal of a charter school upon finding that the school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial fiscal or governance factors or is not serving all pupils who wish to attend, as documented pursuant to subdivision (d).

**EC 47607.2(b)** states, in relevant part:

- (1) for all charter schools for which paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of Section 47607 and subdivision (a) of this section do not apply, the chartering authority shall consider the schoolwide

performance and performance of all subgroups of pupils served by the charter school on the state indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5 and the performance of the charter school on the local indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5.

- (2) The chartering authority shall provide greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.
- (3) In addition to the state and local indicators, the chartering authority shall consider clear and convincing evidence showing either of the following:
  - (A) The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year’s progress for each year in school.
  - (B) Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.
- (4) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) shall be demonstrated by verified data, as defined in subdivision (c).

Verified data is defined as data derived from nationally recognized, valid, peer-reviewed, and reliable sources that are externally produced.

**5 CCR 11966.5(c)(1-2)** provides the considerations and criteria to be used by a county board for making a determination as to whether to renew a charter:

- (1) When considering a petition for renewal, the county board of education shall consider the past performance of the school’s academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement, if any.
- (2) The county board of education may deny a petition for renewal of a charter school only if [it] makes written factual findings, specific to the particular petition, setting forth facts to support one or more of the grounds for denial set forth, as applicable, in **EC 47605(c) or failure to meet one of the criteria set forth in EC section 47607**. (Emphasis added)

**EC 47607(a)(5)(b)** states that renewals of charters are governed by the standards and criteria in 47605, and shall include, but not be

limited to, a reasonably comprehensive description of any new requirement of charter schools enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.

**EC 47605(c)** requires a governing board to be guided by the intent of the legislature that charter schools should become an integral part of the education system and that a charter be granted if the governing board is satisfied that granting the charter is consistent with sound educational practice.

**EC 47605(c)** further states that a governing board may only deny a petition if it provides written factual findings specific to the petition that supports one or more of the following findings:

- (1) The charter school presents an unsound educational program.
- (2) The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program.
- (3) The petition does not contain the required number of signatures.  
*(Not applicable to a renewal petition)*
- (4) The petition does not contain an affirmation of specified assurances.
- (5) The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of 15 required elements of a charter.
- (6) The petition does not contain a declaration of whether or not the charter school shall be deemed the exclusive public employer of the employees of the charter school for purpose of Chapter 10.7.

The County Board shall evaluate the petition according to the criteria and procedures established in law and may only deny the petition if it provides written findings addressing the reasons for the denial.

A summary of key findings is presented through the table on the following page.

The complete report on the written findings of fact is attached.

LACOE staff will present the report to the County Board.



| <b>Jardin de la Infancia Charter School Petition for Renewal</b>   |   | <b>Meets Requirements*</b>   |                |
|--|---|--|----------------|
| <b>EC 47607(c), EC 47607.2(a) and EC 47607.2(b): Academic performance level</b>  |   |  |                |
| <b>Finding 1</b>   | The charter school provided evidence it met one of the statutory criteria for renewal.                  | Yes  |                |
| <b>EC 47605(c): Failure to meet the criteria under Findings 2-5 is grounds for denial.</b>   |   |  |                |
| <b>Finding 2</b>   | Sound Educational Practice  | Yes  |                |
| <b>Finding 3</b>   | Ability to Successfully Implement Intended Program  | Yes  |                |
| <b>Finding 4</b>   | Affirmation of Specified Conditions   | Yes  |                |
| <b>Finding 5:</b><br>The charter petition contains a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements.  | 1   | Description of Educational Program   | Yes*           |
|  | 2   | Measurable Pupil Outcomes  | Yes*           |
|  | 3   | Method for Measuring Pupil Progress  | Yes            |
|  | 4   | Governance Structure   | Yes            |
|  | 5   | Employee Qualifications  | Yes            |
|  | 6   | Health and Safety Procedures   | Yes*           |
|  | 7   | Racial and Ethnic Balance  | Yes*           |
|  | 8   | Admission Requirements   | Yes*           |
|  | 9   | Annual Independent Financial Audits  | Yes            |
|  | 10  | Suspension and Expulsion Procedures  | Yes            |
|  | 11  | Retirement Coverage  | Yes            |
|  | 12  | Public School Attendance Alternatives  | Yes            |
|  | 13  | Post-employment Rights of Employees  | Yes            |
|  | 14  | Dispute Resolution Procedures  | Yes*           |
|  | 15  | Closure Procedures   | Yes            |
| <b>Finding 6:</b>  | Declaration of whether or not it will be the exclusive employer for the employees of the charter school | Yes  |                |
| <b>Finding 7:</b><br>The charter petition meets the additional statutory requirements EC 47605 (d), (f) – (i), (l) – (n)   | (d)   | Standards, Assessments and Parent Consultation   | Qualifies      |
|  | (f)   | Employment is Voluntary  | Not Applicable |
|  | (g)   | Pupil Attendance is Voluntary  | Not Applicable |
|  | (h)   | Effect on Authorizer and Financial Projections<br>Facilities, Administrative Services, Civil Liability and Financial Statements,<br>Nonprofit Board Member Information | Qualifies      |
|  | (i)   | Targets Academically Low Achieving Pupils**  | Qualifies      |
|  | (l)   | Teacher Credentialing  | Qualifies      |
|  | (m)   | Transmission of Audit Report   | Qualifies      |
|  | (n)   | Parent Involvement is Voluntary  | Qualifies      |
| <p><i>*Elements marked as meeting requirements may need further explanation, adjustment or technical changes; however, they are reasonably comprehensive and/or substantively comply with regulatory guidance and the LACOE standard of review described in Board Policy and the Superintendent’s Administrative Regulations.</i></p> <p><i>**Charters created to target academically low achieving pupils are given a priority for authorization.</i></p> <p><i>^There are indicators of potential civil liability effects upon the authorizer.</i></p> |   |  |                |

b. The Superintendent recommends that the Los Angeles County Board of Education (County Board) adopt the written findings of fact stated below and take action to approve the renewal of *Jardin, Grades TK-1*, for a term of five years commencing July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2030, subject to meeting the following conditions by the specified dates:

1. **By May 1, 2025**, the school shall submit to the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) the signed Monitoring and Oversight Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) following approval by the school’s governing board.
2. **By June 2, 2025**, the school shall submit to LACOE a revised charter petition that addresses deficiencies and/or includes necessary technical adjustments identified in the LACOE report on the findings of fact to the County Board dated **April 1, 2025**. Changes include but not limited to:

Element 1 (Description of Educational Programs): Revision of the description of the English Learner (EL) program and reclassification criteria as noted within the report; enhance the description of the instructional program; identify the needs and challenges of student groups to be served such as homeless and foster youth students.

Element 2 (Measurable Pupil Outcomes): Modify the description of the Measurable Pupil Outcomes (MPOs) to include baseline data (2024-25) with growth measures.

Element 6 (Health and Safety Procedures): Update the list of procedures the school will follow to include recent changes to Education Code.

Element 7 (Means to Achieve a Reflective Racial and Ethnic Balance): Update the data chart to reflect the specific demographic information reflecting the district in which the school is located.

Element 8 (Admission Requirements): Changes necessary to identify students who reside within the Los Angeles Unified School District boundaries are the first preference.

Element 14 (Dispute Resolution Procedures): Updates needed to include required language per Board policy.

The County Superintendent of Schools shall determine whether the changes are sufficient; if they are not, the school shall complete additional changes to be sufficient by **July 1, 2025**.

**3. By July 1, 2025,**

- a. The school shall submit to LACOE a revised 2025-26 budget. The budget should include the 2025-26 Position Control Budget, including salaries and benefits for Jardin.
- b. A Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) approved by the charter school’s governing board.

**4. By June 30, 2026,**

Due to the school’s unique program that invalidates many of the renewal criteria based on the state dashboard and verified data, Jardin’s leadership team will work with LACOE’s Charter School Office, during the 2024-25 academic year, to develop mutually agreed upon academic responsive data goals that are developmentally appropriate, aligned with state standards, and provide meaningful insights into student learning in grade TK, K, and 1. These goals will be incorporated into the renewal process for the next charter term.

If any part or sub-part of conditions one (1) through three (3) is not met by the date specified, the Superintendent will notify the County Board at a regularly scheduled meeting. Failure to meet any of the conditions by the specified timeline is grounds for terminating authorization.

Terminating authorization of the charter is considered a denial.

The complete Report of the Findings of Fact on the renewal petition for *Jardin, Grades TK-1*, is attached.

Staff Findings on the Renewal Petition for *Jardin de la Infancia*, Grades TK-1

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The petition for *Jardin de la Infancia* (Jardin) is to renew the charter for a grades TK-1 school with current enrollment of approximately 21 students. This petition was submitted on January 31, 2025. The school is located at 1400 S. Broadway Avenue, Los Angeles, California within the geographic boundary of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD).

Jardin opened in 2004 when it was first authorized by LAUSD. The Los Angeles County Board of Education (County Board) first approved Jardin as an appeal of a denied renewal by the LAUSD in 2012. Jardin was renewed by the County Board on December 13, 2016.

*Jardin* first submitted a renewal petition to the County Board on December 13, 2016. The County Superintendent's recommendation to approve the renewal was upheld by the County Board. The County Board last authorized Jardin for a five-year term commencing on July 1, 2017, and ending on June 30, 2022. Due to legislative changes after the COVID-19 pandemic, the school's charter term was automatically extended to June 30, 2025. On April 16, 2021, the County Superintendent's recommendation to approve the material revision to the charter of Jardin de la Infancia to relocate their South-Central site at 307 East 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Los Angeles, 90014 to 1400 South Broadway Avenue, Los Angeles, 90015 was approved.

Jardin is currently operated by the 501(c)(3) nonprofit public benefit corporation Jardin de la Infancia.

**Mission and Vision:** The petition states the charter school's mission as "Jardin de la Infancia is founded on the belief that all children, regardless of socioeconomic status, can achieve at the highest academic levels when given equitable educational opportunities."

The school's vision is "Students learn in a safe, undistracted environment that is small enough to enable students and teachers to know one another well. It is supportive and demanding of students so that they experience merited feelings of satisfaction from their real achievements without being discouraged by the difficulties associated with learning. Jardin offers an extended-day, extended-year, academically challenging curriculum within a consistent structure of expectations and attitudes that leads to success in school. Success in kindergarten creates the confidence and momentum necessary for mastery of knowledge in each successive grade. Jardin has high academic standards; strong classroom management, positive reinforcement and cooperation, explicit teaching of skills, and strong cross-curricular connections."

**Students Served by the School:** Jardin serves students in grades TK-1, and the petition states enrollment is drawn mainly from Los Angeles and its neighboring communities.

The 2023-24 enrollment at Jardin was approximately 18 students, with the following demographics: 94.4% Hispanic or Latino; 5.6% African American or Black; 100% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students (SED); 5.6% Students with Disabilities (SWD); 66.7% English Learners (ELs); and 5.6% Homeless Youth (HY).

Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

**Table 1: Jardin 2023-2024 Enrollment by Ethnicity**

| Student Groups  | Number Enrolled | Percent of Total Enrollment |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| All             | 18              | 100                         |
| AA/Black        | 1               | 5.6                         |
| American Indian | 0               | 0.0                         |
| Asian           | 0               | 0.0                         |
| Filipino        | 0               | 0.0                         |
| Hispanic        | 17              | 94.4                        |
| Pac Islander    | 0               | 0.0                         |
| Two or more     | 0               | 0.0                         |
| White           | 0               | 0.0                         |

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp>  
Retrieved 11-6-24

**Table 2: Jardin 2023-2024 Enrollment by Student Group**

| Student Groups | Number Enrolled | Percent of Total Enrollment |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| EL             | 12              | 66.7                        |
| Foster         | 0               | 0.0                         |
| Homeless       | 1               | 5.6                         |
| SED            | 18              | 100                         |
| SWD            | 1               | 5.6                         |

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp>  
Retrieved 11-6-24

**Table 3: Jardin Enrollment by Year and Grade**

| Year    | Grade TK | Grade K | Grade 1 | Total |
|---------|----------|---------|---------|-------|
| 2017-18 | --       | 20      | 19      | 39    |
| 2018-19 | --       | 20      | 15      | 35    |
| 2019-20 | --       | 16      | 14      | 30    |
| 2020-21 | --       | 12      | 11      | 23    |
| 2021-22 | --       | 8       | 7       | 15    |
| 2022-23 | --       | 7       | 7       | 14    |
| 2023-24 | 6        | 4       | 4       | 18    |

Since its last authorization by the County Board, Jardin has received two written Notices of Concern. In 2017-18 the school received a Notice due to concerns regarding governing board meeting frequency and use of teleconferencing, composition of governing board, submittal of required governing board meeting materials, submission of governing board member updates, and lack of school website. In 2020-21 the school received a Notice for potential conflict of interest, and the composition of governing board and diversity. Concerns pertaining to both Notices have been resolved.

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION REVIEW PROCESS**

**Review Criteria:** The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Charter School Review Team (Review Team) considered the petition according to the requirements of the *Education Code* and other pertinent laws, guidance established in the *California Code of Regulations* Title 5, County Board Policy and the Superintendent’s Administrative Regulations.<sup>1</sup>

LACOE has adopted the petition review criteria established in 5 CCR section 11967.5.1(a-g) except where LACOE determined that the regulations provide insufficient direction or where they are not applicable because the structure or responsibility of the County Board and LACOE differ from those of the State Board of Education (SBE) and the California Department of Education (CDE). In these instances, LACOE developed its own local review criteria or added criteria to those developed by CDE to reflect the needs of

<sup>1</sup> Words in italics indicate a direct reference to the language in these documents.

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

the County Board as the authorizer and LACOE as the monitoring and oversight agency. These local criteria do not conflict with statute.

A more detailed description of the LACOE petition renewal process can be found in Appendix A.

### CHARTER RENEWAL ELIGIBILITY

#### Statutory Framework and Criteria for Renewal<sup>2</sup>

All charter schools requesting renewal must clearly show that they meet eligibility requirements set forth in the Charter Schools Act and further defined in AB 1505. Depending on the findings adopted by the County Board, a charter may be renewed or denied renewal based on these criteria found in *EC 47605*, *47607* and *47607.2*:

1. Does the petition and the supporting documentation reflect a sound educational program for pupils? Are the petitioners likely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition? Does the petition contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements and affirm the conditions of *EC 47605(e)*?
2. Is the charter eligible for renewal under the High, Middle, or Low performing category and has the charter provided an argument with sufficient evidence that it has attained the criteria for renewal under that category? Has the charter attained measurable increases in academic achievement schoolwide and for numerically significant subgroups served by the charter school, and if applicable, does the school have strong postsecondary outcomes?
3. Does the charter school have discriminatory enrollment or dismissal practices? Does the charter have substantial fiscal or governance issues?

**Jardin is designated as a Middle Performing Charter School under *EC 47607.2(b)* for Evaluation Purposes<sup>3</sup>.**

#### Middle Performing *EC 47607.2(b)*

The school was not found eligible for high performing under *EC 47607(c)* nor low performing under *EC 47607.2(a)*; therefore, the chartering authority:

- A. Shall consider schoolwide performance and performance of all subgroups on the Dashboard, while providing greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal
- B. Shall also consider clear and convincing evidence with verified data showing either:
  1. The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in schoolOR
  2. Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.

Note: An Authorizer may only deny pursuant to *EC 47607.2(b)* upon making written findings that:

---

<sup>2</sup> The full renewal criteria can be found in Appendix B.

<sup>3</sup> Source: CDE Charter Schools Performance Category Data Files  
<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/performcategorydf.asp> Retrieved 11-16-24

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

- (1) The charter school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to pupils of the school;

AND

- (2) Closure is in the best interest of the pupils;

AND

- (3) The decision provided greater weight to the performance on measurements of academic performance.

Written factual findings specific to this particular petition along with supporting facts are presented in the next section of this report.

Written factual findings specific to this particular petition along with supporting facts are presented in the next section of this report.

The review team established that Jardin has met the criteria for renewal. The charter school has made sufficient progress toward meeting standards, they present a sound educational program, they're likely to successfully implement the educational program, the petition contains the required affirmations Ed code 47605 (e), and there is no evidence of fiscal or governance factors or that they are not serving all pupils. Although the petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all elements the review team concluded that the completion of technical adjustments will make the petition fully compliant.

### LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION FINDINGS OF FACT

#### **Finding 1: The charter school's academic performance criteria specified in EC section 47607(b) demonstrated a middle performance classification.**

**Jardin** was identified as Middle-performing classification by the CDE. Verified data were utilized in this renewal consideration [EC 47607.2(c)]. The charter school met the renewal criteria specified in EC 47607.2(b).

Jardin de la Infancia faces unique challenges in demonstrating student academic progress through the California School Dashboard due to its grade span (TK-1) and small student population. Jardin does not administer the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) in English Language Arts (ELA) or Mathematics, as these assessments are only administered to students in grades 3-8 and 11. For the 2023-24 academic year, the school served 18 students, with fewer than 11 students tested on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC).

Further compounding the challenge is the school's small sample sizes within key Dashboard Indicators. Jardin had 19 students counted within the Suspension Rate and Chronic Absenteeism Indicators uploaded to the 2024 CA School Dashboard by the CDE. Given that the CDE requires a minimum of 30 students in an "All Students" category or in any numerically significant student group for data to be reported on the CA School Dashboard, Jardin is unlikely to meet this threshold now or in the foreseeable future. As a result, the CA School Dashboard, a key accountability tool, does not provide a meaningful measure of the school's academic progress.

In addition to the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI), Jardin's California School Dashboard consists of the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator, the Suspension Rate Indicator, and Local Indicators. The Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Rate Indicators are based on very small student populations,

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

making data trends difficult to analyze or interpret. The Local Indicators, which are self-reported by the school, provide additional context on Jardin's progress in areas such as Parent Engagement, School Climate, and Implementation of State Academic Standards.

Recognizing these limitations, if renewed, LACOE’s Charter Schools Office will work with Jardin’s leadership team during the 2025-26 academic year on identifying mutually agreed-upon academic responsive data goals that are developmentally appropriate, aligned with state standards, and provide meaningful insights into student learning in grades TK, K, and 1. Given that the school’s total enrollment and grade-level composition will continue to result in a student population size that will be less than 30 for grades TK, K, and 1 for CA Dashboard reporting, these alternative metrics will serve as a critical accountability mechanism to monitor Jardin's academic growth moving forward in a way that aligns with the school’s unique context, ensuring accountability and continuous development despite the absence of CA Dashboard academic indicators.

In light of the unique structure of Jardin de la Infancia and the limitations in available data, the school’s leadership has provided evidence it meets the necessary criteria for renewal. While traditional performance metrics are limited due to the school's grade span (TK-1) and small student population, alternative measures and qualitative assessments indicate that Jardin is fulfilling its educational mission. The school's commitment to student growth, adherence to state standards, and efforts to implement accountability measures support its renewal despite the constraints of available data. Detailed data tables of all applicable indicators are available in Appendix C.

### Jardin’s Academic Performance Indicators on the California School Dashboard Compared to State

| <b>Table Legend For All California Dashboard Tables</b> |   |
|---|---|
| “*”   | - The student group has fewer than 11 students and is not reported for privacy reasons  |
| “**”  | - Student groups must have at least 30 or more students in both the current and prior year status denominator of the state indicator to receive a Performance Level (color) |
| “—”   | - No data available   |
| “NPL”   | - No Performance Level available  |
| “NPC”   | - No Performance Color available  |
| “N/A”   | - Non-Applicable  |

**Table 4: Jardin California Dashboard**

| Year | ELA | Math | ELPI | CCI | Graduation Rate | Chronic Absenteeism | Suspension |
|------|-----|------|------|-----|-----------------|---------------------|------------|
| 2022 | N/A | N/A  | NPL* | N/A | N/A             | NPL**               | NPL**      |
| 2023 | N/A | N/A  | NPC* | N/A | N/A             | NPC**               | NPC**      |
| 2024 | N/A | N/A  | NPC* | N/A | N/A             | NPC**               | NPC**      |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/>

As a TK-1 school, Jardin does not administer the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) in English Language Arts (ELA) or Mathematics and does not receive CA School Dashboard data for these two academic indicators, as these assessments are only administered to students in grades 3-8 and 11.

The other two academic indicators are CCI and ELPI. As a school with grades TK-1, the College and Career Indicator does not apply. The California School Dashboard requires a minimum of 30 students in



## Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

an “All Students” category or in any numerically significant student group for data to be reported. For all three years of CA School Dashboard data, the number of first grade English Learners enrolled at Jardin who tested on the Summative ELPAC exam to measure progress towards English language proficiency was less than 11 students; therefore, data could not be reported for privacy reasons.

**Table 5: Jardin ELPI Percent Compared to the State**

|  | 2022                                      | 2023 | 2024 |
|--|---|------|------|
| Indicator  | English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) |      |      |
| Status Metric  | Percent Making Progress                   |      |      |
| English Learners   | *   | *    | *    |
| Source: CA School Dashboard <a href="https://www.caschooldashboard.org/">https://www.caschooldashboard.org/</a> Retrieved 11-4-24<br>Comprehensive ELPI data including state comparison is available in Appendix C |   |      |      |

As the school did not have available clear and convincing evidence of academic achievement through the California School Dashboard, the school’s CDE approved verified data assessment, i-Ready, was reviewed. To demonstrate one year’s progress, i-Ready “All Students” and each numerically significant student group’s median Progress to Typical Growth Targets for a school serving grades K-5 is 75% in Reading and 80% in Math. The i-Ready data is disaggregated by grade level for all students tested and numerically significant student groups as defined by the publisher for both Reading and Math.

The school’s leadership shared both in their petition and during their capacity interview that the school began administering i-Ready as a verifiable assessment tool in the spring of 2024 due to negotiations with the publisher to obtain a license for a small school such as Jardin.

Given Jardin’s limited time using the i-Ready assessment in both Reading and Math, to date, Jardin students are unable to demonstrate one year’s progress. This is because there has not yet been a full fall-to-spring assessment cycle to compare against the publisher’s derived cut points (75% for Reading and 80% for Math).

During the capacity interview, the school’s leadership indicated that current i-Ready performance data shows Jardin is meeting mid-year benchmarks and is on track to achieve its end-of-year goals for 2024-25. This data highlights the school's implementation of promising instructional practices. The school has not yet administered all necessary assessments to generate multiple years of data, as the publisher’s standard for measuring annual progress is based on a full fall-to-spring assessment cycle (30 weeks of instruction). For informational purposes, the school provided fall to winter data for the 17 students tested on both assessments demonstrating median Progress to Typical Growth Targets of 67% in Reading and 66% in Math.

In addition to reviewing i-Ready data, student participation rates on benchmark assessments were considered. The participation rates of students taking i-Ready assessments falls within an acceptable range when compared to the school's total enrollment.

### **Academic Engagement, School Conditions and School Climate Indicators on the California Dashboard Compared to State**

To attain measurable increases for renewal in areas of chronic absenteeism and suspension rate, the majority of the numerically significant student groups must be the same or lower than the state.

Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

**Table 6: Jardin Chronic Absenteeism Percent Compared to the State**

|   | 2022                       | 2023    | 2024    |
|---|----------------------------|---------|---------|
| Indicator   | Chronic Absenteeism        |         |         |
| Status Metric   | Percent Chronically Absent |         |         |
| All Students  | Lower**                    | Lower** | Lower** |
| Numerically Significant Student Groups  |                            |         |         |
| Hispanic or Latino  | Lower**                    | Lower** | Lower** |
| English Learner   | Lower**                    | *       | Lower** |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | Lower**                    | Lower** | Lower** |
| Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or below the state average?         | YES**                      | YES**   | YES**   |
| Source: CA School Dashboard <a href="https://www.caschooldashboard.org/">https://www.caschooldashboard.org/</a> Retrieved 11-4-24 |                            |         |         |
| Comprehensive Chronic Absenteeism data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C                   |                            |         |         |

**Table 7: Jardin Suspension Rate Percent Compared to the State**

|   | 2022   | 2023    | 2024    |
|---|--|---------|---------|
| Indicator   | Suspension Rate                                |         |         |
| Status Metric   | Percent of Students Suspended at Least One Day |         |         |
| All Students  | Lower**  | Lower** | Lower** |
| Numerically Significant Student Groups  |  |         |         |
| Hispanic or Latino  | Lower**  | Lower** | Lower** |
| English Learner   | Lower**  | *       | Lower** |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged   | Lower**  | Lower** | Lower** |
| Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or below the state average?         | YES**  | YES**   | YES**   |
| Source: CA School Dashboard <a href="https://www.caschooldashboard.org/">https://www.caschooldashboard.org/</a> Retrieved 11-4-24 |  |         |         |
| Comprehensive Suspension data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C                            |  |         |         |

All Local Indicators<sup>4</sup> were met in the 2022 and 2023 academic years but were not met in 2024 due to a failure to submit on time. During the capacity interview, the school's leadership shared steps it will take to ensure that, moving forward, all Local Indicator data will be compiled, reviewed, and submitted to the CDE concurrently with the LCAP to ensure accuracy and timeliness.

**Table 8: Jardin Local Indicators**

|   | 2022         | 2023         | 2024             |
|---|--------------|--------------|------------------|
| Local Indicators  |              |              |                  |
| Basics: teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilities   | Standard Met | Standard Met | Standard Not Met |
| Implementation of Academic Standards  | Standard Met | Standard Met | Standard Not Met |
| Parent & Family Engagement  | Standard Met | Standard Met | Standard Not Met |
| Local Climate Survey  | Standard Met | Standard Met | Standard Not Met |
| Access to a Broad Course of Study   | Standard Met | Standard Met | Standard Not Met |
| Source: CA School Dashboard <a href="https://www.caschooldashboard.org/">https://www.caschooldashboard.org/</a> Retrieved 11-4-24 |              |              |                  |

**Other Considerations**

Analysis of enrollment data obtained from the CDE, as required by *Education Code 47607(d)*, did not reveal any evidence that the school failed to serve students seeking enrollment.

<sup>4</sup> Per *EC 52064.5*, local indicators are self-assessed and self-reported by LEAs.

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

In the absence of applicable California School Dashboard Indicators and verified state data, staff conducted a review of Jardin’s Measurable Pupil Outcomes (MPOs) and Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) goals. While these measures are not explicitly designated as renewal criteria, the school has consistently met its established targets. The demonstrated progress in these areas provides evidence of overall growth in academic performance and supports the school's efforts in meeting standards that benefit its students.

Based on a comprehensive review, the school has demonstrated measurable progress in key areas required by *Education Code 47607.2(b)*, with greater weight provided to measurements of academic performance. The charter school has demonstrated sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to pupils of the school.

**Finding 2: The petition provides a sound educational program for students to be enrolled in the school.** [EC 47605(c)(1)]

Based on the guidance established in 5 CCR section 11967.5.1(a), the charter petition is *consistent with sound educational practice* based on evidence that *it is likely to be of educational benefit to pupils who attend. A charter school need not be designed or intended to meet the educational needs of every student who might possibly seek to enroll in order for the charter to be granted.*

**Finding 3: The petitioners are demonstrably likely to successfully implement the proposed educational program.** [EC 47605(c)(2)]

5 CCR 11967.5.1(c) provides four indicators for the Board to consider *in determining whether charter petitioners are “demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program.”* The review team determined the petitioners are likely to successfully implement the charter as long as the school (1) meets its enrollment projections and (2) meets its Average Daily Attendance (ADA) projections.

1. They have not had a past history of involvement in charter schools or other education agencies (public or private), that LACOE regards as unsuccessful.
2. They are familiar with the content of the petition or the requirements of law that would apply to the proposed charter school.
3. They have not presented an unrealistic financial and operational plan for the proposed charter school. The following fiscal analysis was used in making this determination and is provided for the Board’s consideration.

### Finance and Operations Overview

**Table 9** illustrates Jardin de la Infancia’s financial performance in the last five (5) years (FY 2020 through FY 2024).

| Year of Operation                                | Cash      | Net Cash Flow | Net Assets | Operating Results | Liabilities | P-2 ADA |
|--|-----------|---------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|---------|
| <b>Jardin de la Infancia authorized by LACOE</b> |           |               |            |                   |             |         |
| 2019-20  | \$150,573 | (21,905)      | \$265,920  | (\$45,133)        | \$102,372   | 29.31   |
| 2020-21  | \$41,206  | (\$109,367)   | \$306,212  | \$40,292          | \$36,519    | 29.31   |
| 2021-22  | \$161,009 | \$119,803     | \$200,311  | (\$105,901)       | \$151,383   | 15.28   |
| 2022-23  | \$679,898 | \$518,889     | \$269,402  | \$69,091          | \$688,214   | 13.88   |
| 2023-24  | \$684,427 | \$4,529       | 330,484    | \$61,082          | \$995,375   | 17.06   |

Source: Jardin de la Infancia Annual independent consolidated audit report (FY 2019-20 thru FY 2023-24).

Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

**Review of Prior Year Audit Reports:**

The petition includes annual audit reports for fiscal years 2019-20 through 2023-24, which provide a comprehensive overview of the financial position and compliance of Jardin de la Infancia. These audits confirm that Jardin de la Infancia ended the 2023-24 fiscal year with a positive fund balance of **\$330,484**.

The Independent Auditors’ Reports for this period consistently resulted in an **unmodified opinion**, no findings, reflecting that the financial statements fairly represent Jardin de la Infancia's financial position in all material respects.

| Table 10 Jardin de la Infancia Annual Audit Reports |             |                                      |            |          |   |
|---|-------------|--------------------------------------|------------|----------|---|
| Entity  | Fiscal Year | Auditing Firm                        | Opinion    | Findings | Ending Fund Balance per Audit – June 30 |
| Jardin de la Infancia                               | 2019-20     | Eide Bailly CPAs & Business Advisors | Unmodified | None     | \$265,920                               |
| Jardin de la Infancia                               | 2020-21     | Eide Bailly CPAs & Business Advisors | Unmodified | None     | \$306,212                               |
| Jardin de la Infancia                               | 2021-22     | Eide Bailly CPAs & Business Advisors | Unmodified | None     | \$200,311                               |
| Jardin de la Infancia                               | 2022-23     | Silva & Silva CPA's                  | Unmodified | None     | \$269,402                               |
| Jardin de la Infancia                               | 2023-24     | Silva & Silva CPA's                  | Unmodified | None     | \$330,484                               |

Source: Jardin de la Infancia’s Annual independent audit reports (FY 2019-2020 thru FY 2023-2024)

**Audit Findings - NONE**

**Budget Projections**

**Table 11** provides a summary of the charter’s proposed budget for the fiscal years 2024-25 through 2027-2028. This includes projected **Average Daily Attendance (ADA), Net Assets, Net Income, and Ending Cash Balance for the four (4) years**. The positive Ending Cash Balance for FY 2024-25 through 2027-28 is contingent upon achieving the school’s targeted enrollment and ADA.

| Table 11 Jardin de la Infancia Proposed Budget Overview |              |              |              |              |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Budget Plan   | FY 2024-2025 | FY 2025-2026 | FY 2026-2027 | FY 2027-2028 |
| ADA   | 21.56        | 23.52        | 24.50        | 27.44        |
| Net Assets  | \$335,208    | \$350,791    | \$361,130    | \$391,116    |
| Net Income Projections                                  | \$4,661      | \$15,583     | \$10,339     | \$29,986     |
| Projected Ending Cash Balance                           | \$650,851    | \$627,853    | \$192,782    | \$213,026    |

To be fiscally solvent, the Budget Plan requires that the school (1) meets its enrollment, and (2) meets its Average Daily Attendance (ADA) projections.

4. The petitioners do not lack the necessary background in areas critical to the charter school’s success.

**Finding 4:** The petition contains an affirmation of all specified assurances. [EC 47605(c)(4); EC 47605(e)]

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

**Finding 5: The petition contains a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements.**  
[EC 47605(c)(5)(A)-(O)]

Based on the guidance established in *Education Code*, California Code of Regulations, the requirements set forth in the Superintendent’s Administrative Regulations (AR) and other requirements of law, all of the 15 required elements are reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies. The findings of the Review Team are as follows:

**Element 1: Description of the Educational Program.** *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

1. The petition does not provide a clear description of how the charter school will meet the needs of English learners through both Designated ELD as a core subject area and Integrated ELD across all subject areas.

However, in response to requests from the Charter Schools Office, Jardin updated its 2024-25 *EL Master Plan* to include both Designated and Integrated ELD. During the capacity interview the petitioner stated that Designated and Integrated ELD are implemented as detailed in the school’s *EL Master Plan*. To meet this condition, the school must ensure that the updated language and information from the *EL Master Plan* are incorporated into the charter petition.

2. The petition omits one of the four criteria to locally establish reclassification policies and procedures.
3. The petition needs to be updated to describe a curriculum and instructional program that is aligned to the updated California Preschool/Transitional Kindergarten Learning Foundations (PTKLF), the 2023 CA Mathematics Framework, and the Next Generation Science Standards.

During the Capacity Interview, the Executive Director stated that she is familiar with the updated California Preschool/Transitional Kindergarten Learning Foundations (PTKLF), the 2023 CA Mathematics Framework, and the Next Generation Science Standards and shared that revisions will be made to the charter petition to update these components.

4. The petition does not sufficiently identify the needs and challenges of Homeless and Foster Youth students and does not clearly describe how the charter school’s instructional program will meet the needs of students in these special populations [5 CCR 11967.5.1(f)(1)(G)].

**Element 2: Measurable Pupil Outcomes.** *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

The petition does not adequately identify baseline data (2024-25) with growth measures for some Measurable Pupil Outcomes (MPOs), that are detailed enough to determine whether pupils are making satisfactory progress. To be sufficiently detailed, objective means of measuring pupil outcomes must be capable of being used readily to evaluate the effectiveness of and to modify instruction for individual students and for groups of students for each year of the upcoming charter term. For example, baseline data and yearly growth measures are missing for the i-Ready diagnostic assessments, chronic absenteeism, suspension, average daily attendance, etc. During the capacity interview the school’s leadership team shared that each MPO will be updated to provide appropriate details.

**Element 3: Method for Measuring Pupil Progress.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 4: Governance Structure.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 5: Employee Qualifications.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 6: Health and Safety Procedures.** *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

The petition does not contain recently updated changes to Education Code for having a Transportation Safety Plan as described in *EC section 39831.3*.

**Element 7: Means to Achieve a Reflective Racial, Ethnic Balance, Special Education and English Learner.** *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

The chart included in the charter petition does not identify or contain specific information on English Learners or Students with disabilities. LACOE staff created the following chart representing this information:

**Table 12: Jardin and Local Comm. Enrollment by Ethnicity & Subgroup**

| Student Groups             | Percent of Total Enrollment of School 2023-2024 | Community*<br>Zip code 90015 |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|
|                            |   | Percent of Total Community   |
| African American or Black  | 5.6%  | 9.4%                         |
| American Indian            | 0%  | 3.7%                         |
| Asian                      | 0%  | 22.6%                        |
| Filipino                   | 0%  | 1.5%                         |
| Hispanic or Latino         | 94.4%   | 45.3%                        |
| Pacific Islander           | 0%  | 0%                           |
| Two or more Races          | 0%  | 11.6%                        |
| White                      | 0%  | 26.7%                        |
| English Learners           | 66.7%   | 20.1%                        |
| Students with Disabilities | 5.6%  | 14.8%                        |

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp> Retrieved 2-27-25  
 \*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2018-2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates  
<https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDP5Y2022.DP05?t=Populations%20and%20People&g=860XX00US90746>

**Element 8: Admission Requirements.** *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

The admission preferences need to be updated to identify students who reside within the LAUSD boundaries as the first enrollment preference.

**Element 9: Annual Independent Financial Audits.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 10: Suspension and Expulsion Procedures.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 11: STRS, PERS, and Social Security.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 12: Public School Attendance Alternatives.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 13: Post-Employment Rights of Employees.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

**Element 14: Dispute Resolution Procedures.** *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

The petition fails to recognize that if the substance of a dispute is a matter that could result in the taking of appropriate action, including, but not limited to, revocation of the charter in accordance with EC section 47604.5, the matter will be addressed at the County Board's discretion in accordance with that provision of law and any regulations pertaining thereto.

- A. It does not acknowledge that in the event that any dispute arises between the charter school and LACOE, both parties agree to use the procedure as stated herein, except for any dispute that is any way related to revocation of the charter school.
- B. It does not state that at any time LACOE believes the dispute relates to an issue that could lead to revocation of the charter school, both parties will no longer be subject to this process.
- C. It does not state that LACOE may proceed immediately with the revocation procedures as set forth in law and stated below if LACOE believes the charter school:
  - a. Committed a material violation of any of the conditions, standards, or procedures set forth in the charter.
  - b. Failed to meet or pursue any of the pupil outcomes identified in the charter.
  - c. Failed to meet generally accepted accounting principles or engaged in fiscal mismanagement.
  - d. Violated any provision of law.

**Element 15: Closure Procedures.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Finding 6:** *The petitioners are not demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial fiscal or governance factors or is not serving all pupils who wish to attend, as documented pursuant to EC 47607(e).*

**Finding 7:** *The petition does satisfy all of the Required Assurances of Education Code section 47605(d), (f) through (i), (l), and (m) as follows:*

**Standards, Assessments and Parent Consultation.** *[EC 47605(d)] Meets the condition*

**Employment is Voluntary.** *[EC 47605(f)] Not applicable*

**Pupil Attendance is Voluntary.** *[EC 47605(g)] Not applicable*

**Effect on the Authorizer and Financial Projections.** *[EC 47605(h)] Provides the necessary evidence*

**Preference to Academically Low Performing Students.** *[EC 47605(i)] Qualifies*

**Teacher Credentialing Requirement.** *[EC 47605(l)] Meets the condition*

**Transmission of Audit Report.** *[EC 47605(m)] Meets the condition*

**Parent Involvement is Voluntary** *[EC 47605(n)] Meets the condition*

## Appendix A

### LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION REVIEW PROCESS

**Review Criteria:** The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Charter School Review Team (Review Team) considered the petition according to the requirements of the *Education Code* and other pertinent laws, guidance established in the *California Code of Regulations (5 CCR)*, Title 5, County Board Policy and Superintendent’s Administrative Regulations.<sup>5</sup>

LACOE has adopted the petition review criteria established in 5 CCR section 11967.5.1(a-g) except where LACOE determined that the regulations provide insufficient direction or where they are not applicable because the structure or responsibility of the County Board and LACOE differ from those of the State Board of Education (SBE) and the CDE. In these instances, LACOE developed its own local review criteria or added criteria to those developed by CDE to reflect the needs of the County Board as the authorizer and LACOE as the monitoring and oversight agency. These local criteria do not conflict with statute.

**Reasonably Comprehensive:** In addition to the regulatory guidance that specifies the components of each required element, 5 CCR section 11967.5.1(g) states a “reasonably comprehensive” description of the required petition elements shall include, but not be limited to, information that:

- (1) *Is substantive and is not, for example, a listing of topics with little elaboration.*
- (2) *For elements that have multiple aspects, addresses essentially all aspects the elements, not just selected aspects.*
- (3) *Is specific to the charter petition being proposed, not to charter schools or charter petitions generally.*
- (4) *Describes, as applicable among the different elements, how the charter school will:*
  - (A) *Improve pupil learning.*
  - (B) *Increase learning opportunities for its pupils, particularly pupils who have been identified as academically low achieving.*
  - (C) *Provide parents, guardians, and pupils with expanded educational opportunities.*
  - (D) *Hold itself accountable for measurable, performance-based pupil outcomes.*
  - (E) *Provide vigorous competition with other public-school options available to parents, guardians, and students.*

**Reasonably Comprehensive with Deficiencies:** An element may be reasonably comprehensive but lacks specific critical information or contain an error important enough to warrant correction. These elements are described as “reasonably comprehensive” with a specific “deficiency” or “deficiencies.” Correcting the deficiency or deficiencies would not be a material revision (as defined in statute and County Board Policy) to the charter.

**Technical Adjustments:** Three circumstances may require a “technical adjustment” to the petition:

- Adjustments necessary to reflect the County Board as the authorizer as required by statute. These adjustments are necessary because the petition was initially submitted to a local district and contains specific references to and/or language required by that district and/or the petition does not reflect the structure of the County Office.

---

<sup>5</sup> Words in italics indicate a direct reference to the language in these documents.



## Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

- Adjustments needed to bring the petition current with changes made to law since the petition was submitted to the district as required by statute.
- Adjustments necessary to address clerical errors or inconsistencies where making the adjustment would not be a material revision (as defined in statute and County Board Policy) to the charter.

**Affirmations and Assurances:** The petition shall contain a clear, unequivocal affirmation of each requirement, not a general statement of intention to comply. Neither the charter nor any of the supporting documents shall include any evidence that the charter will fail to comply with the conditions described in *EC* section 47605(c)(4).

**Reviewers:** The Review Team included staff from Business Advisory Services, Facilities and Construction, Risk Management, Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education, Student Support Services, Human Resources, Office of General Counsel, the Division of Accountability, Support and Monitoring, and the Charter School Office.

**Scope of Review:** Findings are based on a review of the same petition and supporting documents considered by the local district, information obtained through the Capacity Interview and other communications with the petitioner(s) and representatives of the school, and other publicly available information.

### **Legislative Intent**

The Review Team considered whether the petition complies with *EC* section 47601 of the *Charter Schools Act*, which states:

*It is the intent of the Legislature, in enacting this part, to provide opportunities for teachers, parents, pupils, and community members to establish and maintain schools that operate independently from the existing school district structure, as a method to accomplish all of the following:*

- (a) Improve pupil learning.*
- (b) Increase learning opportunities for all pupils, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for pupils who are identified as academically low achieving.*
- (c) Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods.*
- (d) Create new professional opportunities for teachers, including the opportunity to be responsible for the learning program at the school site.*
- (e) Provide parents and pupils with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system.*
- (f) Hold the schools established under this part accountable for meeting measurable pupil outcomes and provide the schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance-based accountability systems.*
- (g) Provide vigorous competition within the public school system to stimulate continual improvements in all public schools.*

### **Additional Review Criteria Specific to a Renewal Petition**

The renewal of a charter authorized by the County Board is governed by *EC* sections 47607 and 47605 or 47605.6 and 5 *CCR* section 11966.5, which provides the requirements for a renewal submission to a county board of education.

**EC 47607(b)** states that renewals *are governed by the standards and criteria in section 47605* (the requirements to establish a charter), and shall include, but not be limited to, *a reasonably comprehensive*

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

*description of any new requirement of charter schools enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.*

This language varies slightly from the requirement under 5 CCR 11966.4(a)(2), which requires the district to determine whether the renewal petition includes *a reasonably comprehensive description of how the charter school has met all new charter school requirements enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.* (Emphasis added)

The Review Team determined whether each required element complies with current legal requirements and whether the petitioners showed they are familiar with current legal requirements through the Capacity Interview. If the petition did not comply or the petitioners were unfamiliar with current law, the Review Team noted the deficiency through the applicable finding.

**EC 47607(e) Notwithstanding subdivision (c) and subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 47607.2, the chartering authority may deny renewal of a charter school upon finding that the school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial fiscal or governance factors, or it not serving all pupils who wish to attend.**

**5 CCR 11966.5(b)** provides the timelines, process and requirements for reviewing a renewal petition:

*A petition for renewal, whether submitted to the county board of education as the chartering authority or on appeal from denial of the renewal petition by the local governing board, shall be considered by the county board of education upon receipt of the petition with all of the requirements set forth in this subdivision.*

- (1) Documentation that the charter school meets at least one of the criteria specified in Education Code section 47607(b).*
- (2) A copy of the renewal charter petition, as denied by the local board, including a reasonably comprehensive description of how the charter school has met all new charter school requirements enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.*
  - (A) The signature requirement set forth in Education Code section 47605(a) is not applicable to a petition for renewal.*
- (3) When applicable, a copy of the governing board's denial and supporting written factual findings, if available.*
- (4) A description of any changes to the renewal petition necessary to reflect the county board of education as the chartering entity.*

County staff may provide a description of whether the petitioner met submission requirements.

**5 CCR 11966.5(c)** provides the areas to be considered to make a determination as to whether a charter should be renewed and provides the conditions under which a county board may deny a renewal petition:

- (1) When considering a petition for renewal, the county board of education shall consider the past performance of the school's academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement, if any.*

Any concerns regarding the past performance of the school are addressed under **Finding 3 (Demonstrably Unlikely....)** Plans for future improvement, if provided, would be addressed as applicable under the appropriate petition requirement.

- (2) The county board of education may deny a petition for renewal of a charter school only if [it] makes written factual findings, specific to the particular petition, setting forth facts to support*

Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

*one or more of the grounds for denial set forth, as applicable, in Education Code 47605(c) or failure to meet one of the criteria set forth in Education Code section 47607(b).*

**Appendix B**

**RENEWAL CRITERIA**

**Statutory Framework and Criteria for Renewal**

All charter schools requesting renewal must clearly show that they meet eligibility requirements set forth in Charter Schools Act and further defined in AB 1505. Depending on the findings adopted by the County Board, a charter may be renewed or denied renewal based on these criteria found in *EC 47605*, *47607* and *47607.2*:

1. Do the petition and supporting documentation reflect a sound educational program for pupils? Are the petitioners likely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition? Does the petition contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements and affirm the conditions of *EC 47605(e)*?
2. Is the charter eligible for renewal under the High, Middle, or Low performing category and has the charter provided an argument with sufficient evidence that it has attained the criteria for renewal under that category? Has the charter attained measurable increases in academic achievement schoolwide and for numerically significant subgroups served by the charter school, and if applicable, does the school have strong postsecondary outcomes?
3. Does the charter school have discriminatory enrollment or dismissal practices? Does the charter have substantial fiscal or governance issues?

**High Performing *EC 47607(c)***

A charter school that for two (2) consecutive years immediately preceding renewal:

- A. Received the two highest performance levels [green or blue] schoolwide on all state indicators on the Dashboard

OR

- B. For all measurements of academic performance, the school received levels schoolwide that are the same or higher than the state average, and for a majority of subgroups performing statewide below the state average in each respective year, received levels that are higher than the state average.

**Middle Performing *EC 47607.2(b)***

For charter schools not designated under either the High or Low Performing criteria, the chartering authority:

- A. Shall consider schoolwide performance and performance of all subgroups on the Dashboard, while providing greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal
- B. Shall also consider clear and convincing evidence with verified data showing either:
  1. The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school

OR

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia

2. Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.

Note: MAY DENY ONLY upon making written findings that:

- (1) The charter school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to pupils of the school;

AND

- (2) Closure is in the best interest of the pupils;

AND

- (3) The decision provided greater weight to the performance on measurements of academic performance.

### **Low Performing EC 47607.2(a)**

A charter school that for two consecutive years immediately preceding renewal:

- A. Received the two (2) lowest performance levels [red or orange] schoolwide on all state indicators on the Dashboard

OR

- B. For all measures of academic performance, the school received performance levels schoolwide that are the same or lower than the state average, and for a majority of subgroups performing statewide below the state average in each respective year, received levels that are lower than the state average.

Note: Renewal for a 2-year term may occur only if the following written factual findings are both made

1. The charter school is taking meaningful steps to address the underlying causes of low performance, and those steps are/will be reflected in a written plan adopted by the school's governing body

AND

2. There is a clear and convincing evidence, demonstrated by verified data showing either:

- a. The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school

OR

- b. Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers

**Appendix C**

**JARDIN DE LA INFANCIA CALIFORNIA DASHBOARD INDICATORS AND VERIFIED DATA**

**California Dashboard Tables**

**Table Legend for All California Dashboard Tables**

“\*” - The student group has fewer than 11 students and is not reported for privacy reasons  
 “\*\*” - Student groups must have at least 30 or more students in both the current and prior year status denominator of the state indicator to receive a Performance Level (color)  
 “—” - No data available  
 “NPL” - No Performance Level available  
 “NPC” - No Performance Color available  
 “N/A” - Non-Applicable

**Table A: Jardin California Dashboard**

| Year | ELA | Math | ELPI | CCI | Graduation Rate | Chronic Absenteeism | Suspension |
|------|-----|------|------|-----|-----------------|---------------------|------------|
| 2022 | N/A | N/A  | NPL* | N/A | N/A             | NPL**               | NPL**      |
| 2023 | N/A | N/A  | NPC* | N/A | N/A             | NPC**               | NPC**      |
| 2024 | N/A | N/A  | NPC* | N/A | N/A             | NPC**               | NPC**      |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/>

**Table B: Jardin English Learner Progress Indicator**

| Year | Dashboard Color | Participation Rate | Number of Students | School Percent | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| 2022 | NPL*            | 100                | *                  | *              | 50.3          | N/A                           | N/A             |
| 2023 | NPC*            | 100                | *                  | *              | 48.7          | N/A                           | N/A             |
| 2024 | NPC*            | 100                | *                  | *              | 45.7          | N/A                           | N/A             |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 11-4-24

**Table C: Jardin 2022 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator**

| Student Groups                  | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All                             | NPL**           | 16                 | 0.0            | —      | 30.0          | -30.0                         | Lower**         |
| AA/Black                        | NPL*            | 1                  | *              | N/A    | 42.9          | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Hispanic or Latino              | NPL**           | 15                 | 0.0            | —      | 35.8          | -35.8                         | Lower**         |
| English Learners                | NPL**           | 13                 | 0.0            | —      | 33.6          | -33.6                         | Lower**         |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | NPL**           | 16                 | 0.0            | —      | 37.4          | -37.4                         | Lower**         |
| Students With Disabilities      | NPL*            | 2                  | *              | N/A    | 39.6          | N/A                           | N/A             |

Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average?

YES\*\*

All Students

YES\*\*

Student Groups

YES\*\*

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 11-4-24

Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia Charter School

**Table D: Jardin 2023 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator**

| Student Groups                  | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All                             | NPC**           | 14                 | 0.0            | 0.0    | 24.3          | -24.3                         | Lower**         |
| Hispanic or Latino              | NPC**           | 14                 | 0.0            | 0.0    | 28.4          | -28.4                         | Lower**         |
| English Learners                | NPC*            | 8                  | *              | N/A    | 26.3          | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Foster Youth                    | NPC*            | 1                  | *              | N/A    | 33.6          | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | NPC**           | 14                 | 0.0            | 0.0    | 29.9          | -29.9                         | Lower**         |
| Students With Disabilities      | NPC*            | 1                  | *              | N/A    | 33.1          | N/A                           | N/A             |

|   |       |                |       |
|---|-------|----------------|-------|
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? | YES** | All Students   | YES** |
|   |       | Student Groups | YES** |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 11-4-24

**Table E: Jardin 2024 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator**

| Student Groups                  | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All                             | NPC**           | 19                 | 0.0            | 0.0    | 18.6          | -18.6                         | Lower**         |
| AA/Black                        | NPC*            | 1                  | *              | N/A    | 31.3          | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Hispanic or Latino              | NPC**           | 18                 | 0.0            | 0.0    | 21.7          | -21.7                         | Lower**         |
| English Learners                | NPC**           | 13                 | 0.0            | 0.0    | 20.1          | -20.1                         | Lower**         |
| Homeless Youth                  | NPC*            | 1                  | *              | N/A    | 32.7          | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | NPC**           | 19                 | 0.0            | 0.0    | 23.4          | -23.4                         | Lower**         |
| Students With Disabilities      | NPC*            | 1                  | *              | N/A    | 26.3          | N/A                           | N/A             |

|   |       |                |       |
|---|-------|----------------|-------|
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? | YES** | All Students   | YES** |
|   |       | Student Groups | YES** |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 11-4-24

Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia Charter School

**Table F: Jardin 2022 Suspension Rate Indicator**

| Student Groups                  | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All                             | NPL**           | 16                 | 0.0            | —      | 3.1           | -3.1                          | Lower**         |
| AA/Black                        | NPL*            | 1                  | *              | N/A    | 7.9           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Hispanic or Latino              | NPL**           | 15                 | 0.0            | —      | 3.3           | -3.3                          | Lower**         |
| English Learners                | NPL**           | 13                 | 0.0            | —      | 3.2           | -3.2                          | Lower**         |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | NPL**           | 16                 | 0.0            | —      | 4.0           | -4.0                          | Lower**         |
| Students With Disabilities      | NPL*            | 2                  | *              | N/A    | 5.4           | N/A                           | N/A             |

|   |       |                |       |
|---|-------|----------------|-------|
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? | YES** | All Students   | YES** |
|   |       | Student Groups | YES** |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 11-4-24

**Table G: Jardin 2023 Suspension Rate Indicator**

| Student Groups                  | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All                             | NPC**           | 14                 | 0.0            | 0.0    | 3.5           | -3.5                          | Lower**         |
| Hispanic or Latino              | NPC**           | 14                 | 0.0            | 0.0    | 3.8           | -3.8                          | Lower**         |
| English Learners                | NPC*            | 8                  | *              | N/A    | 3.7           | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Foster Youth                    | NPC*            | 1                  | *              | N/A    | 13.6          | N/A                           | N/A             |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | NPC**           | 14                 | 0.0            | 0.0    | 4.5           | -4.5                          | Lower**         |
| Students With Disabilities      | NPC*            | 1                  | *              | N/A    | 5.9           | N/A                           | N/A             |

|   |       |                |       |
|---|-------|----------------|-------|
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? | YES** | All Students   | YES** |
|   |       | Student Groups | YES** |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 11-4-24



Staff Findings on the Renewal for Jardin de la Infancia Charter School

**Table H: Jardin 2024 Suspension Rate Indicator**

| <b>Student Groups</b>  | <b>Dashboard Color</b> | <b>Number of Students</b> | <b>School Percent</b> | <b>Change</b> | <b>State Percent</b>  | <b>Difference from State Average</b> | <b>Higher or Lower</b> |
|--|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| All  | NPC**                  | 19                        | 0.0                   | 0.0           | 3.2                   | -3.2                                 | Lower**                |
| AA/Black   | NPC*                   | 1                         | *                     | N/A           | 8.4                   | N/A                                  | N/A                    |
| Hispanic or Latino   | NPC**                  | 18                        | 0.0                   | 0.0           | 3.4                   | -3.4                                 | Lower**                |
| English Learners   | NPC**                  | 13                        | 0.0                   | 0.0           | 3.4                   | -3.4                                 | Lower**                |
| Homeless Youth   | NPC*                   | 1                         | *                     | N/A           | 5.7                   | N/A                                  | N/A                    |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged  | NPC**                  | 19                        | 0.0                   | 0.0           | 4.0                   | -4.0                                 | Lower**                |
| Students With Disabilities   | NPC*                   | 1                         | *                     | N/A           | 5.4                   | N/A                                  | N/A                    |
| <b>Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average?</b> |                        |                           |                       | YES**         | <b>All Students</b>   |                                      | YES**                  |
|  |                        |                           |                       |               | <b>Student Groups</b> |                                      | YES**                  |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 11-4-24

Board Meeting — April 1, 2025

Item VII. Recommendations

- C. Approval of First Reading of Board Policy (BP) 3320 (Claims Against LACOE); Board Bylaw (BB) 9010 (Public Statements); and BB 9012 (Board Member Electronic Communications) (Enclosure)

Note: The Board Policies were presented to the County Board on March 18, 2025.

**Business and Noninstructional Operations**

BP 3320(a)

**CLAIMS AND ACTIONS AGAINST LACOE**

The County Board desires to ensure that LACOE’s operations are conducted in a manner that minimizes risk, protects LACOE resources, and promotes the health and safety of students, staff, and the public. Any and all claims for money or damages against LACOE shall be presented to and acted upon in accordance with law, County Board policy, and administrative regulation as well as LACOE’s insurance coverage.

*(cf. 3530 - Risk Management/Insurance)*  
*(cf. 5143 - Insurance)*

Any claim for money or damages not governed by the Government Claims Act (Government Code 810-996.6) or excepted by Government Code 905 shall be presented consistent with the manner and time limitations in the Government Claims Act, unless a procedure for processing such claims is otherwise provided by state or federal law.

Upon notice to LACOE of a claim, the County Superintendent or designee will take all necessary steps to protect LACOE’s rights under any applicable contractual agreements, including the right to indemnification from its insurance or other coverage provider.

Claims for money or damages shall be processed in accordance with applicable law, including but not limited to the California Government Code and the Code of Civil Procedure.

*Legal Reference: Government Code 900 et seq.; Code of Civil Procedure 352*

The County Superintendent will be responsible for promulgating regulations regarding acceptance of subpoenas for records, claims, and Summons & Complaints on behalf of the Los Angeles County Office of Education; the Los Angeles County Board of Education; the County Superintendent; the Personnel Commission of the Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools; the Los Angeles County Committee on School District Reorganization; the Los Angeles County Schools Regionalized Business Services Corporation; and individual County Board members, commissioners, and employees in their official capacities.

This policy applies retroactively to any existing causes of action and/or claims for money and/or damages.

**Roster Registry of Public Agencies**

Within 10 days of any change in the full, legal name of LACOE, the mailing address of the County Board, or the names, titles, and addresses of the County Board president, clerk, secretary, or other members, The the County Superintendent or designee will file the updated information required for the Roster of Public Agencies with the Secretary of State and the County Clerk. This information will include the name of the school LACOE, the mailing address of the County Board, and the names and addresses of the County Board presiding officer, the County Board clerk or secretary, and other members of the County Board. (Government Code 53051)

**CLAIMS AND ACTIONS AGAINST LACOE (continued)**

~~Any changes to such information shall be filed within 10 days after the change has occurred.  
(Government Code 53051)~~

*Legal Reference:*

*EDUCATION CODE*

*35200 Liability for debts and contracts*

*35202 Claims against districts; applicability of Government Code*

*CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE*

*85-86 Limited civil cases; amount in controversy*

*340.1 Damages suffered as result of childhood sexual abuse Action for recovery of damages suffered as a result of childhood sexual assault*

*340.11 Action for recovery of damages suffered as a result of childhood sexual assault that occurred before January 1, 2024*

*GOVERNMENT CODE*

*800 Cost in civil actions*

*810-996.6 Claims and actions against public entities*

*6500-6536 Joint exercise of powers*

*53051 Information filed with secretary of state and county clerk*

*PENAL CODE*

*72 Fraudulent claims*

*COURT DECISIONS*

*City of Stockton v. Superior Court, (2007) 42 Cal. 4th 730*

*Connelly v. County of Fresno, (2006) 146 Cal.App.4th 29*

*CSEA v. South Orange Community College District, (2004) 123 Cal.App.4th 574*

*CSEA v. Azusa Unified School District, (1984) 152 Cal.App.3d 580*

*Management Resources:*

*WEB SITES*

*California Secretary of State's Office: <http://www.sos.ca.gov>*

**Board Bylaws**

BB 9010

**PUBLIC STATEMENTS**

The County Board recognizes the rights of its members to freely express their views and encourages open discussion of issues during County Board meetings. The County Board believes that its members have a responsibility to express themselves, whether in agreement or disagreement with the Board majority, in ways that promote the County Board’s ability to oversee LACOE.

When speaking to the media, legislators, community groups, or other members of the public, individual County Board members should recognize that their statements may be perceived as reflecting the views and positions of the County Board or LACOE. County Board members have a responsibility to identify personal viewpoints as such and not as the viewpoint of the County Board or LACOE. For example, a County Board member may include a disclaimer on the County Board member’s personal social media account that the County Board member is expressing personal viewpoints and not those of the County Board or the County Office of Education.

All public statements authorized to be made on behalf of the County Board shall be made by the County Board President or, ~~if appropriate,~~ with respect to a specific issue or topic, other representatives as designated by the County Board or County Board President. Superintendent or other designated representative.

*(cf. 9011 - Disclosure of Confidential/Privileged Information)*  
*(cf. 9200 - Limits of Board Member Authority)*

*Legal References:*

EDUCATION CODE

*1040 Duties and responsibilities; county boards of education*

*35010 Control of district; prescription and enforcement of rules*

GOVERNMENT CODE

*54960 Actions to stop or prevent violation of meeting provisions*

**Board Bylaws**

BB 9012(a)

**BOARD MEMBER ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS**

The County Board recognizes that electronic communication is an efficient and convenient way for County Board members to communicate and expedite the exchange of information with members of the public. County Board members shall exercise caution so as to ensure that electronic communications are not used as a means for the County Board to deliberate outside of an agenda County Board meeting, circumvent the public’s right to access records regarding Board or LACOE business, or restrict access to a public forum.

*(cf. 1100 - Communication with the Public)*  
*(cf. 9000 - Role of the Board)*  
*(cf. 9322 - Agenda/Meeting Materials)*

A majority of the County Board shall not, outside of an authorized meeting, use a series of electronic communications of any kind, directly or through intermediaries, to discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the County Board.

*(cf. 9320 - Meetings and Notices)*

Examples of permissible electronic communications concerning Board and LACOE business include, but are not limited to, dissemination of County Board meeting agendas and agenda packets, reports of activities from the County Superintendent, and reminders regarding meeting times, dates, and places.

County Board members may engage in separate conversations or communications with members of the public on a social media platform to answer questions, provide information, or solicit information regarding a matter that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the County Board. A majority of County Board members cannot use social media to discuss among themselves business of a specific nature that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board. A County Board member is prohibited from responding directly to any communication from other County Board members regarding matters that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the County Board or using digital icons (e.g., “likes” or emojis) to express reactions to communications made by other County Board members. (Government Code 54952.2)

Whenever a County Board member uses a social media platform to communicate with the public about LACOE business or County Board activities, the County Board member shall not block access to a member of the public based on the viewpoint expressed by that individual.

County Board members may use electronic communications to discuss matters that do not pertain to County Board business, regardless of the number of County Board members participating in the discussion.

**BOARD MEMBER ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS (continued)**

County Board members shall ensure that their electronic communications conform to the same standards and protocols established for other forms of communication. Any complaint or request for information should be forwarded to the County Superintendent in accordance with County Board bylaws and protocols. As appropriate, communication received from the media shall be forwarded to the designated LACOE spokesperson.

*(cf. 1112 - Media Relations)*  
*(cf. 1312.3 - Uniform Complaint Procedures)*  
*(cf. 1312.4 - Williams Uniform Complaint Procedures)*  
*(cf. 3320 - Claims and Actions Against the LACOE)*  
*(cf. 9005 - Governance Standards)*  
*(cf. 9121 - President)*  
*(cf. 9200 - Limits of Board Member Authority)*

To the extent possible, electronic communications regarding any Board-related business shall be transmitted through a Board-provided device or account. When any such communication is transmitted through a Board member's personal device or account, he/she shall copy the communication to a LACOE electronic storage device for easy retrieval.

This bylaw does not apply to County Board electronic communications not related to COE business or not conducted by a County Board member in the County Board member's official capacity.

*(cf. 1340 - Access to LACOE Records)*  
*(cf. 3580 - LACOE Records)*

*Legal References (see next page)*

**BOARD MEMBER ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS (continued)**

*Legal Reference:*

*EDUCATION CODE*

*35140 Time and place of meetings*

*35145 Public meetings*

*35145.5 Agenda; public participation; regulations*

*35147 Open meeting law exceptions and applications*

*GOVERNMENT CODE*

*6250-6270 California Public Records Act*

*11135 State programs and activities, discrimination*

*54950-54963 The Ralph M. Brown Act, especially:*

*54952.2 Meeting, defined*

*54953 Meetings to be open and public; attendance*

*54954.2 Agenda posting requirements, board actions*

*COURT DECISIONS*

*City of San Jose v. Superior Court (2017) 2 Cal.5<sup>th</sup> 608*

*Management Resources:*

*CSBA PUBLICATIONS*

*Legal Alert: Tips for Governing Boards in Response to Public Records Act Ruling on Electronic Communications, March 2017*

*The Brown Act: School Boards and Open Meeting Laws, rev. 2014*

*ATTORNEY GENERAL PUBLICATIONS*

*The Brown Act: Open Meetings for Legislative Bodies, 2003*

*WEB SITES*

*CSBA: <http://www.csba.org>*

*CSBA, Agenda Online:*

*<https://www.csba.org/ProductsAndServices/AllServices/AgendaOnline.aspx>*

*California Attorney General's Office: <https://oag.ca.gov>*



Board Meeting – April 1, 2025

Item VII. Recommendations

- D. Approval of Extension for County Board Action on the *Alma Fuerte Public School, Grades TK-8*: Renewal Petition to the Los Angeles County Office of Education.

The Superintendent recommends that the Los Angeles County Board of Education (County Board) agree to extend the statutory timeline to take action to grant or deny the charter for Alma Fuerte Public School, as the California Department of Education (CDE) released the tier list in March 2025 and it is currently being analyzed by the school and LACOE staff. An extension of up to 30 days is allowable pursuant to Education Code section 47605 if both the petitioners and County Board are in agreement.

The petitioners request a 30-day extension. (Attachment)

The County Board will receive the Superintendent's recommendation no later than May 5, 2025.



Outlook

---

**Re: Charter renewal extension**

---

**From** Fernandez\_Angela <Fernandez\_Angela@lacoedu.edu>**Date** Wed 3/19/2025 11:46 AM**To** Laurilie Keay <laurilie.keay@alfafuerteps.org>; Adriani Leon <adriani.leon@alfafuerteps.org>; Lee J. Rosenberg <lrosenberg@ymclegal.com>

Hi Laurilie,

Thank you for your email.

I understand the importance of presenting clear and compelling data for the renewal process. This email serves as confirmation of receipt, and the submission will be presented to our board for approval. I will keep you updated regarding any timeline adjustments.

Please feel free to reach out if you have any additional details or questions.

**Angela Fernandez (she/her)**

Coordinator III

Charter School Office

562.922.6832 Office

[Fernandez\\_Angela@lacoedu.edu](mailto:Fernandez_Angela@lacoedu.edu) | [lacoedu.edu](http://lacoedu.edu)Follow us on: [Instagram](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [YouTube](#)**Los Angeles County  
Office of Education**

---

**From:** Laurilie Keay <laurilie.keay@alfafuerteps.org>**Sent:** Wednesday, March 19, 2025 9:02 AM**To:** Fernandez\_Angela <Fernandez\_Angela@lacoedu.edu>; Adriani Leon <adriani.leon@alfafuerteps.org>; Lee J. Rosenberg <lrosenberg@ymclegal.com>**Subject:** Charter renewal extension

Good morning Angela,

I hope this email finds you well. I am writing to you this morning to respectfully request an extension to the Alma Fuerte renewal timeline.

We are working diligently to ensure that you have the most accurate, clear and convincing data to assist with the renewal recommendation for our school. Pleased let me know if you have any questions or concerns with this request.

Best,

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of LACOE. Please do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and expected the message.

Board Meeting – April 1, 2025

Item VII. Recommendations

E. Approval of Position Recommendation Report PRR 1.0 – April 2025

The Superintendent recommends that the County Board approve the position recommendations made by Governmental Relations for the following bills:

| <u>Bill No.</u> | <u>Author</u> | <u>Topic</u>   | <u>Position</u> |
|-----------------|---------------|--|-----------------|
| AB 279          | Patel         | School libraries: model library standards.   | Support         |
| AB 401          | Muratsuchi    | California Career Technical Education Incentive Grant Program: annual adjustment: renewal grants.                      | Support         |
| AB 598          | Gipson        | School safety: School Mapping Data Grant Program.  | Support         |
| AB 727          | González, M.  | Pupil and student safety: statewide resources: identification cards.   | Support         |
| AB 767          | Alanis        | Sexually violent predators: schools.   | Support         |
| AB 810          | Irwin         | Local government: internet websites and email addresses.   | Oppose          |
| AB 1194         | Muratsuchi    | Pupil literacy: administrative services credential program standards and professional development.                     | Support         |
| AB 1224         | Valencia      | Teacher credentialing: substitute teachers: days of service.   | Support         |
| SB 745          | Ochoa Bogh    | High school graduation requirements: American government and civics: curriculum guide: State Seal of Civic Engagement. | Support         |

**AB 279 (Patel) School libraries: model library standards.**  
[Amended: 3/17/2025]

Recommended Position: **Support**

Background Information: Existing law requires the State Board of Education to adopt standards, rules, and regulations for school library services. Existing law requires the Instructional Quality Commission, among other duties, to recommend the adoption of minimum standards for courses of study in preschool, kindergarten, elementary, and secondary schools to the state board upon request. Existing law requires the courses of study in public schools to conform to those minimum standards when adopted.

This bill would require, on or before July 1, 2028, and every eight years thereafter, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in consultation with the state board, to consider recommending revisions to the standards for school library services to the state board. The bill require, if the Superintendent decides to recommend revisions, the Superintendent to convene a group of experts to assist the Superintendent in developing the recommended revisions. The bill would require the Superintendent, in consultation with the Instructional Quality Commission, to hold a minimum of two public hearings in order for the public to provide input on the recommended revisions. The bill would require the Superintendent, within 18 months of convening the experts, to present to the state board the revised content standards for school library services, which the state board is required to adopt, reject, or modify. The operation of the bill would be subject to an appropriation being made for its purposes in the annual Budget Act or another statute.

LACOE Subject Matter Experts: The following LACOE division reviewed the bill and provided the following comments for a recommendation of support:

Technology Learning and Support Services: The Model School Library Standards was last published in 2010 and is in need in of revisions. It is important to review the standards and determine what needs to be updated to support students with learning how to access, evaluate, integrate, and use information.

Organizations in Support: None on File

Organizations in Opposition: None on File

Status: As of March 24, 2025, this bill is pending a hearing in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

**AB 401 (Muratsuchi) California Career Technical Education Incentive Grant Program: annual adjustment: renewal grants.** [Amended: 2/25/2025]

Recommended Position: **Support**

Background Information: Existing law establishes the California Career Technical Education Incentive Grant Program, administered by the State Department of Education, with the purpose of encouraging, maintaining, and strengthening the delivery of high-quality career technical education programs. Existing law requires, for the 2021-22 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, \$300,000,000 to be available to the department, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for the program. Existing law requires a grant applicant to demonstrate a proportional dollar-for-dollar match and sets that amount at \$2 for every \$1 received from the program. Existing law prohibits an applicant from being awarded an amount higher than the amount that the allocation formula determines them to be eligible to receive under the program. Existing law authorizes a grant recipient under the program to consist of one or more, or any combination, of school districts, county offices of education, charter schools, or regional occupational centers or programs operated by joint powers authorities or county offices of education. Existing law provides that an applicant receiving a grant from the program in a prior fiscal year is eligible to apply to receive a renewal grant if the applicant's career technical education program continues to meet their requirements.

This bill would delete the prohibition against an applicant being awarded more than the amount determined by the allocation formula and would provide, for the 2025-26 fiscal year, and each fiscal year thereafter, that the amount to be made available to the department, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for the program to be the amount appropriated in the prior fiscal year as adjusted by the percentage change in the annual average value of the Implicit Price Deflator for State and Local Government Purchases of Goods and Services for the United States, as published by the United States Department of Commerce for the 12-month period ending in the third quarter of the prior fiscal year. The bill would instead provide that an applicant receiving a grant from the program in a prior fiscal year is required to receive a renewal grant for three additional years. The bill would require, beginning with the 2025-26 fiscal year, up to 90 percent of the grants awarded pursuant to the program to be designated for renewal grants and up to 10 percent to be designated for grants for new applicants, unless otherwise determined by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The bill would require the Superintendent to cease distribution of funding and recover previously distributed funding if the grant recipient did not implement the program substantively as was initially proposed.

LACOE Subject Matter Experts: The following LACOE division reviewed the bill and provided the following comments for a recommendation of support:

Accountability, Support, and Monitoring: Expanding the CTEIG program to include three-year grants would encourage the implementation and growth of high-quality CTE courses. The longer time span provides for thoughtful planning for CTE pathways and ensures the steady funding needed. CTE programs have not had significantly increased investments, yet these programs engage students in learning and lead to positive post-secondary outcomes.

A longer grant period would also encourage a focus on implementing building the program, rather than preparing plans and grant reports.

Organizations in Support:

- CTE Coalition (sponsor)

Organizations in Opposition: None on File

Status: As of March 24, 2025, this bill is set to be heard in the Assembly Education Committee on March 26, 2025.

**AB 598 (Gipson) School safety: School Mapping Data Grant Program.**  
[Amended: 3/17/2025]

Recommended Position: **Support**

Background Information: Existing law provides that it is the intent of the Legislature that all public schools, in kindergarten, and grades 1 to 12, inclusive, operated by school districts, develop a comprehensive school safety plan. Existing law provides that school districts and county offices of education are responsible for the overall development of a comprehensive school safety plan for each of its schools.

Existing law, the Charter Schools Act of 1992, provides for the establishment and operation of charter schools, including countywide charter schools, and requires a petition for the establishment of a charter school to contain comprehensive descriptions of various matters and procedures, including procedures that the charter school will follow to ensure the health and safety of pupils and staff. The act requires those procedures to also require the development of a school safety plan.

This bill, upon appropriation by the Legislature, would establish the School Mapping Data Grant Program under the administration of the Office of Emergency Services to provide one-time grants to participating school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools to enter into contracts with qualified vendors providing school mapping data for purposes of assisting public safety agencies in efficiently responding to on-campus emergencies at schools.

LACOE Subject Matter Experts: The following LACOE divisions reviewed the bill and provided the following comments for a recommendation of support:

Business Advisory Services: This bill seeks to enhance school safety by funding school mapping data for K-12 public schools, charter schools, and county education offices. LACOE is committed to emergency preparedness, school security, and public safety, and recognizes the urgent need for improved emergency response coordination. During critical incidents such as active shooter situations, fires, or medical emergencies, first responders often face challenges navigating unfamiliar school campuses. School mapping data provides essential digital floor plans, entry and exit points, and utility shut-off locations, enabling law enforcement and emergency personnel to respond with greater efficiency and precision. In high-risk incidents, rapid access to accurate mapping data can significantly reduce response times, prevent injuries, and save lives.

AB 598 also strengthens collaboration between schools and public safety agencies by ensuring shared, real-time access to campus layouts. This integration allows emergency responders to coordinate evacuations, lockdowns, and tactical responses more effectively. Additionally, the bill aligns with existing state-mandated Comprehensive School Safety Plans by providing necessary funding for schools to modernize these plans using digital mapping technology. Many schools currently rely on outdated paper-based maps, which are often ineffective during high-stress emergency situations. By supporting AB 598, the state will help schools implement modern safety solutions that enhance overall preparedness.

Beyond improving emergency response times, this bill supports broader violence prevention and school security efforts. Given the growing concerns over school shootings, natural disasters, and other security threats, it is imperative that schools have access to the latest technology to ensure student and staff safety. AB 598 offers a proactive approach to risk management by equipping schools with essential mapping tools that can be integrated into emergency preparedness programs.

Furthermore, the School Mapping Data Grant Program represents a cost-effective, one-time investment with long-term benefits. Once mapping data is collected, it can be maintained with minimal expense and incorporated into existing emergency management systems. To maximize the program's effectiveness, LACOE recommends strong collaboration between school districts and local first responders to ensure mapping data meets emergency response needs. The use of Geographic Information System (GIS) technology should be prioritized for real-time mapping updates, and schools in high-risk areas should receive early access to grant funding. Additionally, school mapping

should be integrated into annual emergency drills for staff and students to reinforce preparedness strategies.

AB 598 is a vital initiative that modernizes school security infrastructure, accelerates emergency response, and enhances overall safety at no cost to local schools. By funding school mapping data, the bill ensures that public safety agencies can respond quickly and effectively to emergencies, ultimately protecting students, teachers, and staff.

Student Support Services: Providing schools with the ability to access funding to develop mapping as a component of enhancing school safety is a critical aspect of safeguarding schools. Mapping is a powerful tool for improving school safety. It provides accurate, detailed building visualizations and provides locations of emergency equipment and potential hazards. Specifically, it allows those who require emergency access to school campuses, such as law enforcement and the fire department, a comprehensive understanding of the campus, including its weaknesses. This process can assist in creating a secure environment for students, staff, and visitors.

Technology Infrastructure Services: AB 598 enhances school safety and emergency response through the School Mapping Data Grant Program. Providing funding for digital mapping of school campuses enables first responders to act quickly and efficiently during emergencies, improving student and staff safety. By integrating technology and emergency preparedness, this bill aligns with LACOE's role in supporting school security infrastructure and crisis response planning.

Organizations in Support: None on File

Organizations in Opposition: None on File

Status: As of March 24, 2025, this bill is set to be heard in the Assembly Education Committee on March 26, 2025.

**AB 727 (González, M.) Pupil and student safety: statewide resources: identification cards.** [Introduced: 2/18/2025]

Recommended Position: **Support**

Background Information: Existing law, commencing July 1, 2025, requires a public or private school that serves pupils in any of grades 7 to 12, inclusive, and that issues pupil identification cards to have printed on the identification cards the number for the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline. Existing law requires a public or private institution of higher education that issues student



identification cards to have printed on either side of the student identification cards the telephone number for the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline.

This bill, commencing July 1, 2026, would require the above-referenced schools and institutions to additionally have printed on the identification cards the telephone number and text line for a specified suicide hotline that is available 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

Existing law, the Safe Place to Learn Act, requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to post, and annually update, on the State Department of Education's internet website, and notify school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools of the availability of, a list of statewide resources that provide support to youth, and their families, who have been subjected to school-based discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or bullying, including school-based discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or bullying on the basis of neurodiversity, religious affiliation, nationality, race, or ethnicity, or perceived neurodiversity, religious affiliation, nationality, race, or ethnicity.

This bill would additionally require that list to include resources that provide support to youth, and their families, who have been subjected to school-based discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or bullying on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression, or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.

LACOE Subject Matter Experts: The following LACOE division reviewed the bill and provided the following comments for a recommendation of support:

Student Support Services: Reducing suicide among youth requires a multi-disciplined, collaborative approach. It is critical for youth to have access to a text line at all times. Many youth may feel more at ease utilizing the text line to express their emotions. The text line provides a readily accessible, confidential way for young people to reach out for help during a mental health crisis. The text line allows them to be discreet while still seeking support. Youth may not be able to express themselves on a call due to privacy issues or comfort level. Utilizing texting is common for today's youth. It may be a more comfortable form of communication and make it easier for them to reach out for help. Speaking to someone via phone call may cause anxiety, increasing crisis levels for the young person. The text line also gives the student greater anonymity, which may help them open up about personal issues, eliminating fear of judgement. Students and families need a clear pathway not only for reporting issues related to discrimination, harassment, intimidation, or bullying but also access to resources to assist them during and after the reporting process. Access to resources for youth and their families can help prevent bullying, promote respect,

and improve mental wellbeing. These resources can create a safer school environment.

Organizations in Support: None on File

Organizations in Opposition: None on File

Status: As of March 24, 2025, this bill is set to be heard in the Assembly Education Committee on April 9, 2025.

**AB 767 (Alanis) Sexually violent predators: schools.**  
[Amended: 3/11/2025]

Recommended Position: **Support**

Background Information: Existing law provides for the civil commitment of a person who is determined to be a sexually violent predator. Existing law establishes a procedure by which a person committed as a sexually violent predator may petition for conditional release and requires the court and may place the person on conditional release. Existing law generally requires that a person released on conditional release pursuant to these provisions be placed in the person's county of domicile prior to their incarceration unless extraordinary circumstances exist requiring placement outside the county. Existing law prohibits a person being released under these provisions from being placed within 1/4 mile of any public or private school, if the person has previously been convicted of specified sexual misconduct of a child or if the court finds that the person has a history of improper sexual conduct with children.

This bill would additionally prohibit a person being released under the above-described provisions from being placed within 1/4 mile of a child daycare facility. The bill would define private school to mean a facility or home that has filed a private school affidavit with the State Department of Education and provides private school instruction at the elementary or high school level.

LACOE Subject Matter Experts: The following LACOE divisions reviewed the bill and provided the following comments for a recommendation of support:

Head Start and Early Learning: This bill would extend protections already in place for public and private schools to child daycare facilities as well. Safety of all learners is paramount, and steps taken by the state to include early learning as part of the same educational continuum that includes K–12 schools should be applauded.

Student Support Services: Keeping individuals convicted of sexual conduct away from schools and childcares facilities is critical in keeping children safe. This legislation would protect children from potential

abuse and reduce the risk of victimization. Sexual assault can have devastating long-term effects, increasing emotional trauma. Legislation such as this one serves to expand policies and prevent predators from accessing vulnerable populations within these institutions.

Organizations in Support: None on File

Organizations in Opposition: None on File

Status: As of March 24, 2025, this bill is pending a hearing in the Assembly Public Safety Committee.

**AB 810 (Irwin) Local government: internet websites and email addresses.**  
[Introduced: 2/19/2025]

Recommended Position: **Oppose**

Background Information: Existing law requires that a local agency that maintains an internet website for use by the public to ensure that the internet website uses a “.gov” top-level domain or a “.ca.gov” second-level domain no later than January 1, 2029. Existing law requires that a local agency that maintains public email addresses to ensure that each email address provided to its employees uses a “.gov” domain name or a “.ca.gov” domain name no later than January 1, 2029.

This bill would allow a community college district, community college, or other postsecondary institution to use a “.edu” domain to satisfy these requirements. The bill would also add to the definition of “local government” to include a special district, school district, joint powers authority, or other political subdivision. By adding to the duties of local officials, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

LACOE Subject Matter Experts: The following LACOE divisions reviewed the bill and provided the following comments for a recommendation of oppose:

Technology Infrastructure Services: This bill would impose unfunded mandates on school districts and local agencies by requiring migration to .gov or .ca.gov domains without guaranteeing financial or technical support. While enhancing cybersecurity and public trust is important, many districts already have established, secure domains and email systems that meet industry best practices. The transition would require significant information technology resources, reconfiguration of existing infrastructure, and potential service disruptions. Without dedicated state funding and implementation support, this mandate places an unnecessary burden on schools and local agencies.

Organizations in Support: None on File

Organizations in Opposition: None on File

Status: As of March 24, 2025, this bill is pending a hearing in the Assembly Local Government Committee.

**AB 1194 (Muratsuchi) Pupil literacy: administrative services credential program standards and professional development.** [Introduced: 2/21/2025]

Recommended Position: **Support**

Background Information: Existing law establishes the State Department of Education, under the administration of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and assigns to the department numerous duties relating to the financing, governance, and guidance of the public elementary and secondary schools in this state.

This bill would require the department to, no later than September 1, 2026, identify and post on its internet website a list of inservice professional development programs for effective means of teaching literacy that may be used by school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools for training teachers. The bill would require the department to ensure that the list includes programs offered in different modalities, including in-person and virtual formats.

Existing law requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to establish standards for the issuance and renewal of credentials, certificates, and permits. Existing law sets forth the minimum requirements for a preliminary services credential with a specialization in administrative services, which include completion of an entry-level program of specialized and professional preparation in administrative services or a one-year internship in a program of supervised training in administrative services, subject to approval by the commission.

This bill would require the commission to, no later than September 1, 2027, ensure that the program standards for the professional preparation of candidates for a preliminary services credential with a specialization in administrative services meets criteria, including that the program standards include preparation on how to support teachers in delivering instruction through effective means for teaching literacy. The bill would require the commission to, no later than September 1, 2029, certify that all professional preparation programs and internships for candidates for a preliminary services credential with a specialization in administrative services approved by the commission meet those program standards.

LACOE Subject Matter Experts: The following LACOE division reviewed the bill and provided the following comments for a recommendation of support:

Curriculum and Instructional Services: AB 1194 is a pivotal piece of legislation that aligns seamlessly with existing literacy initiatives aimed at enhancing reading proficiency among students. This bill supports two primary areas of literacy support in both teacher and administrator professional learning. AB 1194 significantly impacts teachers by providing them with additional evidence-aligned resources and support necessary to enhance literacy instruction. With this law, teachers will have access to training programs focused on innovative literacy strategies and best practices, like LACOE’s own award-winning Getting Reading Right literacy training program.

Another benefit is the impact on new administrators to learn how to support quality literacy instruction in their school, as part of their credentialing program. Training teachers is not enough to improve over 30 years of stagnant reading scores, it takes a systems approach to build, monitor and sustain effective Tier 1 programs. Many administrators become principals at elementary schools, with no knowledge of effective Tier 1 literacy instruction at all and struggle to know what to do. This bill would provide training to assist them in filling that knowledge gap.

Organizations in Support: None on File

Organizations in Opposition: None on File

Status: As of March 24, 2025, this bill is pending a hearing in the Assembly Education Committee.

**AB 1224 (Valencia) Teacher credentialing: substitute teachers: days of service.** [Amended: 3/17/2025]

Recommended Position: **Support**

Background Information: Existing law requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to establish standards and procedures for the issuance and renewal of credentials, certificates, and permits. Existing regulations prohibit a holder of an emergency substitute teaching permit from substitute teaching during the school year for any one teacher (1) for more than 30 days for a holder of an emergency 30-day substitute permit or an emergency substitute teaching permit for prospective teachers or (2) for more than 60 days for a holder of a career emergency substitute permit. Existing law authorizes a person holding a valid credential authorizing substitute teaching to serve as a substitute for the appropriately credentialed special education teacher for not more than 20 cumulative school days for each special education teacher

absent during each school year, except as otherwise provided. Existing law, notwithstanding those provisions or any other law, temporarily authorized, until July 1, 2024, any holder of a credential or permit issued by the commission that authorizes the holder to substitute teach in a general, special, or career technical education assignment to serve in a substitute teaching assignment aligned with their authorization, including for staff vacancies, for up to 60 cumulative days for any one assignment.

Existing law authorizes the commission to waive provisions governing the preparation or licensing of educators in certain situations. If a suitable fully prepared teacher is not available to the school district, the school district is required to make reasonable efforts to recruit first a candidate who is qualified to participate and enrolls in an approved internship program in the region of the school district and then a candidate who is scheduled to complete the preliminary credential requirements within 6 months. Existing regulations authorize a local employing agency to request a teaching permit for statutory leave when a teacher of record is unable to provide services due to a statutory leave and certain requirements are met.

This bill, notwithstanding any other law, would indefinitely reestablish the above-described 60-cumulative day authorization for any one assignment. assignment, if, before using the authorization, the local educational agency has both (1) employed all available and suitable substitute teachers who hold a teaching permit for statutory leave, as provided, if the substitute will serve in a position in which the teacher on record is currently on statutory leave and (2) made reasonable efforts to recruit an individual in the order specified above.

This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

LACOE Subject Matter Experts: The following LACOE division reviewed the bill and provided the following comments for a recommendation of support:

Labor Relations: The new bill is proposing reestablishment of an existing law that has not posed an issue to school districts or county offices of education thus far. On the contrary, the 60 day extension has assisted school districts and county offices of education to fill their need for substitute teachers.

Organizations in Support:

- Association of California School Administrators (sponsor)
- California County Superintendents (sponsor)
- California Schools Boards Assn. (sponsor)
- California School Business Officials (sponsor)

Organizations in Opposition: None on File

Status: As of March 24, 2025, this bill is set to be heard in the Assembly Education Committee on March 26, 2025.

**SB 745 (Ochoa Bogh) High school graduation requirements: American government and civics: curriculum guide: State Seal of Civic Engagement.** [Introduced: 2/21/2025]

Recommended Position: **Support**

Background Information: Existing law requires a pupil to complete designated coursework while in grades 9 to 12, inclusive, in order to receive a diploma of graduation from high school. These graduation requirements include the completion of three courses in social studies, including a one-semester course in American government and civics.

This bill would require, commencing with pupils graduating in the 2032–33 school year, the course in American government and civics to instead be a one-year course unless the governing board or body of a school district, county office of education, or charter school, as applicable, through a formal action at a publicly noticed meeting, elects to require only a one-semester course in American government and civics.

Existing law establishes the Instructional Quality Commission and requires the commission to recommend curriculum frameworks to the State Board of Education.

This bill would require the commission to develop and recommend to the state board, and require the state board to adopt, on or before July 1, 2028, a curriculum guide and recommended resources for the one-year course in American government and civics, as provided. The bill would require the curriculum guide to include fundamentals on federal, state, and local government, and information relating to voting.

Existing law requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction, on or before January 1, 2020, to recommend to the state board criteria for awarding a State Seal of Civic Engagement to pupils who have demonstrated excellence in civics education and participation and have demonstrated an understanding of the United States Constitution, the California Constitution, and the democratic system of government. Existing law requires the state board, on or before January 31, 2021, to adopt, reject, or modify the criteria recommended by the Superintendent. Existing law requires a school district electing to participate in the program to maintain appropriate records in order to identify pupils who have earned a State Seal of Civic Engagement.

This bill would require a school district participating in the program to deem a pupil's successful completion of a one-year course in American government and civics as satisfying specified criteria adopted by the state board. The bill would require a pupil who has successfully completed a one-year course in American government and civics, in order to receive the State Seal of Civic Engagement, to still satisfy all other criteria adopted by the state board.

LACOE Subject Matter Experts: The following LACOE division reviewed the bill and provided the following comments for a recommendation of support:

Curriculum and Instructional Services: SB 745 calls for the development of a one-year Government and Civics class to be offered at the high school while also providing local educational agencies with the flexibility to maintain the current, one-semester Government course. By providing local educational agencies with this flexibility, districts will have the ability to select the option that aligns best with their goals as outlined in their Local Control and Accountability Plan. Additionally, the bill further provides a streamlined process for students to earn the State Seal of Civic Engagement. This helps to address a critical need as students often have difficulty meeting the coursework requirement of the State Seal.

Organizations in Support: None on File

Organizations in Opposition: None on File

Status: As of March 24, 2025, this bill is pending a hearing in the Senate Education Committee.



Board Meeting – April 1, 2025

Item VIII. Informational Items

A. Governmental Relations

Dr. Duardo will provide an update on Governmental Relations.

Board Meeting – April 1, 2025

Item VIII. Informational Items

- B. Los Angeles County Board of Education Meeting Schedule, Establishment of Meeting Times, Future Agenda Items, and Follow up.

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
BOARD OF EDUCATION**

**MEETING CALENDAR  
April 2025 - June 30, 2025**

| APRIL 1 2025   | APRIL 15 2025   |
|--|---|
| <p>3:00 Board Meeting<br/> <b>Rec./Public Hearing:</b> Adopt the Superintendent's Recommendation to Deny the Petition for KIPP Sol Academy, Grades 5-8: Appeal of a Renewal Petition Denied by the Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education with Attached Report<br/> <b>Rec./Public Hearing:</b> Adopt the Superintendent's Recommendation to Authorize the Renewal Petition for Jardin de la Infancia, Grades TK-1: Renewal Petition with Attached Report<br/> <b>Rec:</b> Approval of First Reading of Board Policy (BP) 3320 (Claims Against LACOE), Board Bylaw (BB) 9010 (Public Statements), and BB 9012 (Board Member Electronic Communications) (Enclosure)<br/> <b>Rec:</b> Approval of Extension for County Board Action on the Alma Fuerte Public School, Grades TK-8: Renewal Petition to the Los Angeles County Office of Education<br/> <b>Rec:</b> Approval of Position Recommendation Report PRR 1.0 – April 2025<br/> <b>Interdistrict Attendance Appeals</b><br/> 1. Thiago S. v. Mountain View SD<br/> 2. Lexi S. v. Mountain View SD<br/> 3. Sofia A. v. Mountain View SD<br/> 4. Milan A. P. v. Castaic Union SD<br/> 5. <del>Makayla S. v. Los Angeles USD</del><br/> 6. <del>Uriah M. v. Los Angeles USD</del></p> | <p><b>2:30 Study Session:</b> Mental Health Initiatives<br/> 3:00 Board Meeting<br/> <b>Presentation:</b> 2024-25 Los Angeles County Academic Decathlon Winners<br/> <b>Consent Rec/Bd. Res.:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. ___ to recognize May __, 2025, as El Dia del Maestro, or Day of the Teacher, in Los Angeles County<br/> <b>Consent Rec/Bd. Res.:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. ___ to recognize May ____, 2025 as Classified School Employees Week in Los Angeles County<br/> <b>Consent Rec/Bd. Res.:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. ___: May Day, May __, 2025<br/> <b>Consent Rec:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. ___: to recognize May __, 2025, as National School Nurse Day<br/> <b>Consent Rec:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. ___: to recognize May 2025, as National Foster Care Month<br/> <b>Consent Rec:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. ___: Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month, May 2025<br/> <b>Consent Rec:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. ___: to recognize May __, 2025 as Harvey Milk Day<br/> <b>Consent Rec:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. ___: National Mental Health Month, May 2025<br/> <b>Consent Rec:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. ___: to Recognize May as Jewish American Heritage Month<br/> <b>Rec:</b> Approval of Head Start and Early Learning Division Budget Revision – Non-Federal Match Waiver Request with Attached Staff Report<br/> <b>Recommendation/Public Hearing:</b> Adopt the Superintendent's Recommendation to Approve/Deny the Appeal Petition for <i>LA Leadership Academy</i><br/> <b>Interdistrict Attendance Appeals</b><br/> 1. <del>Sheyla R. v. Los Angeles USD (Spanish Interpreter)</del><br/> 2. <del>Arlette R. v. Los Angeles USD (Spanish Interpreter)</del><br/> 3. Gregory A. v. Bonita USD<br/> 4. Joseph A. v. Bonita USD<br/> 5. <del>Kyle Y. v. Las Virgenes USD</del><br/> 6. <del>Rosie H. v. Las Virgenes USD</del><br/> 7. Charlotte G. W. v. Long Beach USD<br/> 8. Aireon S. v. Long Beach USD<br/> 9. Ian R. v. Long Beach USD<br/> 10. Aubrey W. v. Long Beach USD<br/> 11. Shane F. v. Lawndale ESD<br/> 12. Ronan O. v. Lawndale ESD<br/> 13. Athena G. v. Mountain View SD<br/> 14. MariaFernanda M. v. Compton USD<br/> 15. Eduardo M. v. Compton USD<br/> 16. Athena M. v. Compton USD<br/> 17. Nikolas R. v. Los Angeles USD<br/> 18. Salar T. v. Los Angeles USD<br/> 19. Ekram S. v. Los Angeles USD</p> |
| <p><b>APRIL 8</b><br/> <b>2:30</b> Board Audit Committee Meeting<br/> 3:00 Board Meeting<br/> <b>Rpt:</b> Williams Uniform Complaint Procedure Quarterly Report for Educational Programs, January 1 to March 31, 2025<br/> <b>Consent Rec:</b> Acceptance of Project Funds No. 50<br/> <b>Consent Rec:</b> Acceptance of Project Funds No. 51<br/> <b>Consent Rec:</b> Acceptance of Project Funds No. 52<br/> <b>Consent Rec:</b> Acceptance of Project Funds No. 53<br/> <b>Consent Rec:</b> Acceptance of Gifts No. 32<br/> <b>Recommendation/Public Hearing:</b> Adopt the Superintendent's Recommendation to Approve/Deny the Renewal Petition for <i>Alma Fuerte Public School</i><br/> <b>Rec:</b> Approval of Second Reading and Adoption of Board Policy (BP) 3320 (Claims Against LACOE), Board Bylaw (BB) 9010 (Public Statements), and BB 9012 (Board Member Electronic Communications) (Enclosure)<br/> <b>Interdistrict Attendance Appeals</b><br/> 1. Kaley C. v. Mountain View SD (Cantonese Interpreter)<br/> 2. Savannah F. v. Torrance USD<br/> 3. <del>Matthew M. v. ABC USD</del><br/> 4. <del>Julian M. v. South Whittier SD</del><br/> 5. <del>Mia B. v. Los Angeles USD</del></p>  |   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>MAY 6</b> 2025</p> <p>3:00 Board Meeting</p> <p><b>Presentation:</b> Day of the Teacher 2025</p> <p><b>Interdistrict Attendance Appeals</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Saylor S. v. Long Beach USD</u></li> <li>2. <u>Sienna A. v. Long Beach USD</u></li> <li>3. <u>Luca D. v. Long Beach USD</u></li> <li>4. <u>Alyssa B. v. Long Beach USD</u></li> <li>5. <u>Jackson C. v. Whittier City SD</u></li> <li>6. <u>Leah B. v. San Gabriel USD</u></li> <li>7. <u>Hanhao L. v. San Gabriel USD</u></li> <li>8. <u>Elijah H. v. Lawndale ESD</u></li> <li>9. <u>Ashna M. v. Lawndale ESD</u></li> <li>10. <u>Kamila S. v. Compton USD</u></li> <li>11. <u>Alexander J. v. Compton USD</u></li> <li>12. <u>Noah A. v. Compton USD</u></li> <li>13. <u>Thomas G. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>14. <u>Savannah M. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>15. <u>Nicolas S. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>16. <u>Heidi H. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>17. <u>Aleena R. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>18. <u>Dylan M. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>19. <u>Kaylie O. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>20. <u>Josiah W. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>21. <u>Jayla W. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>22. <u>Aria C. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>23. <u>Aivyn C. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>24. <u>Ooana J. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>25. <u>Petra J. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>26. <u>Hudson S. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> <li>27. <u>Indy S. v. Los Angeles USD</u></li> </ol> <p><b>Expulsión Appeal</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Case No. 2425-0002 v. Centinela Valley UHSD</u></li> </ol> | <p><b>MAY 13</b> 2025</p> <p><b>2:30 p.m.</b> Community Schools Initiative</p> <p>3:00 Board Meeting</p> <p><b>Presentation:</b> Recognition of Classified School Employees Week</p> <p><b>Presentation:</b> Recognition of the 2025 Los Angeles County Spelling Bee</p> <p><b>Consent Rec:</b> Approval of Los Angeles County Board of Education Institutional Memberships for the 2025-26 Fiscal Year</p> <p><b>Recommendation/Public Hearing:</b> Adopt the Superintendent's Recommendation to Approve/Deny the Renewal Petition for <i>Crete Academy</i></p><br><p><b>MAY 20</b></p> <p>3:00 Board Meeting</p> <p><b>Presentation:</b> History Day Awards 2025</p> <p><b>Rpt:</b> Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) for Educational Programs</p> <p><b>Consent Rec:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. __: LGBTQ Pride Month, June 2025</p> <p><b>Consent Rec:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. __: Immigrant Heritage Month, June 2025</p> <p><b>Recommendation/Public Hearing:</b> Adopt the Superintendent's Recommendation to Approve/Deny the Renewal Petition for <i>Alma Fuerte Public School</i></p> |
|--|---|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>JUNE 3</b> 2025</p> <p>3:00 Board Meeting</p> <p><b>Presentation:</b> Recognition of 2024-25 Science and Math Competition and Other Events</p> <p><b>Rpt:</b> Budget Report – Estimated Actuals</p> <p><b>Rpt:</b> Report on Policies</p> <p><b>Consent Rec:</b> Approval of Annual Distribution of United States Forest Reserve and Flood Control Funds</p> <p><b>Consent Rec:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. __: Juneteenth, June 19, 2025</p> <p><b>Consent Rec:</b> Approval of Re-Issuance of Stale-Dated Warrants</p> <p><b>Rec:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. __: Short-term Cash Loan to School Districts in Los Angeles County – <b>BS</b></p> <p><b>Rec:</b> Approval of the Los Angeles County Board of Education Schedule, 2025-2026, Establishment of meeting times, future agenda items, follow up</p><br><p><b>JUNE 10</b></p> <p>3:00 Board Meeting</p> <p><b>Public Hearing:</b> Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP)</p> <p><b>Public Hearing:</b> Public Hearing on the Annual Budget and Service Plans for the Los Angeles County Court Schools Special Education Local Plan Area (LAC Court Schools SELPA)</p> <p><b>Public Hearing:</b> 2025-26 Proposed Budget</p> <p><b>Rpt:</b> Los Angeles County Office of Education’s Proposed Budget 2025-26 (Enclosure)</p> <p><b>Rec:</b> Approval of First Reading of Policies</p> <p><b>Rec:</b> Annual Budget and Service Plans for the Los Angeles County Court Schools Special Education Local Plan Area (LAC Court Schools SELPA)</p> | <p><b>JUNE 17</b> 2025</p> <p>3:00 Board Meeting</p> <p><b>Presentation:</b> Academic Bowl 2025</p> <p><b>Rpt:</b> LCFF Local Indicator Report</p> <p><b>Consent Rec:</b> Adoption of Board Resolution No. __: 2025-26 on how funds received from the Education Protection act shall be spent as required by Article XIII, Section 36 of the California Constitution (EPA) – <b>BS</b></p> <p><b>Rec:</b> Approval of Second Reading and Adoption of Policies</p> <p><b>Rec:</b> Adoption of Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP)</p> <p><b>Rec:</b> Adoption of 2025-26 Proposed Budget</p> <p><b>Rec:</b> Los Angeles County Office of Education – County Office System of Support Annual Summary Report</p> |
|---|--|

Board Meeting – April 1, 2025

Item IX. Interdistrict and Expulsion Appeal Hearings

- A. Los Angeles County Board of Education's Decision on Interdistrict Attendance Appeals (Enclosures)

Final decisions on Interdistrict Attendance Appeals

On February 27 and March 11 and 13, 2025, the Administrative Hearing Consultant(s) heard the appeal(s). The consultant's findings and recommendations were sent to the County Board of Education, along with the hearing folder, for review.

The Superintendent will provide legal counsel from the County Office of Education.

**Interdistrict  
 Attendance Permit Appeal(s)**

| Student's Name      | Hearing Consultant       | Grade | Represented by  | Resident District              | District Representative  | Desired District |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-------|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------|
| 1. Thiago S.        | Mrs. Melissa Schoonmaker | 1     | Mrs. Marisela Sanchez and Mr. Arnold Sanchez, parents | <b><u>Mountain View SD</u></b> | Mr. George Schonborn, Director of Pupil Personnel Services         | El Monte City SD |
| 2. Lexi S.          | Mrs. Melissa Schoonmaker | TK    | Mrs. Marisela Sanchez and Mr. Arnold Sanchez, parents | <b><u>Mountain View SD</u></b> | Mr. George Schonborn, Director of Pupil Personnel Services         | El Monte City SD |
| 3. Sofia A.         | Mrs. Melissa Schoonmaker | 6     | Ms. Vanessa Salazar and Mr. Noe Almendariz, parents   | <b><u>Mountain View SD</u></b> | Mr. George Schonborn, Director of Pupil Personnel Services         | El Monte City SD |
| 4. Milan Angelee P. | Ms. Angela Chandler      | K     | Ms. Brenda Jimenez and Mr. Diego Pastrano, parents    | <b><u>Castaic Union SD</u></b> | Ms. Stephanie Beach Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services | Newhall SD       |