



Board of Education Report

File #: Rep-164-16/17, **Version:** 1

Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2

October 18, 2016

Charter Schools Division

Action Proposed:

Staff recommends denial of the renewal petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2 (MSA 2), which is located in Board District 3 and Local District Northwest, and adoption of the attached *Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2*.

Background:

Magnolia Science Academy 2 was originally approved on May 8, 2007, and was authorized by LAUSD's Board of Education to serve 425 students in grades 6-12. The charter was renewed on March 13, 2012, to serve up to 425 students in grades 6-12.

Magnolia Educational Research Foundation (MERF), dba Magnolia Public Schools, currently operates eight LAUSD-authorized independent charter schools: Magnolia Science Academy, Magnolia Science Academy 2, Magnolia Science Academy 3, Magnolia Science Academy 4, Magnolia Science Academy 5, Magnolia Science Academy 6, Magnolia Science Academy 7, and Magnolia Science Academy Bell.

On August 22, 2016, Magnolia Science Academy 2 submitted a renewal petition application to the Charter Schools Division seeking to renew its independent charter span school to serve 473 students in grades 6-12. The school serves 460 students in grades 6-12 in Board District 3 and Local District Northwest, and is currently co-located through Proposition 39 on the campus of Birmingham Community Charter High School, located at 17125 Victory Blvd., Van Nuys, CA 91406.

Upon submission, the District comprehensively reviews each renewal petition application to determine whether the charter school has met the requirements for renewal set forth in California Education Code sections 47605 and 47607. The 60-day statutory timeline for Board action on this renewal petition runs through October 21, 2016.

Based on a comprehensive review and assessment of MSA's renewal petition application and its record of performance, staff has determined that the charter school has not met the requirements for renewal and therefore recommends denial of the renewal petition. Please see attached *Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2*.

Statutory Framework

Education Code sections 47605(b) and 47607(b) set forth grounds for denying a renewal petition.

Pursuant to section 47607(b), a charter school seeking renewal must meet at least one of the following minimum academic performance criteria:

- (1) Attained its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in the prior year or in two of the last three years both school wide and for all groups of pupils served by the charter school; *or*
- (2) Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API in the prior year or in two of the last three years; *or*
- (3) Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API for a demographically comparable school in the prior year or in two of the last three years; *or*
- (4) (A) The entity that granted the charter determines that the academic performance of the charter school is at least equal to the academic performance of the public schools that the charter school pupils would otherwise have been required to attend, as well as the academic performance of the schools in the school district in which the charter school is located, taking into account the composition of the pupil population that is served at the charter school.

(B) The determination made pursuant to this paragraph shall be based upon all of the following:
 - i) Documented and clear and convincing data.
 - ii) Pupil achievement data from assessments, including, but not limited to, the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program established by Article 4 (commencing with Section 60640) for demographically similar pupil populations in the comparison schools.
 - iii) Information submitted by the charter school; *or*
- (5) Qualified for an alternative accountability system pursuant to subdivision (h) of section 52052.

In addition, section 47607(a)(2) provides that charter school renewals are governed by the standards and criteria set forth in Section 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.

Section 47605(b) states that "[t]he governing board of the school district shall grant a charter for the operation of a school under this part if it is satisfied that granting the charter is consistent with sound educational practice. The governing board of the school district shall not deny a petition for the establishment of a charter school unless it makes written factual findings, specific to the particular petition, setting forth specific facts to support one or more of the following findings:

- (1) The charter school presents an unsound educational program for the pupils to be enrolled in the charter school.
- (2) The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.
- (3) The petition does not contain the number of signatures required by subdivision [47605] (a).
- (4) The petition does not contain an affirmation of each of the conditions described in subdivision (d) [of section 47605].
- (5) The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all of the [fifteen elements set forth in section 47605 (b)(5)].

- (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 purposes of Chapter 10.7 (commencing with Section 3540) of Division 4 of Title 1 of the Government Code.”

Pursuant to the requirements of SB 1290, the District “shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.” Ed. Code § 47607(a)(3)(A). In addition, state regulations require the District to “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.” 5 CCR § 11966.4.

Grounds for Denial

Staff of the Charter Schools Division and the Office of the General Counsel reviewed the renewal petition application for Magnolia Science Academy 2. Based on the results of the District review process, staff has assessed that the charter school *has not met* the standards and criteria for renewal. In accordance with SB 1290, staff has given extra consideration to the school’s record of academic performance for students in numerically significant subgroups in making its determination whether to recommend renewal.

As fully discussed in the attached *Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2*, staff has determined, in accordance with Education Code sections 47605 and 47607, the following:

- (1) Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the educational program set forth in the petition.
- (2) The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all of the fifteen elements required in a charter school petition.

SB 1290 Analysis

For reasons more fully set forth in the attached *Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2*, staff’s recommendation is consistent with the requirements of SB 1290. The percentage of students who Met or Exceeded standards for all subgroups (Latino, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, African American, and Students with Disabilities) decreased in the area of Mathematics from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016. In comparing data using the same years, the Not Met band in Mathematics CAASPP, increased from 41% to 49%.

Moreover, the continuing operational deficiencies in the performance of the school and MERF, along with the pattern of insufficient responses to inquiries, substantially outweigh the extra consideration accorded to subgroup academic growth by SB 1290 and confirm the organization’s persistent failure to successfully operate its schools in accordance with applicable law and the terms of its schools’ charters. Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2* for further analysis.

Due Diligence

A due diligence review of the school leader and onsite financial manager is being performed by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG). Current Magnolia Public Schools Governing Board members completed questionnaires regarding conflicts of interest.

A Public Hearing was held on September 20, 2016.

The petition is available for perusal in the Charter Schools Division and online at the District's Board of Education website at the following link: <http://laschoolboard.org/charterpetitions>.

Expected Outcomes:

Magnolia Science Academy 2 is expected to operate its charter school in a manner consistent with local, state, and federal ordinances, laws and regulations and the terms and conditions set forth in its petition. As noted in the attached *Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2*, Magnolia Science Academy 2's renewal petition does not meet the legal standards and criteria for approval set forth in Education Code section 47605.

Board Options and Consequences:

“Yes” - If the Board adopts the recommendation of denial and the attached *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2*, Magnolia Science Academy 2 would be prevented from operating as an LAUSD authorized charter school effective July 1, 2017. The charter school may appeal the denial to the Los Angeles County Board of Education and the California State Board of Education for authorization by those entities.

“No” - If the Board does not adopt the recommendation of denial of the renewal petition and the attached *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2*, and instead takes specific action to approve the charter petition, Magnolia Science Academy 2 would be authorized to continue to operate as an LAUSD authorized charter school for a charter term beginning July 1, 2017. Within 30 days, the Board requires that the school submit to the Charter Schools Division a revised renewal petition that meets all LAUSD requirements, including but not limited to a reasonably comprehensive description of all fifteen required elements and compliance with current District Required Language.

Policy Implications:

There are no policy implications at this time.

Budget Impact:

There is no budget impact.

Issues and Analysis:

Issues are outlined above and in more detail in the attached *Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy*.

Attachments:

Staff Assessment and Recommendation Report

Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2

Informatives:

Not applicable

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

APPROVED & PRESENTED BY:

MICHELLE KING
Superintendent

JOSÉ COLE-GUTIÉRREZ
Director
Charter Schools Division

REVIEWED BY:

DAVID HOLMQUIST
General Counsel

___ Approved as to form.

REVIEWED BY:

CHERYL SIMPSON
Director, Budget Services and Financial Planning

___ Approved as to budget impact statement.

STAFF ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATION REPORT RENEWAL PETITION

Board of Education Report 164 – 16/17
October 18, 2016

School Name:	Magnolia Science Academy 2		BOARD IS REQUIRED TO TAKE ACTION BY: October 18, 2016
Type of Charter School:	Start-Up Independent		
CMO/Network:	Magnolia Public Schools (MERF)		
Location Code:	8461		
Type of Site(s):	Proposition 39 Co-Location with Birmingham Community Charter High School		
Site Address(es):	17125 Victory Blvd, Van Nuys, CA 91406		
Board District(s):	3	Local District(s):	Northwest
Grade Levels Currently Served:	6-12	Current Enrollment:	460
Grade Levels Authorized in Current Charter:	6-12	Enrollment Authorized in Current Charter:	425
STAFF RECOMMENDATION:	Denial		
SUMMARY OF STAFF FINDINGS	<p>Based on a comprehensive review of the renewal petition application and the school’s record of performance, staff has determined that the charter school has not met the standards and criteria for renewal. Staff findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ <i>Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the educational program set forth in the petition.</i> ◆ <i>The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all required elements.</i> <p>Please see <i>Findings of Fact in Support of Recommendation of Denial of the Renewal Charter Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2</i> for further detail. Please also see “Staff Review and Assessment” section below.</p>		
PROPOSED BENCHMARKS:	N/A		

STAFF ASSESSMENT

I. ACTION PROPOSED

Staff recommends denial of the renewal petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2 (“MSA2” or “Charter School”), located in Board District 3 and Local District Northwest, to serve 460 students in grades 6-12.

II. CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL

Upon submission, District staff comprehensively reviews each renewal petition application to determine whether the school has met the requirements for renewal set forth in California Education Code sections 47605 and 47607. Once a charter school is determined to be eligible for renewal under § 47607(b), the school must submit a renewal petition application that, upon review, is determined to be **educationally sound, reasonably comprehensive, and demonstrably likely to be successfully implemented.** (Ed. Code §§ 47607(a) and 47605.) Pursuant to the requirements of SB 1290, the District “shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.” (Ed. Code § 47607(a)(3)(A).) The District “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.” (5 CCR § 11966.4.) Please see *Policy for Charter School Authorizing* (LAUSD Board of Education, February 7, 2012) for more information.

III. GENERAL SCHOOL INFORMATION

A. School History

	Magnolia Science Academy 2
Initial Authorization	On May 8, 2007, MSA2 was authorized by LAUSD Board of Education to serve 425 students in grades 6-12.
Most Recent Renewal	The charter was renewed on March 13, 2012, to serve up to 425 students in grades 6-12.
Approved Revisions of Current Charter	A settlement agreement was entered between MPS and LAUSD in March of 2015. There was a major change in leadership in the academic school year 2014-2015. All ties with the Accord Institute were severed for all 8 Magnolia Public Schools. Thus, the management organization had to hire a professional staff of its own to support with the services that Accord previously provided.
Board Benchmarks in Current Charter Term	On March 13, 2012, the Board of Education issued a benchmark to MSA 2. <i>“As a result of Magnolia Science Academy 2’s low absolute performance on the Math and Algebra I California Standards Tests, coupled with at predicted three-year Academic Growth Over Time results, the following benchmarks must be met by the end of its five-year term of the renewal:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Benchmark #1: “CST Mathematics data for 2010-11 indicates that 20% of Magnolia Science Academy 2’s students scored Proficient/Advanced while the Median of Resident Schools Median of students scoring Proficient/Advanced in Mathematics based on the CST</i>

	<p>scores for the term of its charter. The Charter Schools Division will monitor this annually through its ongoing oversight.”</p> <p>Update: CST Mathematics data for 2012-2013 indicates that 30% of MSA 2’s students scored Proficient/Advanced while the Median of LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE indicates that of 30% of students scored Proficient/Advanced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Benchmark #2: “CST Mathematics data for 2010-11 indicates that 46% of Magnolia Science Academy 2’s students scored Below Basic and Far Below Basic while the Median of Resident Schools Median of students scoring Below Basic and Far Below Basic was 32%. Therefore, Magnolia Science Academy 2 will have a lower percentage of students scoring Below Basic and Far Below Basic in Mathematics than the Resident Schools Median based on CST scores for the term of its charter. The Charter Schools Division will monitor this annually through its ongoing oversight.”</i> <p>Update: CST Mathematics data for 2012-2013 indicates that 40% of MSA 2’s students scored Below Basic/Far Below Basic while the Median of LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE indicates that of 44% of students scored Below Basic/Far Below Basic.</p>
<p>Submission of Renewal Petition Application</p>	<p>MSA2 submitted its renewal petition application on August 22, 2016. The 60-day statutory timeline for Board action on the petition runs through October 21, 2016.</p>
<p>Concurrent Request for Material Revision</p>	<p>N/A</p>

B. Educational Program

	<p>Magnolia Science Academy 2</p>
<p>Key Features of Educational Program</p>	<p>Magnolia Science Academy 2 is a 6-12 span school offers Science Technology Engineering Arts and Mathematics (STEAM) instructional program that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Science – MSA has a partnership with Mt. Wilson Observatory where the school’s science department works with their team of scientists to design curricular aligned trips. Science is brought to life as example, the school has a “life lab” Student Garden and outdoor classroom where theory meets the real world and students engage in gardening and soil analysis. ◆ Technology – is used to personalize learning and integrate all subjects in project-based learning opportunities in a fun and meaningful way. The technology curriculum develops critical thinking skills as students explore a variety of ways to solve problems in various content areas.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ College Pathways Program - provides students with the emotional and instrumental support students need to graduate college and career ready. By providing students with college awareness starting in middle school and college guidance throughout high school, students are able to see the importance of advancing their education and becoming positive contributors to society.
Program Components to Meet the Needs of English Learners	<p>Magnolia Science Academy 2 implements its own English Learner Master Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Teachers implement Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) to scaffold content area instruction for English learners. ◆ The school uses myON and Study Sync to support language acquisition and fluency in the four language domains and also incorporates daily English Language Development classes. ◆ Push-in and pull-out services are also provided for either one-on-one or small-group instructional support.
Program Components to Meet the Needs of GATE/High Achieving Students	<p>MSA2 identifies GATE students through teacher and/or administrator recommendations as well as work samples in its identification process. GATE teams, comprised of the GATE coordinator or Special Education Teacher, Academic Dean, and General Education teacher, review all pieces of data and then make a determination of eligibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ MSA2 provides honors and AP classes, enrichment activities (i.e. Academic Decathlon, Robotics, etc.) and the Congressional Award Program (CAP), a voluntary mentorship program designed to help qualified students improve their skills in academic athletics, character education leadership, and voluntary public service.
Special Education SELPA	MSA2 participates in LAUSD SELPA Option 3.

C. Student Population

School	Total Enroll #	% F/R Meal	% GATE	% EL	% Latino	% White	% Af. Amer.	% Asian	% Fili.	% Am Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More
Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	79%	2%	13%	82%	9%	3%	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%

*As of October 2015 Census Day

D. Charter School Operator

MSA2 is operated by Magnolia Educational and Research Foundation (MERF), a California nonprofit public benefit corporation that also operates 7 other LAUSD-authorized charter schools.

IV. STAFF REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

Based on a comprehensive review of the renewal petition application and the school's record of performance, staff has determined that the charter school has not met the standards and criteria for renewal. Please see accompanying *Findings of Fact in Support of Recommendation of Denial of the*

Renewal Charter Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2 and Magnolia Science Academy 2 Data Set. Please also see staff review below.

A. Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?

This criterion has not been determined to be a finding.

B. Are Petitioners Demonstrably Likely To Succeed?

For reasons more fully set forth in the Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2, petitioners are not demonstrably likely to successfully implement the educational program set forth in the renewal petition.

1. *Student Achievement and Educational Performance*

a. Summary

MSA 2's comparative performance on the CAASPP (SBAC) from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016 reflects a 6% increase of students who Met or Exceeded performance standards in English Language Arts (ELA) and a 3% decrease of students who Met or Exceeded performance standards in Math. MSA 2's CAASPP SBAC results show levels of academic performance that are 12% below the Resident Schools Median in ELA and 3% above in Math. MSA 2 achieved a 2014-2015 Cohort Graduation Rate of 100%, which exceeds the LAUSD Similar Schools Median of 98% and the Resident Schools Median of 86%. Please see attached *Magnolia Science Academy 2 Data Set*.

b. Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math

On the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 35% of MSA 2's students Met or Exceeded the performance standard, as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 47%. In Math, 23% of MSA 2's students Met or Exceeded the performance standard as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 20%. On the 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 29% of MSA 2's students Met or Exceeded the performance standard, as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 33%. In Math, 26% of MSA 2's students Met or Exceeded the performance standard as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 17%.

2015-16		English Language Arts				Mathematics			
School	Subgroup	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
Magnolia Science Academy #2	All Students	34	31	27	8	49	27	14	9
	African American	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Latino	37	32	25	6	52	27	13	8
	English Learners	90	7	2	0	86	10	5	0
	Soc-eco Disadvantaged	35	32	26	7	49	28	14	8
	Students with Disabilities	71	22	6	0	84	8	8	0
Similar Schools Median	All Students	33	31	31	8	42	32	16	7
Resident Schools Median	All Students	27	24	32	15	53	26	13	7
2014-15		English Language Arts				Mathematics			
School	Subgroup	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
Magnolia Science Academy #2	All Students	34	36	24	5	41	33	16	10
	African American	58	17	17	8	50	42	0	8
	Latino	35	38	23	4	44	32	15	9
	English Learners	86	14	0	0	77	17	3	3
	Soc-eco Disadvantaged	35	37	23	5	43	33	14	9
	Students with Disabilities	70	23	6	0	77	13	6	4
Similar Schools Median	All Students	36	33	25	4	49	32	14	5
Resident Schools Median	All Students	33	29	26	7	58	27	12	5

c. Minimum Renewal Eligibility Criteria

Minimum Renewal Criteria (School must meet at least one of the following criteria (Ed. Code § 47607(b).))	Yes/No
Has the charter school attained its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in the prior year or in two of the last three years, both schoolwide and for all significant subgroups?	N/A**
Has the charter school ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API in the prior year or in two of the last three years?	N/A**
Has the charter school ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API for a demographically comparable school in the prior year or in two of the last three years?	N/A**
Has the charter school presented clear and convincing evidence of academic performance that is at least equal to or greater than the academic performance of Resident Schools and District Similar Schools*?	Yes

*"Resident Schools" = Public schools that the charter school students would have otherwise attended based on their addresses. "District Similar Schools" are LAUSD schools on the CDE's Similar Schools list for this charter school.

**Not available

d. Student Subgroup Academic Growth

For reasons more fully set forth in the attached *Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2*, staff's recommendation is consistent with the requirements of SB 1290. The percentage of students who Met or Exceeded standards for all subgroups (Latino, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, African American, and Students with Disabilities) decreased in the area of Mathematics from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016. In comparing data using the same years, the Not Met band in Mathematics CAASPP, increased from 41% to 49%.

Moreover, the continuing operational deficiencies in the performance of the school and MERF, along with the pattern of insufficient responses to inquiries, substantially outweigh the extra consideration accorded to subgroup academic growth by SB 1290 and confirm the organization’s persistent failure to successfully operate its schools in accordance with applicable law and the terms of its schools’ charters. Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2* for further analysis.

e. English Learner Reclassification Rates

MSA 2’s 2015-2016 reclassification rate of 30% is higher than both Resident Schools Median at 15% and Similar Schools Median at 16%.

MSA’s reclassification criteria are the following:

- CELDT – Overall score of 4 or 5 and scores of 3 or higher in Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing
- Students must score either a 2 (Nearly Met) or higher on the SBAC or score Basic on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Reading test (MAP tests are computer adaptive assessments that students take in reading and mathematics)
- Grades of C or higher in English Language Arts class
- Parents notified of potential reclassification and give consent

School	12-13 EL #*	13-14 Reclass #	13-14 Reclass Rate	13-14 EL #	14-15 Reclass #	14-15 Reclass Rate	14-15 EL #	15-16 Reclass #	15-16 Reclass Rate
Magnolia Science Academy 2	56	9	15%	68	12	18%	66	20	30%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	107	21	23%	126	24	23%	98	19	16%
Resident Schools Median	278	49	12%	296	59	20%	274	44	15%

f. CAHSEE Passage and Graduation Rates [HS only]

School	2014-15 Grade Span	2012-13 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed Math	2012-13 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed ELA	2013-14 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed Math	2013-14 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed ELA	2014-15 Cohort Graduation Rate
Magnolia Science Academy 2	6-12	97%	87%	83%	83%	100%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	--	89%	81%	62%	71%	98%
Resident Schools Median	--	86%	87%	88%	87%	86%

g. Annual Oversight Results (Based on Former API System)

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report Rating in Category of Student Achievement and Educational Performance*	2 Developing	2 Developing

*Note: The annual oversight rating represents the Charter Schools Division staff evaluation of the school’s performance as outlined in the Annual Performance-Based Oversight Visit Report on or about the date of the annual oversight visit.

h. Additional Information

None

2. **Governance**

The school has unresolved issues in this category. Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2* for further detail.

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report Rating in Category of Governance*	1 Unsatisfactory	3 Proficient

*Note: The annual oversight rating represents the Charter Schools Division staff evaluation of the school's performance as outlined in the Annual Performance-Based Oversight Visit Report on or about the date of the annual oversight visit.

3. **Organizational Management, Programs, and Operations**

a. Summary

The school has unresolved issues in this category. Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2* for further detail.

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report Rating in Category of Organizational Management, Programs, and Operations	3 Proficient	3 Proficient

*Note: The annual oversight rating represents the Charter Schools Division staff evaluation of the school's performance as outlined in the Annual Performance-Based Oversight Visit Report on or about the date of the annual oversight visit.

b. School Climate and Student Discipline

School	Susp. Event Rate 2013-14	Susp. Event Rate 2014-15	2015-16															
			2015-16										2015-16 SUBGROUPS					
			Susp. Event Rate	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16	
Magnolia Science Academy 2	1.6%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	487	3	12	14	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	82	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	811	5	9	12	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	107	2	4	4.3%	0.9%	
Resident Schools Median	0.0%	1.1%	1.5%	1.3%	1356	21	33	51	3	4	4.9%	4.6%	217	33	35	14.3%	2.7%	

c. Access and Equity

School	Total Enroll #	% F/R Meal	% GATE	% EL	% Latino	% White	% Af. Amer.	% Asian	% Fili.	% Am Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More
Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	79%	2%	13%	82%	9%	3%	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	811	84%	1%	13%	91%	1%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Resident Schools Median	1356	83%	4%	21%	81%	8%	4%	3%	3%	0%	0%	1%

*As of October 2015 Census Day

d. Special Education

School	OCT 2015 Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll %	% High Incidence	% Low Incidence	# AUT	# DB	# DEAF	# ED	# EMD	# HOH	# MR	# OHI*	# OI	# SLD*	# SLI*	# TBI	# VI
Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	86	18%	91%	9%	5	--	--	--	--	1	--	24	1	51	3	--	--
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	811	82	11%	81%	20%	13	--	1	2	--	2	1	14	2	60	2	1	1
Resident Schools Median	1356	216	15%	78%	22%	28	--	1	3	--	2	1	34	2	127	3	1	1

e. Additional Information

None

4. ***Fiscal Operations***

Magnolia Science Academy 2's record of performance and related information demonstrate that the school has had positive net assets and positive net income for the last four years. The school's financial operations is still being reviewed by the Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT). Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2*.

a. Summary

Magnolia Science Academy 2 has achieved the ratings of Unsatisfactory and Developing in the category of Fiscal Operations on its annual oversight evaluation reports for the last two years.

During the 2015-2016 oversight visit, the CSD noted that the school and the CMO need to more consistently follow its board-approved fiscal policies and procedures. Examples of this include that invoices be paid in a timely manner to avoid incurring late fees and interest charges, payments be supported by check requests, requisitions, or contracts, vendors be identified on the purchase orders, vendors be part of the organization's approved list, three quotes be required for purchases exceeding the \$5,000 limit, and payments above the \$5,000 threshold be borne with the principal's and the CFO's signatures. The CSD will continue to monitor through oversight.

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report Rating in Category of Fiscal Operations	1 Unsatisfactory	2 Developing

*Note: The annual oversight rating represents the Charter Schools Division staff evaluation of the school's performance as outlined in the Annual Performance-Based Oversight Visit Report on or about the date of the annual oversight visit.

b. Fiscal Condition

According to the 2014-2015 independent audit report, the school had positive net assets of \$994,259 and net income of \$154,851. The 2015-2016 Unaudited Actuals indicate positive net assets and positive net income.

	2011-2012 (Audited Actuals)	2012-2013 (Audited Actuals)	2013-2014 (Audited Actuals)	2014-2015 (Audited Actuals)	2015-2016 (Unaudited Actuals)
Net Assets	\$12,910	\$288,287	\$839,408	\$994,259	\$1,210,746
Net Income/Loss	(\$311,496)	\$275,377	\$551,121	\$154,851	\$216,487
Transfers In/Out	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Prior Year Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

The Magnolia Education & Research Foundation (MERF) is the CMO for Magnolia Science Academy 2 and seven other academies authorized by LAUSD. Some of the academies (MSA 4, 6 and 7) were insolvent at points prior to fiscal year 2013-2014, partly because of state funding delays. To help financially struggling academies, MERF facilitated loans between academies and did not charge some academies its full management fees. The academies that loaned funds were not negatively impacted by this practice and these loans served a useful purpose by enabling struggling academies to continue to serve their students. As of June 30, 2015, the independent audit report showed that MSA 6 had an outstanding loan of \$181,177 owed to MERF.

The 2014/15 audit report also revealed the following intra-company receivables from MERF as of June 30, 2015:

- MSA 2 - \$103,066
- MSA 3 - \$307,336
- MSA 5 - \$180,692
- MSA 7 - \$133,118
- MSA 8 - \$148,920

Per the audit report as of June 30, 2015, intra-company receivables result from a net cumulative difference between resources provided by MERF to the Charter Schools and reimbursement for those resources from the Charter Schools to MERF, and cash transfers for cash flow purposes.

- c. 2014-15 Independent Audit Report
 Audit Opinion: Unmodified
 Material Weakness: None Reported
 Deficiency/Finding: None Reported

- d. Other Significant Fiscal Information
 On or about March 20, 2015, LAUSD and MERF entered into a Settlement Agreement whereby parties agreed to resolve the petition for writ of mandate and complaint for injunction and declaratory relief filed by MERF when the District rescinded the conditional renewals of Magnolia Science Academies 6, 7, and 8. The terms of the Settlement Agreement have not been fully complied. Refer to *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2*.

C. Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?
For reasons more fully set forth in the Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2, the petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all required elements.

D. Does the Petition Contain the Required Affirmations, Assurances, and Declarations?
This criterion has not been determined to be a finding.

CRITERIA SUMMARY

A charter school that has operated for at least four years is eligible for renewal only if the school has satisfied at least one of the following criteria prior to receiving a charter renewal: Attained its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in the prior year or in two of the last three years, both school wide and for all groups of pupils served by the charter school; ranked 4 to 10 on the API statewide or similar schools rank in the prior year or in two of the last three years **both schoolwide and for all groups of pupils served by the charter school** (SB 1290). The academic performance of the charter school must be at least equal to the academic performance of the public schools that the charter school pupils would otherwise have been required to attend, as well as the academic performance of the schools in the school district in which the charter school is located, taking into account the composition of pupil population served at the charter school (Ed. Code 47607).

Schoolwide Academic Performance Index (API)	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Base API	744	761	759
Growth API	759	758	756
Growth Target	5	5	5
Growth	15	-3	-3
Met Schoolwide Growth Target	Yes	No	No
Met All Student Groups Target	Yes	No	No
Base API State Rank	5	4	4
Base API Similar Schools Rank	9	5	5
2013 Growth API State Rank	--	--	4
2013 Growth API Similar Schools Rank	--	--	5

Subgroup API	2010-11			2011-12			2012-13		
	Growth Target	Growth	Met Target	Growth Target	Growth	Met Target	Growth Target	Growth	Met Target
African American or Black	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
American Indian or Alaska Native	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Filipino	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Latino	5	18	Yes	5	-6	No	5	-3	No
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
White	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Two or More Races	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
English Learners	--	--	--	5	-6	No	5	8	Yes
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	5	14	Yes	5	12	Yes	5	-10	No
Students with Disabilities	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

"--" indicates that the subgroup is not numerically significant or the school was not open, therefore will have not API score or target information. "A" indicates the school or student groups scored at or above the statewide performance target of 800 in the 2012 Base. "B" indicates the school did not have a valid 2012 Base API and will not have any growth or target information.

	API Comparison					
	2011 Base API	2012 Growth API	11-12 Growth	2012 Base API	2013 Growth API	12-13 Growth
Magnolia Science Academy 2	761	758	-3	759	756	-3
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	738	761	23	764	764	0
Resident Schools Median	721	741	20	748	743	-5

	2012-13 CST Comparison			
	English Language Arts		Mathematics	
	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below Basic	Proficient & Advanced	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below Basic	Proficient & Advanced
Magnolia Science Academy 2	51%	48%	69%	30%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	52%	47%	61%	39%
Resident Schools Median	56%	45%	70%	30%

	AYP Comparison								
	2012 AYP			2013 AYP			2014 AYP		
	# Criteria	# Met	% Met	# Criteria	# Met	% Met	# Criteria	# Met	% Met
Magnolia Science Academy 2	17	13	76%	19	10	53%	--	--	--
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	17	15	76%	17	10	53%	--	--	--
Resident Schools Median	21	12	57%	21	14	59%	22	14	69%

Magnolia Science Academy 2
2012 BASE API AND 2013 GROWTH API DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

This page displays the 2012 Base API, 2013 Growth API, school ranks and the demographic information from the 2013 Growth API report.

An asterisk (*) indicates that the school does not have a valid 2012 Base API or 2013 Growth API. *Note: The 2013 statewide and similar schools ranks are the final set of ranks reported. These ranks are based on the 2013 Growth API data.*

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	2013 Enrolled # on 1st Day of Testing	2013 Conf	2012 Base API	2013 Growth API	2013 State Rank	2013 Similar Schools Rank	Met 2013 Sch-wide Target	Met 2013 Subgroup Targets	% Free/Reduced Lunch	% Sp Ed	% GATE	% EL	% RFEF	% Latino	% White	% Af. Amer	% Asian	% Fili Indian	% Am Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	365	6-12	759	756	4	5	No	No	67	16	0	15	31	71	13	5	4	4	0	1	2
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																								
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	1557	6-8	763	771	4	7	Yes	No	71	12	16	9	35	70	6	15	2	5	0	2	0
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	883	6-8	764	764	4	6	No	No	100	13	19	14	51	82	7	6	3	2	0	0	0
XR	4	8004	ICEF Vista Middle Academy	199	6-8	779	798	6	10	Yes	Yes	88	14	0	35	37	91	2	4	1	2	0	0	2
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	873	7-8	792	786	5	8	No	No	100	11	19	12	40	91	1	2	2	3	1	0	0
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	372	6-12	785	748	3	8	No	No	72	10	0	5	19	44	2	51	1	1	0	1	1
XR	6	7779	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	308	6-8	813	821	6	10	Yes	Yes	92	12	5	11	59	98	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1489	6-8	733	753	4	5	Yes	No	71	14	16	8	23	73	13	8	1	1	1	1	0
E	5	8377	South Gate Middle	2372	6-8	724	722	2	2	No	No	85	10	16	16	44	99	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
E	5	8153	Southeast Middle	1153	6-8	683	690	1	1	Yes	No	81	10	15	20	43	99	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triumph Charter High	336	6-8	828	838	7	10	Yes	Yes	93	13	7	10	60	97	0	2	0	0	1	0	0
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle	416	6-8	713	752	3	5	Yes	Yes	91	4	0	10	59	86	1	3	1	8	0	0	
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																								
				873	--	764	764	4	7	--	--	88	12	15	11	43	91	1	3	1	1	0	0	
Resident Schools																								
NW	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	1447	6-8	713	716	2	2	No	No	80	17	15	19	42	87	5	5	2	1	0	0	0
NW	6	8814	Reseda Senior High	1344	9-12	752	748	5	9	No	No	64	15	17	16	42	74	12	6	4	3	0	0	0
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1775	6-12	648	657	2	2	Yes	No	73	15	10	26	48	90	2	3	2	3	0	0	0
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	2256	9-12	722	734	4	8	Yes	No	86	12	9	14	43	81	7	7	2	2	0	0	0
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle	1319	6-8	751	742	3	5	No	No	64	17	14	20	40	80	9	5	3	3	0	0	0
NW	3	8283	Northridge Middle	863	6-8	769	744	3	9	No	No	100	21	12	20	46	83	5	4	5	2	0	0	0
NW	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	794	9-12	744	764	6	8	Yes	Yes	68	14	15	8	36	64	20	5	4	6	1	1	0
NW	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	2581	9-12	789	808	8	10	Yes	No	67	11	32	15	37	63	15	5	13	4	0	0	0
NW	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	925	9-12	686	724	4	3	Yes	Yes	64	15	19	7	33	63	18	7	5	7	1	0	0
NW	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	1305	6-8	735	764	4	8	Yes	No	100	19	14	18	43	83	4	5	6	2	0	0	0
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	2142	9-12	762	767	6	7	Yes	No	100	11	32	16	44	62	11	5	14	8	0	0	0
NW	6	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle	1624	6-8	751	731	2	6	No	No	100	13	20	25	46	85	3	4	3	6	0	0	0
Resident Schools Median																								
				1396	--	748	743	4	8	--	--	77	15	15	17	43	81	8	5	4	3	0	0	0

Magnolia Science Academy 2
OCTOBER 2015 CALPADS DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

This page displays K-12 enrollment number and percentages of select subgroups as of October 2015 Census Day.

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	Total Enroll #	% F/R Meal	% GATE	% EL	% Latino	% White	% Af. Amer.	% Asian	% Fili.	% Am Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	79%	2%	13%	82%	9%	3%	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE															
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	1442	80%	1%	13%	72%	5%	14%	3%	4%	0%	1%	1%
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	811	84%	2%	16%	75%	6%	13%	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%
XR	4	8004	ICEF Vista Middle Academy	241	97%	1%	24%	98%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	815	88%	2%	11%	90%	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	0%	0%
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	455	81%	1%	5%	49%	2%	44%	1%	0%	1%	1%	3%
XR	6	7779	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	423	77%	0%	19%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1546	68%	1%	9%	70%	15%	8%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%
E	5	8377	South Gate Middle	2063	88%	1%	13%	98%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
E	5	8153	Southeast Middle	1113	94%	1%	18%	99%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triumph Charter High	726	80%	0%	11%	97%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle	407	95%	3%	22%	91%	0%	0%	1%	7%	0%	0%	0%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				811	84%	1%	13%	91%	1%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Resident Schools															
NW	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	1162	91%	4%	23%	87%	6%	4%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%
NW	6	8814	Reseda Senior High	1597	79%	7%	19%	77%	10%	4%	4%	3%	0%	0%	0%
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1769	91%	7%	24%	88%	2%	3%	2%	3%	0%	0%	0%
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	3278	85%	5%	11%	83%	7%	4%	2%	3%	0%	0%	1%
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle	1159	81%	3%	23%	82%	8%	3%	3%	3%	0%	0%	1%
NW	3	8283	Northridge Middle	839	90%	8%	28%	80%	6%	4%	6%	3%	0%	1%	1%
NW	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	1072	71%	1%	5%	67%	18%	3%	3%	7%	0%	0%	1%
NW	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	3202	65%	5%	11%	60%	17%	5%	13%	4%	0%	0%	1%
NW	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	1201	61%	2%	6%	59%	22%	5%	3%	7%	1%	0%	2%
NW	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	862	91%	4%	26%	83%	4%	4%	6%	2%	0%	0%	1%
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	2594	77%	6%	12%	63%	11%	4%	13%	8%	0%	0%	1%
NW	6	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle	1511	88%	3%	28%	86%	3%	3%	3%	4%	0%	1%	0%
Resident Schools Median				1356	83%	4%	21%	81%	8%	4%	3%	3%	0%	0%	1%

**Magnolia Science Academy 2
RECLASSIFICATION RATES**

This page displays the number of English learners (ELs) on Census Day, the number of students reclassified since the prior Census Day, and the reclassification rate for each specified year. The reclassification rate, displayed in percentage, is calculated by dividing the number reclassified by the number of prior year ELs. These data have historically been collected as of Spring Census Day. However, beginning in 2013-14, the state moved the collection of official EL and Reclassification counts from Spring Census to Fall Census. The 2012-13 EL total displayed on this page is the Spring Census (March 2013) count which remains to be the official EL count for that year. The 2013-14 reclassification rate is calculated by dividing the 2013-14 Fall Census reclassified count by the 2012-13 Fall Census (October 2012) EL count which is not displayed on this page.

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	12-13 EL #*	13-14 Reclass #	13-14 Reclass Rate	13-14 EL #	14-15 Reclass #	14-15 Reclass Rate	14-15 EL #	15-16 Reclass #	15-16 Reclass Rate
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	56	9	15%	68	12	18%	66	20	30%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE												
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	141	42	26%	168	30	18%	153	10	7%
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	118	40	27%	126	32	25%	120	19	16%
XR	4	8004	ICEF Vista Middle Academy	71	20	22%	86	3	4%	68	6	9%
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	107	26	21%	139	48	35%	98	28	29%
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	18	9	28%	27	0	0%	35	18	51%
XR	6	7779	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	33	10	23%	43	14	33%	48	0	0%
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	114	21	17%	131	33	25%	120	9	8%
E	5	8377	South Gate Middle	387	59	14%	396	92	23%	288	62	22%
E	5	8153	Southeast Middle	240	23	9%	243	24	10%	201	28	14%
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triumph Charter High	36	18	32%	51	12	24%	52	21	40%
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle	43	13	27%	59	6	10%	72	27	38%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				107	21	23%	126	24	23%	98	19	16%
Resident Schools												
NW	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	279	47	15%	294	55	19%	224	49	22%
NW	6	8814	Reseda Senior High	277	39	12%	297	61	21%	293	33	11%
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	481	63	12%	493	86	17%	435	61	14%
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	496	50	11%	416	0	0%	412	76	18%
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle	264	54	18%	257	57	22%	255	42	16%
NW	3	8283	Northridge Middle	174	61	27%	194	41	21%	187	27	14%
NW	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	70	12	15%	85	17	20%	72	24	33%
NW	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	448	61	12%	402	93	23%	332	49	15%
NW	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	84	11	11%	88	16	18%	67	15	22%
NW	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	232	61	22%	290	77	27%	240	28	12%
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	389	46	10%	414	88	21%	371	56	15%
NW	6	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle	397	42	10%	433	64	15%	425	46	11%
Resident Schools Median				278	49	12%	296	59	20%	274	44	15%

Magnolia Science Academy 2 RECLASSIFICATION OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

This page displays the number of English learners (ELs) on Census Day, the number of students reclassified since the prior Census Day, and the reclassification rate for each specified year. The reclassification rate, displayed in percentage, is calculated by dividing the number reclassified by the number of prior year ELs. These data have historically been collected as of Spring Census Day. However, beginning in 2013-14, the state moved the collection of official EL and Reclassification counts from Spring Census to Fall Census. The 2012-13 EL total displayed on this page is the Spring Census (March 2013) count which remains to be the official EL count for that year. The 2013-14 reclassification rate is calculated by dividing the 2013-14 Fall Census reclassified count by the 2012-13 Fall Census (October 2012) EL count which is not displayed on this page.

2015-16	2014-15 # EL	2015-16 # Reclassified	2015-16 Reclassification Rate	Change from Prior Year
Magnolia Science Academy 2	66	20	30.3%	12.7%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	98	19	15.8%	-7.4%
Resident Schools Median	274	44	0	-5.3%
District	164,349	19,952	12.1%	-4.5%

2014-15	2013-14 # EL	2014-15 # Reclassified	2014-15 Reclassification Rate
Magnolia Science Academy 2	68	12	17.6%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	126	24	23.2%
Resident Schools Median	296	59	20.3%
District	179,322	29,694	16.6%

2013-14	2012-13 # EL	2013-14 # Reclassified	2013-14 Reclassification Rate
Magnolia Science Academy 2	56	9	15.3%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	107	21	23.3%
Resident Schools Median	278	49	12.2%
District	170,797	25,532	13.9%

Magnolia Science Academy 2
K-12 SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS (DECEMBER 2015 CASEMIS REPORT)

This page displays the K-12 enrollment total (as of October 2015) and the number of K-12 special education students in total, by incidence category, and by eligibility as reported on the December 2015 California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) Report. High incidence eligibilities are indicated by an asterisk (*).

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	OCT 2015 Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll %	% High Incidence	% Low Incidence	# AUT	# DB	# DEAF	# ED	# EMD	# HOH	# MR	# OH*	# OI	# SLD*	# TBI	# VI
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	86	18%	91%	9%	5	--	--	--	1	24	1	51	3	--	--	
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																				
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	1442	153	11%	78%	22%	21	--	--	2	--	2	--	18	1	101	1	--
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	811	51	6%	69%	31%	9	--	4	--	2	4	--	31	--	--	--	1
XR	4	8004	ICEF Vista Middle Academy	241	23	10%	91%	9%	2	--	--	--	--	5	--	15	1	--	--	--
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	815	82	10%	78%	22%	16	--	--	--	--	3	--	60	1	--	--	1
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	455	48	11%	90%	10%	3	--	--	1	--	7	--	34	2	--	--	--
XR	6	7779	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	423	51	12%	88%	12%	5	--	--	1	--	14	--	28	3	--	--	--
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1546	200	13%	81%	20%	24	--	--	5	--	2	1	28	3	133	--	--
E	5	8377	South Gate Middle	2063	223	11%	74%	26%	42	--	1	--	1	14	--	149	3	1	--	--
E	5	8153	Southeast Middle	1113	128	12%	80%	20%	11	--	--	--	2	15	2	83	4	--	--	--
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triumph Charter High	726	129	18%	85%	15%	15	--	--	--	3	20	1	90	--	--	--	--
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle	407	25	6%	96%	4%	--	--	1	--	--	2	--	21	1	--	--	--
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																				
				811	82	11%	81%	20%	13	--	1	2	--	2	1	14	2	60	2	1
Resident Schools																				
NW	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	1162	141	12%	77%	23%	18	--	1	--	--	5	--	19	2	86	4	--
NW	6	8814	Reseda Senior High	1597	321	20%	55%	45%	50	--	--	30	--	--	--	38	3	138	1	--
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1769	274	15%	88%	12%	26	--	--	3	--	1	--	31	3	207	2	--
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	3278	400	12%	83%	17%	41	--	--	7	--	4	1	68	1	261	4	--
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle	1159	144	12%	72%	28%	35	--	--	--	2	25	1	76	3	--	--	--
NW	3	8283	Northridge Middle	839	177	21%	75%	25%	15	--	--	1	--	--	14	--	117	2	2	--
NW	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	1072	175	16%	80%	20%	30	--	--	--	--	1	--	39	2	101	--	1
NW	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	3202	313	10%	82%	18%	41	--	--	3	--	1	--	34	--	217	6	--
NW	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	1201	211	18%	72%	28%	20	--	--	3	--	--	1	36	2	113	2	10
NW	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	862	172	20%	77%	22%	25	--	--	--	--	--	12	1	117	4	--	--
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	2594	239	9%	79%	21%	37	--	--	4	--	2	1	35	--	155	--	1
NW	6	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle	1511	221	15%	78%	22%	20	--	--	1	--	1	2	33	3	136	3	1
Resident Schools Median																				
				1356	216	15%	78%	22%	28	--	1	3	--	2	1	34	2	127	3	1

Magnolia Science Academy 2
2012-13 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS-TEST (CST) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH RESULTS

LD	BD	Loc. Code	School Name	2013 CST ELA							2013 CST MATH								
				# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/(B)/FB	% Prof /Adv	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/(B)/FB	% Prof /Adv
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	352	6%	12%	33%	30%	18%	51%	48%	350	10%	30%	29%	23%	7%	69%	30%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																			
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	1423	4%	11%	38%	30%	17%	53%	47%	1440	7%	22%	32%	27%	12%	61%	39%
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	812	5%	11%	35%	32%	17%	51%	49%	830	7%	21%	34%	32%	6%	62%	38%
XR	4	8004	ICEF Vista Middle Academy	185	1%	12%	39%	32%	15%	52%	47%	189	1%	19%	34%	28%	18%	54%	46%
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	810	5%	12%	33%	36%	15%	50%	51%	808	5%	16%	28%	35%	16%	49%	51%
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	372	5%	15%	30%	38%	13%	50%	51%	371	14%	35%	27%	17%	7%	76%	24%
XR	6	7779	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	300	5%	10%	32%	37%	16%	47%	53%	302	3%	13%	27%	39%	18%	43%	57%
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1365	5%	13%	36%	31%	14%	54%	45%	1357	8%	23%	30%	27%	12%	61%	39%
E	5	8377	South Gate Middle	2294	7%	16%	36%	28%	12%	59%	40%	2289	10%	30%	31%	21%	7%	71%	28%
E	5	8153	Southeast Middle	1101	11%	20%	35%	26%	8%	66%	34%	1116	12%	31%	26%	23%	7%	69%	30%
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triumph	311	2%	11%	37%	37%	13%	50%	50%	318	1%	7%	14%	38%	40%	22%	78%
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle	413	3%	11%	41%	31%	13%	55%	44%	413	5%	30%	38%	21%	7%	73%	28%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				810	5%	12%	36%	32%	14%	52%	47%	808	7%	22%	30%	27%	12%	61%	39%
Resident Schools																			
NW	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	1295	6%	16%	37%	28%	13%	59%	41%	1322	11%	34%	28%	19%	8%	73%	27%
NW	6	8814	Reseda Senior High	1233	5%	10%	32%	34%	19%	47%	53%	1140	20%	37%	24%	15%	4%	81%	19%
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1603	12%	19%	37%	22%	9%	68%	31%	1622	21%	36%	25%	15%	3%	82%	18%
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	2060	6%	13%	35%	32%	15%	54%	47%	1994	12%	43%	29%	14%	2%	84%	16%
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle	1143	7%	16%	35%	26%	16%	58%	42%	1182	9%	24%	30%	27%	10%	63%	37%
NW	3	8283	Northridge Middle	741	4%	14%	43%	29%	10%	61%	39%	766	3%	23%	32%	30%	11%	58%	41%
NW	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	741	2%	8%	32%	40%	18%	42%	58%	739	11%	39%	31%	16%	3%	81%	19%
NW	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	2406	5%	10%	24%	29%	32%	39%	61%	2258	7%	23%	25%	29%	16%	55%	45%
NW	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	845	2%	6%	34%	36%	21%	42%	57%	851	29%	42%	21%	8%	1%	92%	9%
NW	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	1197	7%	13%	37%	30%	13%	57%	43%	1208	4%	16%	30%	38%	12%	50%	50%
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	2004	8%	11%	23%	25%	32%	42%	57%	1978	16%	31%	20%	22%	11%	67%	33%
NW	6	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle	1468	10%	18%	32%	24%	16%	60%	40%	1500	9%	25%	26%	25%	14%	60%	39%
Resident Schools Median				1264	6%	13%	35%	29%	16%	56%	45%	1265	11%	33%	27%	21%	9%	70%	30%

Magnolia Science Academy 2
2011-12 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS-TEST (CST) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH RESULTS

LD	BD	Loc. Code	School Name	2012 CST ELA										2012 CST MATH									
				# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/F BB	% Prof /Adv	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/F BB	% Prof /Adv				
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	307	4%	13%	34%	24%	25%	51%	49%	307	16%	35%	24%	20%	5%	75%	25%				
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																							
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	1526	5%	12%	34%	29%	20%	51%	49%	1561	10%	25%	29%	24%	13%	64%	37%				
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	886	6%	14%	32%	30%	17%	52%	47%	913	4%	20%	37%	33%	7%	61%	40%				
XR	4	8004	ICEF Vista Middle Academy	181	2%	12%	42%	27%	17%	56%	44%	181	5%	24%	33%	28%	10%	62%	38%				
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	782	4%	10%	32%	37%	17%	46%	54%	783	5%	19%	27%	32%	17%	51%	49%				
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	270	4%	10%	28%	37%	21%	42%	58%	270	9%	32%	31%	20%	9%	72%	29%				
XR	6	7779	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	323	5%	12%	28%	35%	20%	45%	55%	327	3%	12%	18%	39%	28%	33%	67%				
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1429	7%	17%	30%	28%	17%	54%	45%	1416	9%	24%	29%	26%	12%	62%	38%				
E	5	8377	South Gate Middle	2519	9%	16%	34%	27%	14%	59%	41%	2516	9%	26%	28%	28%	9%	63%	37%				
E	5	8153	Southeast Middle	1234	10%	22%	33%	23%	12%	65%	35%	1240	16%	35%	26%	17%	7%	77%	24%				
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triumph	316	5%	7%	34%	38%	16%	46%	54%	316	3%	6%	17%	41%	34%	26%	75%				
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle	341	6%	12%	36%	37%	10%	54%	47%	343	11%	31%	30%	24%	4%	72%	28%				
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																							
				782	5%	12%	33%	30%	17%	52%	47%	783	9%	24%	29%	28%	10%	62%	38%				
Resident Schools																							
NW	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	1471	7%	15%	33%	27%	17%	55%	44%	1499	12%	31%	31%	19%	8%	74%	27%				
NW	6	8814	Reseda Senior High	1303	7%	12%	31%	28%	23%	50%	51%	1165	14%	34%	28%	17%	6%	76%	23%				
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1792	11%	21%	37%	22%	10%	69%	32%	1784	21%	40%	24%	12%	3%	85%	15%				
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	1752	6%	13%	35%	31%	15%	54%	46%	1592	17%	42%	28%	12%	2%	87%	14%				
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle	1166	7%	14%	33%	29%	17%	54%	46%	1216	8%	23%	30%	29%	9%	61%	38%				
NW	3	8283	Northridge Middle	740	4%	13%	36%	33%	14%	53%	47%	758	4%	18%	30%	36%	11%	52%	47%				
NW	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	778	3%	10%	33%	33%	22%	46%	55%	763	13%	41%	29%	14%	3%	83%	17%				
NW	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	2466	6%	12%	24%	27%	30%	42%	57%	2175	6%	17%	27%	34%	16%	50%	50%				
NW	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	779	8%	12%	32%	28%	19%	52%	47%	775	27%	39%	23%	9%	1%	89%	10%				
NW	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	1320	10%	18%	33%	25%	14%	61%	39%	1321	6%	20%	32%	30%	11%	58%	41%				
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	2017	10%	13%	22%	23%	31%	45%	54%	1892	17%	26%	23%	22%	13%	66%	35%				
NW	6	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle	1485	8%	16%	32%	26%	19%	56%	45%	1527	10%	22%	26%	27%	15%	58%	42%				
Resident Schools Median																							
				1396	7%	13%	33%	28%	18%	54%	47%	1410	13%	29%	28%	21%	9%	70%	31%				

Magnolia Science Academy 2 HIGH SCHOOL DATA

This page displays the CAHSEE pass rates and graduation rates of the specified school year as published by the California Department of Education (CDE).

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	2014-15 Grade Span	2012-13 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed Math	2012-13 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed ELA	2013-14 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed Math	2013-14 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed ELA	2014-15 Cohort Graduation Rate
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	6-12	97%	87%	83%	83%	100%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE									
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	4	8004	ICEF Vista Middle Academy	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	7-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	6-12	89%	81%	62%	71%	98%
XR	6	7779	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
E	5	8377	South Gate Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
E	5	8153	Southeast Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triumph Charter High	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median					89%	81%	62%	71%	98%
Resident Schools									
NW	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
NW	6	8814	Reseda Senior High	9-12	90%	86%	85%	82%	84%
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	6-12	71%	71%	73%	70%	83%
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	9-12	86%	87%	84%	83%	91%
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
NW	3	8283	Northridge Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
NW	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	9-12	92%	91%	88%	87%	94%
NW	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	9-12	92%	87%	88%	87%	85%
NW	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	9-12	86%	90%	89%	92%	91%
NW	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	9-12	86%	86%	88%	88%	86%
NW	6	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
Resident Schools Median					86%	87%	88%	87%	86%

Magnolia Science Academy #2

TITLE III ACCOUNTABILITY DATA

The Title III program assists LEAs to develop and enhance their capacity to provide high-quality instructional programs designed to prepare ELs to enter all-English instructional settings. Title III Accountability ensures that LEAs assist ELs in overcoming language barriers and meeting academic achievement outcomes as demonstrated by meeting the Annual Measurable Academic Objectives (AMAO) targets.

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	School Type	AMAO 1 - Annual Growth						AMAO 2 - Attaining English Proficiency							
					Number of Annual CELDT Takers	Number in Cohort	Percent with Prior CELDT Scores	Number Met AMAO 1	Percent Met AMAO 1 2014-15	Percent Met AMAO 1 2013-14	Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14	Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14		
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy #2	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	65	0	0.0%	--	--	56.0%	14	7	50.0%	--	51	22	43.1%	41.7%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																		
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle School	Middle School	136	136	100.0%	50	36.8%	49.7%	25	5	20.0%	--	118	29	24.6%	36.6%
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle School	Middle School	124	124	100.0%	51	41.1%	58.1%	14	5	35.7%	--	114	35	30.7%	41.5%
XR	0	8004	Inner City Education Foundation Vista Middle Academy	Middle School	63	63	100.0%	43	68.3%	74.4%	5	--	--	--	59	38	64.4%	60.8%
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle School	Middle School	96	96	100.0%	59	61.5%	67.7%	23	6	26.1%	--	77	32	41.6%	47.8%
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy #3	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	29	16	55.2%	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	29	12	41.4%	--
XR	6	7779	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	Middle School	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle School	Middle School	112	112	100.0%	29	25.9%	50.8%	19	1	5.3%	--	104	19	18.3%	40.5%
E	5	8377	South Gate Middle School	Middle School	285	285	100.0%	140	49.1%	53.9%	35	8	22.9%	20.8%	259	93	35.9%	37.2%
E	5	8153	Southeast Middle School	Middle School	198	198	100.0%	86	43.4%	38.5%	32	4	12.5%	--	169	48	28.4%	23.1%
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Academy and High School	Middle School	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle School	Middle School	72	70	97.2%	40	57.1%	--	9	2	22.2%	--	63	30	47.6%	--
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																		
Resident Schools																		
NW	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle School	Middle School	207	207	100.0%	107	51.7%	51.7%	62	11	17.7%	11.5%	171	64	37.4%	43.8%
NW	6	8814	Reseda Senior High	Senior High School	210	207	98.6%	79	38.2%	50.8%	110	8	7.3%	21.3%	139	34	24.5%	37.0%
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory School	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	394	393	99.7%	161	41.0%	44.2%	131	20	15.3%	17.0%	301	80	26.6%	28.6%
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High School	Senior High School	336	336	100.0%	173	51.5%	48.9%	146	23	15.8%	13.3%	248	97	39.1%	32.6%
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle School	Middle School	248	248	100.0%	116	46.8%	51.0%	52	13	25.0%	18.2%	213	65	30.5%	36.6%
NW	3	8283	Northridge Middle School	Middle School	170	170	100.0%	86	50.6%	45.7%	48	9	18.8%	25.0%	142	46	32.4%	32.7%
NW	3	8513	Northridge Academy Senior High	Senior High School	76	76	100.0%	46	60.5%	48.8%	11	8	72.7%	--	65	30	46.2%	32.1%
NW	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High School	Senior High School	287	274	95.5%	160	58.4%	57.7%	124	15	12.1%	26.8%	193	84	43.5%	41.8%
NW	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	Senior High School	43	41	95.3%	28	68.3%	44.3%	11	7	63.6%	--	32	19	59.4%	32.1%
NW	4	8406	John A Sutter Middle School	Middle School	238	238	100.0%	108	45.4%	52.4%	43	7	16.3%	27.5%	211	61	28.9%	39.2%
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	Senior High School	305	303	99.3%	162	53.5%	56.4%	162	25	15.4%	14.4%	181	71	39.2%	45.5%
NW	6	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle School	Middle School	428	428	100.0%	178	41.6%	36.5%	68	16	23.5%	14.0%	377	109	28.9%	23.2%
Resident Schools Median																		
					243	243	100.0%	112	51.1%	49.9%	65	12	17.0%	17.6%	187	65	34.9%	34.7%

PLOC	School Name	Board District	Test	Grade	Subgroup ID	Students with Scores	Percentage Standard Not Met	Percentage Standard Nearly Met	Percentage Standard Met	Percentage Standard Exceeded
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	6	EL	16	94%	6%	0%	0%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	7	EL	13	85%	15%	0%	0%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	8	EL	10				
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	11	EL	3				
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	6	EL	16	88%	13%	0%	0%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	7	EL	13	85%	15%	0%	0%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	8	EL	10				
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	11	EL	3				
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	6	RFEP	37	30%	38%	30%	3%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	7	RFEP	55	38%	33%	27%	2%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	8	RFEP	56	14%	54%	29%	4%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	11	RFEP	16	13%	25%	38%	25%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	6	RFEP	37	35%	43%	16%	5%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	7	RFEP	55	49%	31%	13%	7%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	8	RFEP	56	50%	30%	9%	11%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	11	RFEP	16	44%	25%	19%	13%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	6	SPED	12	100%	0%	0%	0%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	7	SPED	17	76%	24%	0%	0%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	8	SPED	12	50%	33%	17%	0%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	11	SPED	8				
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	6	SPED	12	100%	0%	0%	0%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	7	SPED	17	82%	6%	12%	0%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	8	SPED	12	75%	25%	0%	0%
8461	Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	11	SPED	8				

Magnolia Science Academy #2
2014-15 and 2015-16 Smarter Balanced Assessment Achievement Data

2015-16		English Language Arts				Mathematics						
LD	BD	Loc Code	School	Subgroup	% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Exceeds Standard
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy #2	All Students	34	31	27	27	49	27	14	9
				African American	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
				Latino	37	32	25	27	52	27	13	8
				English Learners	90	7	2	10	86	10	5	0
				Soc-eco Disadvantaged	35	32	26	26	49	28	14	8
				Students with Disabilities	71	22	6	6	84	8	8	0
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE												
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle School	All Students	29	30	31	31	39	31	18	12
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle School	All Students	33	31	31	31	54	28	12	6
XR	4	8004	Inner City Education Foundation Vista Middle Aca	All Students	23	33	35	35	28	39	19	13
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle School	All Students	27	31	33	33	37	29	19	15
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy #3	All Students	23	34	35	35	42	36	16	6
XR	6	7779	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	All Students	36	30	28	28	41	34	17	8
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle School	All Students	39	29	25	31	46	31	13	10
E	5	8377	South Gate Middle School	All Students	36	31	28	28	52	27	13	7
E	5	8153	Southeast Middle School	All Students	46	29	22	22	54	32	11	3
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Academy and High School	All Students	32	28	32	32	39	34	20	7
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle School	All Students	33	31	27	27	51	32	11	6
				All Students	33	31	31	31	42	32	16	7
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median												
Resident Schools												
NW	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle School	All Students	37	28	27	27	52	25	13	9
NW	6	8814	Reseda Senior High	All Students	15	25	36	36	46	24	20	11
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory School	All Students	45	31	20	20	64	27	8	2
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High School	All Students	14	22	40	40	44	31	19	7
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle School	All Students	46	30	21	21	60	25	10	4
NW	3	8283	Northridge Middle School	All Students	45	26	23	23	55	24	13	8
NW	3	8513	Northridge Academy Senior High	All Students	16	21	36	36	41	33	21	5
NW	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High School	All Students	9	22	38	38	33	28	27	12
NW	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	All Students	12	20	45	45	54	30	12	4
NW	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle School	All Students	41	33	23	23	57	25	13	5
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	All Students	13	21	43	43	35	28	25	13
NW	6	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle School	All Students	53	23	20	20	58	24	11	7
				All Students	27	24	32	32	53	26	13	7
Resident Schools Median												

Magnolia Science Academy #2
2014-15 and 2015-16 Smarter Balanced Assessment Achievement Data

2014-15		English Language Arts				Mathematics						
LD	BD	Loc Code	School	Subgroup	% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Exceeds Standard	
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy #2	All Students	34	36	24	33	41	16	10	
				African American	58	17	17	42	50	0	8	
				Latino	35	38	23	32	44	15	9	
				English Learners	86	14	0	17	77	3	3	
				Soc-eco Disadvantaged Students with Disabilities	35	37	23	33	43	14	9	
					70	23	6	13	77	6	4	
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE												
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle School	All Students	36	31	26	32	46	15	8	
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle School	All Students	36	32	29	31	54	12	4	
XR	4	8004	Inner City Education Foundation Vista Middle Aca	All Students	23	39	33	40	23	21	16	
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle School	All Students	30	34	30	32	41	18	9	
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy #3	All Students	44	34	19	37	50	10	3	
XR	6	7779	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	All Students	32	42	24	37	42	18	4	
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle School	All Students	37	31	25	29	48	14	9	
E	5	8377	South Gate Middle School	All Students	38	33	26	29	53	12	6	
E	5	8153	Southeast Middle School	All Students	41	32	24	30	59	8	3	
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Academy and High School	All Students	45	33	20	22	59	14	5	
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle School	All Students	29	42	24	35	49	11	5	
			LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	All Students	36	33	25	32	49	14	5	
Resident Schools												
NW	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle School	All Students	44	31	21	21	61	12	5	
NW	6	8814	Reseda Senior High	All Students	18	29	40	23	61	12	4	
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory School	All Students	52	29	16	23	68	7	2	
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High School	All Students	24	34	31	20	67	10	3	
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle School	All Students	53	29	17	27	60	10	3	
NW	3	8283	Northridge Middle School	All Students	41	35	21	29	58	9	4	
NW	3	8513	Northridge Academy Senior High	All Students	15	29	35	28	47	21	5	
NW	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High School	All Students	12	24	33	31	37	22	10	
NW	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	All Students	8	24	49	31	51	15	3	
NW	4	8406	John A Sutter Middle School	All Students	51	29	18	29	56	11	5	
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	All Students	18	27	35	27	35	23	14	
NW	6	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle School	All Students	52	27	18	23	58	12	7	
			Resident Schools Median	All Students	33	29	26	27	58	12	5	

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS
2012 BASE API AND 2013 GROWTH API DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

This page displays the 2012 Base API, 2013 Growth API, school ranks and the demographic information from the 2013 Growth API report.

An asterisk (*) indicates that the school does not have a valid 2012 Base API or 2013 Growth API. *Note: The 2013 statewide and similar schools ranks are the final set of ranks reported. These ranks are based on the 2013 Growth API data.*

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	School Demographic Characteristics																						
				2013 Enrolled # on 1st Day of Testing	Conf	2012 Base API	2013 Growth API	2013 State Rank	2013 Similar Schools Rank	Met 2013 Sch-wide Target	Met 2013 Subgroup Targets	% Free/Reduced Lunch	% Sp Ed	% GATE	% EL	% RFP	% Latino	% White	% Af. Amer	% Asian	% Fili Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More			
XR	6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	432	6-12	805	797	7	10	No	No	No	No	88	12	0	10	50	76	10	1	5	6	0	0	0
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	365	6-12	759	756	4	5	No	No	No	No	67	16	0	15	31	71	13	5	4	4	0	1	2
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	372	6-12	785	748	3	8	No	No	No	No	72	10	0	5	19	44	2	51	1	1	0	1	1
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	182	6-12	767	761	5	7	No	No	No	No	76	12	0	8	30	60	18	16	2	2	0	1	1
XR	6	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	236	6-12	843	759	4	5	No	No	No	No	85	9	0	17	48	81	6	3	5	5	0	0	0
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	126	6-8	845	828	7	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	48	10	0	3	14	50	20	15	3	6	2	1	3
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	116	K-5	906	904	9	10	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	73	16	1	15	20	61	23	2	5	5	0	0	3
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	490	6-8	714	763	4	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	94	7	0	16	47	98	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schools Median				301	--	795	762	5	7	--	--	--	75	11	0	13	31	66	12	4	4	5	0	1	1	

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS
OCTOBER 2015 CALPADS DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

This page displays K-12 enrollment number and percentages of select subgroups as of October 2015 Census Day.

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	Total Enroll #	% F/R Meal	% GATE	% EL	% Latino	% White	% Af. Amer.	% Asian	% Fili.	% Am Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More
XR	6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	540	91%	1%	12%	84%	7%	1%	4%	3%	0%	0%	0%
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	79%	2%	13%	82%	9%	3%	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	455	81%	1%	5%	49%	2%	44%	1%	0%	1%	1%	3%
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	184	76%	1%	9%	78%	8%	10%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
XR	6	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	148	89%	4%	28%	82%	8%	5%	1%	4%	0%	0%	1%
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	165	84%	1%	15%	85%	3%	10%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	291	74%	2%	32%	66%	19%	5%	5%	3%	0%	0%	2%
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	493	94%	1%	14%	93%	6%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Schools Median				373	83%	1%	14%	82%	7%	5%	1%	2%	0%	0%	1%

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS RECLASSIFICATION RATES

This page displays the number of English learners (ELs) on Census Day, the number of students reclassified since the prior Census Day, and the reclassification rate for each specified year. The reclassification rate, displayed in percentage, is calculated by dividing the number reclassified by the number of prior year ELs. These data have historically been collected as of Spring Census Day. However, beginning in 2013-14, the state moved the collection of official EL and Reclassification counts from Spring Census to Fall Census. The 2012-13 EL total displayed on this page is the Spring Census (March 2013) count which remains to be the official EL count for that year. The 2013-14 reclassification rate is calculated by dividing the 2013-14 Fall Census reclassified count by the 2012-13 Fall Census (October 2012) EL count which is not displayed on this page.

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	12-13 EL #*	13-14 Reclass #	13-14 Reclass Rate	13-14 EL #	14-15 Reclass #	14-15 Reclass Rate	14-15 EL #	15-16 Reclass #	15-16 Reclass Rate
XR	6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	45	26	36%	72	21	29%	64	21	33%
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	56	9	15%	68	12	18%	66	20	30%
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	18	9	28%	27	0	0%	35	18	51%
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	14	1	5%	25	0	0%	28	3	11%
XR	6	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	41	8	18%	48	10	21%	34	2	6%
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	8	1	14%	12	3	25%	19	8	42%
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	42	15	40%	96	23	24%	74	0	0%
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	76	19	19%	87	16	18%	74	21	28%
Schools Median				42	9	19%	58	11	20%	50	13	29%

**MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS
RECLASSIFICATION OF ENGLISH LEARNERS**

This page displays the number of English learners (ELs) on Census Day, the number of students reclassified since the prior Census Day, and the reclassification rate for each specified year. The reclassification rate, displayed in percentage, is calculated by dividing the number reclassified by the number of prior year ELs. These data have historically been collected as of Spring Census Day. However, beginning in 2013-14, the state moved the collection of official EL and Reclassification counts from Spring Census to Fall Census. The 2012-13 EL total displayed on this page is the Spring Census (March 2013) count which remains to be the official EL count for that year. The 2013-14 reclassification rate is calculated by dividing the 2013-14 Fall Census reclassified count by the 2012-13 Fall Census (October 2012) EL count which is not displayed on this page.

	2014-15 # EL	2015-16 # Reclassified	2015-16 Reclassification Rate	Change from Prior Year
2015-16				
Schools Median	50	13	0	9.7%
District	164,349	19,952	12.1%	-4.5%

	2013-14 # EL	2014-15 # Reclassified	2014-15 Reclassification Rate
2014-15			
Schools Median	58	11	19.6%
District	179,322	29,694	16.6%

	2012-13 # EL	2013-14 # Reclassified	2013-14 Reclassification Rate
2013-14			
Schools Median	42	9	18.7%
District	170,797	25,532	13.9%

**MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS
K-12 SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS (DECEMBER 2015 CASEMIS REPORT)**

This page displays the K-12 enrollment total (as of October 2015) and the number of K-12 special education students in total, by incidence category, and by eligibility as reported on the December 2015 California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) Report. High incidence eligibilities are indicated by an asterisk (*).

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	OCT 2015 Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll %	% High Incidence	% Low Incidence	# AUT	# DB	# DEAF	# ED	# EMD	# HOH	# MR	# OHI*	# OI	# SLD*	# SLI*	# TBI	# VI
XR	6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	540	85	16%	89%	11%	7	--	--	--	--	2	--	9	--	60	7	--	--
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	86	18%	91%	9%	5	--	--	--	--	1	--	24	1	51	3	--	--
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	455	48	11%	90%	10%	3	--	--	1	--	1	--	7	--	34	2	--	--
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	184	25	14%	84%	16%	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	--	12	3	--	--
XR	6	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	148	28	19%	93%	7%	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	4	--	20	2	--	--
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	165	27	16%	78%	22%	2	--	--	--	--	4	--	11	--	9	1	--	--
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	291	36	12%	94%	6%	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	8	23	--	--
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	493	53	11%	85%	15%	6	--	--	--	--	1	--	4	1	37	4	--	--
Schools Median				373	42	15%	89%	11%	4	--	--	1	--	1	--	7	1	27	3	--	--

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS
2012-13 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS-TEST (CST) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH RESULTS

LD	BD	Loc. Code	School Name	2013 CST ELA										2013 CST MATH					
				# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/F BB	% Prof /Adv	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/F BB	% Prof /Adv
XR	6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	421	5%	10%	31%	32%	22%	46%	54%	420	3%	23%	33%	26%	16%	59%	42%
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	352	6%	12%	33%	30%	18%	51%	48%	350	10%	30%	29%	23%	7%	69%	30%
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	372	5%	15%	30%	38%	13%	50%	51%	371	14%	35%	27%	17%	7%	76%	24%
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	181	5%	8%	31%	34%	21%	44%	55%	178	13%	30%	24%	24%	10%	67%	34%
XR	6	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	225	4%	14%	42%	27%	13%	60%	40%	227	5%	29%	27%	30%	9%	61%	39%
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	126	2%	6%	30%	34%	28%	38%	62%	126	3%	26%	35%	23%	13%	64%	36%
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	116	1%	0%	25%	35%	39%	26%	74%	116	1%	3%	9%	37%	50%	13%	87%
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	473	5%	11%	40%	31%	13%	56%	44%	473	7%	25%	30%	28%	10%	62%	38%
Schools Median				289	5%	11%	31%	33%	20%	48%	53%	289	6%	28%	28%	25%	10%	63%	37%

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS
2011-12 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS-TEST (CST) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH RESULTS

LD	BD	Loc. Code	School Name	2012 CST ELA								2012 CST MATH							
				# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/BB	% Prof /Adv	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/BB	% Prof /Adv
XR	6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	457	4%	10%	27%	34%	25%	41%	59%	457	6%	22%	25%	30%	17%	53%	47%
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	307	4%	13%	34%	24%	25%	51%	49%	307	16%	35%	24%	20%	5%	75%	25%
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	270	4%	10%	28%	37%	21%	42%	58%	270	9%	32%	31%	20%	9%	72%	29%
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	160	9%	8%	34%	21%	29%	51%	50%	160	8%	33%	25%	21%	13%	66%	34%
XR	6	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	188	2%	6%	32%	37%	22%	40%	59%	190	5%	9%	28%	33%	25%	42%	58%
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	154	1%	5%	19%	39%	36%	25%	75%	154	6%	18%	37%	25%	13%	61%	38%
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	71	1%	7%	21%	32%	38%	29%	70%	71	1%	0%	8%	45%	45%	9%	90%
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	473	8%	15%	34%	27%	16%	57%	43%	473	14%	33%	28%	18%	8%	75%	26%
Resident Schools Median				229	4%	9%	30%	33%	25%	42%	59%	230	7%	27%	27%	23%	13%	64%	36%

**MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS
HIGH SCHOOL DATA**

This page displays the CAHSEE pass rates and graduation rates of the specified school year as published by the California Department of Education (CDE).

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	2014-15 Grade Span	2012-13 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed Math	2012-13 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed ELA	2013-14 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed Math	2013-14 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed ELA	2014-15 Cohort Graduation Rate
XR	6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	6-12	95%	93%	98%	95%	98%
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	6-12	97%	87%	83%	83%	100%
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	6-12	89%	81%	62%	71%	98%
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	6-12	88%	90%	88%	91%	88%
XR	6	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	6-12	85%	92%	87%	96%	--
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	K-5	--	--	--	--	--
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
Schools Median					89%	90%	87%	91%	98%

**MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS
OUT-OF-SCHOOL SUSPENSION EVENTS**

This page displays the out-of-school suspension event rates for 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16, and suspension events, days and rates for 2015-2016 school year based on schools' self-reported monthly suspensions.

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	2015-16				2015-16 SUBGROUPS				2015-16 SUBGROUPS				STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY			
				Susp. Event Rate 2013-14	Susp. Event Rate 2014-15	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Susp. Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Susp. Rate 2015-16
XR	6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	540	1	5	3	84	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	1.6%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	487	3	12	14	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	2.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	455	0	0	198	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	6.9%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	184	0	0	19	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
XR	6	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	2.9%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	148	0	0	7	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	165	1	1	17	1	1	1	5.9%	5.9%	0.0%		
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	291	0	0	14	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	0.6%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	493	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Schools Median				1.2%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	373	0	0	14	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		

Suspension Events: The number of suspensions issued by the school

Suspension Days: The total number of days issued for all suspension events

Suspension Event Rate: The rate is calculated by dividing the total number of suspension events for the school or subgroup by the total enrollment of the school or subgroup (events/enrollment)

Single Student Suspension %: The percent of students in the school or subgroup that have been suspended one or more times (students suspended/enrollment)

MAGNOLIA CMO

TITLE III ACCOUNTABILITY DATA

The Title III program assists LEAs to develop and enhance their capacity to provide high-quality instructional programs designed to prepare ELs to enter all-English instructional settings. Title III Accountability ensures that LEAs assist ELs in overcoming language barriers and meeting academic achievement outcomes as demonstrated by meeting the Annual Measureable Academic Objectives (AMAO) targets.

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	School Type	AMAO 1 - Annual Growth					AMAO 2 - Attaining English Proficiency							
					Number of Annual CELDT Takers	Number in Cohort	Percent with Prior CELDT Scores	Number Met AMAO 1	Percent Met AMAO 1	Number Met AMAO 1	Percent Met AMAO 1	Number in Cohort	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level
XR	6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	63	0	0.0%	--	--	7	--	--	56	--	19	33.9%	46.6%
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy #2	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	65	0	0.0%	--	56.0%	14	7	50.0%	51	--	22	43.1%	41.7%
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy #3	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	29	16	55.2%	--	--	1	--	--	29	--	12	41.4%	--
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy #4	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	16	13	81.3%	8	61.5%	2	--	--	22	--	8	36.4%	--
XR	6	8012	Magnolia Science Academy #5	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	27	22	81.5%	4	18.2%	12	0	0.0%	22	--	4	18.2%	46.3%
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy #6	Middle School	20	0	0.0%	--	--	7	--	--	15	--	7	46.7%	--
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy #7	Elementary School	90	90	100.0%	53	58.9%	91	35	38.5%	5	37.5%	30	41.7%	31.7%
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell @ South Region MS #2A	Middle School	75	0	0.0%	--	--	3	--	--	72	--	12	41.4%	44.0%
CMO Schools Median					46	7	27.6%	8	58.9%	7	7	38.5%	26	37.5%	12	41.4%	44.0%

**FINDINGS OF FACT IN SUPPORT OF DENIAL OF THE
RENEWAL CHARTER PETITION FOR
MAGNOLIA SCIENCE ACADEMY 2
BY THE LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

BOARD OF EDUCATION REPORT #164-16/17
October 18, 2016

I. INTRODUCTION.

On August 22, 2016, the Los Angeles Unified School District (“District”) received a charter petition (“Petition”) from Magnolia Education and Research Foundation (“MERF”) (dba as Magnolia Public Schools), a California nonprofit public benefit corporation, for the renewal of Magnolia Science Academy 2 (“MSA-2” or “Charter School”) charter petition for a term of five years. The school serves 460 students in grades 6-12 in Board District 3 and Local District Northwest, and is currently co located through Proposition 39 on the campus of Birmingham Community Charter High School, located at 17125 Victory Blvd, Van Nuys, CA 91406.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW FOR A RENEWAL CHARTER.

The Charter Schools Act of 1992 (“Act”) governs the creation of charter schools in the State of California. The Act includes Education Code section 47605, subdivision (b), which sets out the standards and criteria for petition review, and provides that a school district governing board in considering whether to grant a charter petition “shall be guided by the intent of the Legislature that charter schools are and should become an integral part of the California educational system and that establishment of charter schools should be encouraged.”

The Act further provides that renewals and material revisions of charter petitions are governed by the same standards and criteria set forth in Education Code section 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.” (Ed. Code § 47607, subd. (a)(2).)

According to the California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 11966.4, subdivision (a)(1), a charter school must also provide documentation with its petition for renewal showing that it has satisfied at least one of the following academic performance criteria specified in Education Code section 47607, subdivision (b):

1. Attained its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in the prior year or in two of the last three years, or in the aggregate for the prior three years; or
2. Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API in the prior year or in two of the last three years; or
3. Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API for a demographically comparable school in the prior year or in two of the last three years; or

4. The entity that granted the charter determines that the academic performance of the charter school is at least equal to the academic performance of the public schools that the charter school pupils would otherwise have been required to attend, as well as the academic performance of the schools in the school district in which the charter school is located, taking into account the composition of the pupil population that is served at the charter school. This determination shall be based upon all of the following: a) documented and clear and convincing data; b) pupil achievement data from assessments, including, but not limited to, the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program established by Article 4 (commencing with Section 60640) for demographically similar pupil populations in the comparison schools; and c) information submitted by the charter school; or
5. Qualified for an alternative accountability system pursuant to subdivision (h) of Section 52052.

Section 47605(b) states that “[t]he governing board of the school district shall grant a charter for the operation of a school under this part if it is satisfied that granting the charter is consistent with sound educational practice. The governing board of the school district shall not deny a petition for the establishment of a charter school unless it makes written factual findings, specific to the particular petition, setting forth specific facts to support one or more of the following findings:

- 1) The charter school presents an unsound educational program for the pupils to be enrolled in the charter school.
- 2) The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.
- 3) The petition does not contain the number of signatures required by subdivision [47605] (a).
- 4) The petition does not contain an affirmation of each of the conditions described in subdivision (d) [of section 47605].
- 5) The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all of the [fifteen elements set forth in section 47605 (b) (5)].
- 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 purposes of Chapter 10.7 (commencing with Section 3540) of division 4 of Title 1 of the Government Code.”

State regulations provide:

A petition for renewal submitted pursuant to Education Code section 47607 shall be considered by the district governing board 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 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. (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, section 11966.4, subdivision (a).)

Pursuant to the requirements of SB 1290, the District “shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.” (Ed. Code § 47607(a) (3) (A).)

In addition, state regulations require the District to “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.” (5 CCR § 11966.4.)

III. ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

As discussed above, charter schools that have operated for at least four years must first meet one of the minimum academic performance criteria listed in Education Code section 47607, subdivision (b) or Education Code sections 52052(e)(2)(F) and 52052(e)(4) before the renewal request is analyzed further. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11966.4; Ed. Code, § 47607, subd. (b).)

A. Summary

District staff has concluded that Magnolia Science Academy 2 has met at least one of the minimum academic performance criteria pursuant to Education Code section 47607, subdivision (b), in that the Charter School presented clear and convincing evidence of academic performance that is at least equal to or greater than the academic performance of Resident Schools¹ and District Similar Schools.² (Exhibit 2, Magnolia Science Academy 2 Data Set).

Magnolia Science Academy 2 achieved a moderate to overall record of academic achievement and growth. Its 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) results show levels of academic performance that are below the Resident Schools Median in English Language Arts (ELA) and above the Resident Schools Median in Mathematics. Internal assessment data show moderate levels of academic achievement and growth both schoolwide and for the school’s numerically significant subgroups.

¹ “Resident Schools” are the public schools that the Charter School’s students would have otherwise attended based on their addresses.

² “District Similar Schools” are LAUSD schools on the CDE’s Similar Schools list for this Charter School.

Historically, under the former API system, in the 2013-2014 and 2012-2013 school years, the Charter School earned a Statewide rank of 4 and a Similar Schools rank of 5 for both years. (Exhibit 2,- Magnolia Science Academy 2 Data Set and Exhibit 3 - Magnolia Science Academy 2 SBAC Data).

In 2015-2016, MSA-2's English Learner reclassification rate of 30.3%, which was higher than both the Similar and Resident School Median rates. In 2014-2015, Magnolia Science Academy 2 reclassification rate was 17.6%.

(Exhibit 2, Magnolia Science Academy 2 Data Set).

B. Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math

On the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 35% of MSA-2's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is lower than the Resident Schools Median of 47%. In Math, 23% of MSA-2 students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 20%. On the 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 29% of MSA-2's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is less than the Resident Schools Median of 33%. In Math, 26% of MSA-2's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 17%.

(Exhibit 3 - Magnolia Science Academy 2 SBAC Data).

C. Student Subgroup Academic Growth

Pursuant to the requirements of SB 1290, the District "shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to grant a charter renewal." (Ed. Code § 47607(a) (3) (A).)

The District has reviewed and considered increases in academic achievement for all groups of pupils at MSA-2 with the recognition that this performance is the most important factor when deciding whether to renew the charter. MSA-2 serves the following numerically significant pupil subgroups: 82% Latinos, 79% Students who Qualify for Free and Reduced Meal, 13% English Learners, and 18% Students with Disabilities. (Exhibit 2 - Magnolia Science Academy 2 Data Set).

The Charter School's record of academic performance does indicate that most of MSA-2's numerically significant student subgroups achieved growth in English Language Arts, but all numerically significant subgroups declined in Math. Based on the past two years of CAASPP (SBAC) data in the met and exceeded performance standards, Latino students showed an increase of 4 percentage points in ELA and decline of 3 percentage points in Math. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students showed an increase of 5 percentage points in ELA and 1 percentage point decline in Math. Students with Disabilities remained the same in ELA (6% met and exceeded both years) and a 2 percentage points decline in Math. The English learner subgroup showed an increase of 2% percentage points in ELA and 1% point decline in math. (Exhibit 3 - Magnolia Science Academy 2 SBAC Data).

As part of the District's extra consideration of MSA-2's increases in academic achievement, an analysis of MSA-2's 2016 CAASPP (SBAC) subgroup performance compared to subgroup performance of District resident schools ("Resident Schools") has been performed. When comparing the percentage of students who Met or Exceeded the performance standards, the Latino subgroup in ELA, is lower than 7 out of 12 Resident Schools; and in Math, MSA-2 is lower than 6 out of 12 resident schools. For the English Learner subgroup in ELA, MSA-2 exceeded 6 out of 11 Resident Schools; in Math, the Charter School is higher than 10 out of 11 Resident Schools. It should be noted that one Resident School had less than 10 English learners taking the CAASPP assessment which resulted in a score of an asterisk (*) in the category of English learner. For the Socio-economically Disadvantaged subgroup in ELA, MSA-2 is lower than 6 out of 12 Resident Schools; in Math, the Charter School exceeded 6 out of 12 Resident Schools. Finally, for the Students with Disabilities subgroup in ELA, MSA-2 is lower than 7 out of 12 Resident Schools; in Math, the Charter School exceeds 9 out of 12 Resident Schools. (Exhibit 4, Magnolia Science Academy 2 SBAC Resident Schools Subgroup Data).

Schoolwide 2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment data confirms that the performance of the Charter School is lower than the performance of the Resident Schools Median in ELA (35% compared to 47%). Conversely, the performance of the Charter School is higher than the performance of Resident Schools Median in Math (23% compared to 20%). (Exhibit 3, Magnolia Science Academy 2 SBAC Data).

As stated in the comment to SB 1290, "This bill specifies that a charter authorizer must consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the school, as measured by the [Academic Performance Index (API)], 'as the most important factor' for renewal and revocation. This does not mean the charter school is automatically not renewed or revoked, but it does mean that the charter authority must consider this information as the most important factor in making its decision. In other words, the charter authority must give extra weight to this factor when it considers all the factors for renewal or revocation."

The cumulative gravity of the Charter School's Charter Management Organization's [Magnolia Educational Research Foundation (MERF)] operational deficiencies and its ongoing pattern of failing to respond adequately to District inquires as noted in these findings of fact substantially outweighs the academic growth achieved by most of the Charter School's student subgroups in ELA. Again, it is worth noting that there has been an across the board decline in academic growth for all subgroups in Math. MERF's continued and repeated failure to timely respond to reasonable requests for information and documentation from the District and FCMAT limited the District's ability to fully oversee the fiscal condition of MERF and the District authorized charter schools operated by MERF. The ability of the District to perform its oversight function is essential for the District to ensure compliance with laws and proper use of public funds by one of its authorized charter schools.

IV. STAFF SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION.

After a careful and thorough review of the Petition and all supporting documentation provided by Petitioner, District staff recommends that the District Governing Board adopt these Findings of Fact for the Denial of the Magnolia Science Academy 2 Charter Renewal based on the following grounds:

- (1) Petitioner is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the programs set forth in the Petition; (Ed. Code § 47605(b)(2);
- (2) The Petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements. (Ed. Code § 47605(b)(5).)

V. FINDINGS OF FACT FOR DENIAL.

A. MSA-2 is Demonstrably Unlikely to Successfully Implement the Programs Set Forth in the Petition

The District's oversight of MSA-2 has revealed that MSA-2 is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the programs in the petition, for reasons including the following:

1. Failure to Respond To Reasonable Inquiries interfere the District's Ability to Fully Oversee the School:

For reasons including the following, MERF violated the terms of its District authorized charters and the requirement of Education Code section 47604.3 requiring that it "promptly respond to all reasonable inquiries, including, but not limited to, inquiries regarding financial records, from its chartering authority" limiting the District's ability to conduct full oversight of the school.

a. Failure to Timely Respond to FCMAT's Document Requests:

On or about March 20, 2015, the District and MERF entered into a Settlement Agreement whereby the parties agreed to resolve a lawsuit filed by MERF when the District rescinded the conditional renewals of Magnolia Science Academy 6, 7, and 8. The terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement require that "MERF agrees to be subject to fiscal oversight during fiscal year 2015-16 by the Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT), or a reasonably equivalent fiscal organization, which would oversee MERF's fiscal operations." (Exhibit 5, Settlement Agreement).

In furtherance of the Settlement Agreement, MERF entered into a Study Agreement with FCMAT dated August 25, 2015. (See Exhibit 6, Attachment to Letter from FCMAT to the District dated September 14, 2016.) The Study Agreement's scope of work included monthly fiscal oversight services for the 2015-16 fiscal year in accordance with MERF's Settlement Agreement with the District, which was attached to the Study Agreement and made part of its terms. In a letter dated

September 14, 2016, FCMAT explained, “The premise of the monthly review was that, based on the sample of monthly financial transactions selected for review and testing, there would likely be a higher number of exceptions early in the process and with regular feedback from FCMAT, the number of exceptions would diminish as the fiscal year progressed. The hope was that the review for June 2016 would reflect that Magnolia was consistent with best practices and its gradual improvement in financial reporting was acceptable to LAUSD.” (Exhibit 6.)

Contrary to the above-referenced agreements, MERF did not timely provide FCMAT with all documents requested. As FCMAT indicated in the September 14 letter,

“The only way for the process outlined above to work was that Magnolia needed to be timely in providing FCMAT with all documents requested...Magnolia has not performed timely as required, and FCMAT has continued to work with Magnolia to obtain the documents requested for July 2015 transactions. Given the significant delays by Magnolia, FCMAT has been unable to perform its obligations and has documented such to Magnolia and LAUSD in its management letters. Given Magnolia’s noncompliance with the terms of the study agreement and agreed upon protocols, on June 9, 2016 FCMAT informed Magnolia that we could not complete the engagement. It was apparent to both Magnolia and FCMAT that there was no point in conducting monthly reviews for the 2015-16 fiscal year since the purpose of the monthly reviews was to provide timely feedback and for Magnolia to implement FCMAT’s recommendations and demonstrate improvement over the course of the year.” (Exhibit 6).

As a result, FCMAT could not conduct its review on a timely basis and the District had little information about the fiscal performance of the MERF’s charter schools needed for conducting monthly fiscal oversight during the 2015-16 fiscal year. The following are examples of MERF’s failure to timely respond to FCMAT’s reasonable requests for information and documents:

- On November 6, 2015, FCMAT sent its first management letter to Magnolia Public Schools’ Chief Financial Officer, reiterating the scope of review and documenting that FCMAT sent an initial document list to Magnolia staff and requested that all items be posted to FCMAT’s SharePoint document repository by September 23, 2015. The letter also noted that the FCMAT study team met with Magnolia staff members to discuss the scope of work and documents needed for FCMAT to complete its monthly fiscal oversight. After several follow-up requests for the necessary documents, Magnolia staff posted some documents on SharePoint but not all of the documents as of October 30, 2015. Accordingly, FCMAT was unable to complete the monthly fiscal oversight for period July 1 to October 30, 2015. (Exhibit 7, Letter to Magnolia Public Schools from FCMAT, November 6, 2015).
- On January 8, 2016, more than six months into the fiscal year, FCMAT sent its second management letter to MERF memorializing that “as of December 30, 2015 all of the documents originally requested on September 17, 2015 had not yet been posted.” The letter also memorialized a conference call between MERF

management and FCMAT on January 7, 2016, during which MERF indicated all available outstanding documents would be posted by January 11, 2016, at which time FCMAT would “begin to complete monthly fiscal oversight as indicated in the study agreement.” As would become apparent, MERF did not fulfill its commitment to FCMAT to provide requested documents. (See Exhibit 8, Letter to Magnolia Public Schools from FCMAT, January 8, 2016).

- FCMAT sent MERF management letters for February and March 2016. (Exhibit 9, FCMAT management letters, February 17 and March 21, 2016). Although MERF provided responses to some documents which FCMAT indicated it will review, on April 22, 2016, FCMAT indicated that it did not receive answers to some follow-up questions and documents had not been answered. (Exhibit 10, FCMAT management letter, April 22, 2016).
- On June 13, 2016, at nearly the end of the fiscal year during which MERF was supposed to have benefited from feedback from FCMAT, the District wrote to FCMAT and MERF questioning the status of the fiscal oversight required in the Settlement Agreement. As explained in the letter, “In the monthly management letters prepared by FCMAT and reviewed by LAUSD we find that there is little information about the fiscal performance of the schools. The primary issue appears to be the lack of documentation submitted to FCMAT by MERF.” (See Exhibit 11, Letter from LAUSD to FCMAT, June 13, 2016).
- On August 3, 2016, FCMAT entered into an Amended Study Agreement with MERF at MERF’s request. The Amended Study Agreement’s scope of work was truncated to include review of July 2015, followed by reviews of sample financial transactions and reports for August 2015, May 2016 and June 2016 for MSA-6, MSA-7, and Magnolia Science Academy 8 (MSA-8). Subsequently on August 23, 2016 and September 14, 2016, respectively, MERF and FCMAT informed the District that the organizations entered into an Amended Study Agreement, wherein FCMAT agreed to complete its review of July 2015 for all eight MERF schools authorized by the District and then conduct reviews of a sample of financial transactions and various financial reports for August 2015, May 2016 and June 2016 for MSA-6, MSA -7, and MSA-8. (Exhibit 6, FCMAT Letter to LAUSD, September 14, 2016).
- On August 22, 2016, the District wrote to MERF requesting the following by August 31, 2016: “Written communication from FCMAT that they have received all of the documentation required to fulfill the contract; Written documentation that MERF and FCMAT have agreed to meet ALL provisions of the original contract; [and] A copy of the final report from FCMAT after completion of the contract.” To date, the District has not received a final report from FCMAT. (Exhibit 12, Letter to Caprice Young from LAUSD, August 22, 2016).

By failing to perform its obligations under the Settlement Agreement, including, but not limited to, its failure to provide timely documentation requested by FCMAT based on the Study Agreement, MERF violated the terms of the Settlement

Agreement and accordingly its District authorized charters and the requirement of Education Code section 47604.3 requiring that it “promptly respond to all reasonable inquiries, including, but not limited to, inquiries regarding financial records, from its chartering authority.” MERF’s continued and repeated failure to timely respond to reasonable requests for information and documentation from the District and FCMAT limited the District’s ability to fully oversee the fiscal condition of MERF and the District authorized charter schools operated by MERF.

b. Failure to Timely Respond to OIG’s Document/Information Requests:³ MERF has continued in its pattern of providing insufficient and incomplete responses to documentation to the OIG. Examples of MERF’s failure to timely respond to OIG’s reasonable requests for information and documents include:

- On July 29, 2014, OIG sent MERF a letter requesting twenty-nine distinct categories of records and information. MERF sent a series of responses to OIG on August 4, 2014; August 11, 2014; August 17, 2014; and September 8, 2014. Despite its responses, MERF did not provide OIG with a complete set of the records and information it had requested. In an attempt to access needed records, OIG was forced to obtain certain banking records by way of subpoena and seek the assistance of the California Department of Education.
- On August 22, 2016, over two years after OIG’s original request, MERF sent another response that failed to account for and provide the requested records and information. Among other things, MERF failed to provide the following requested items:
 - Corporate documents related to MERF and all affiliates, including, but not limited to, MPM Sherman Way LLC and Magnolia Properties Management Inc.
 - QuickBooks files for all entities, including, but not limited to, MPM Sherman Way LLC
 - Identification of owners, partners, and members of all affiliates, including, but not limited to, MPM Sherman Way LLC and Magnolia Properties Management Inc.
 - Payroll registers, 1099s, and W-2s

³ In anticipation of Petitioner’s contention that the Settlement Agreement resolved issues including any pending investigation by the OIG, the Settlement Agreement did not set aside any further inquiries/investigation by the OIG. Paragraph 10 of the Settlement Agreement states: “The District agrees not to raise issues contained in the State’s Joint Legislative Audit Committee’s (“JLAC”) audit that were previously contained in the District’s staff reports or VLS report. However, the District reserves its right to issue notices of concern and/or initiate revocation proceedings pursuant to Education Code section 47607 in the event that the JLAC audit or *the OIG’s investigation on MERF* reveals any misappropriation of funds or new concerns unrelated to the District’s prior review by the OIG. In the event the District issues a notice of concern or initiates revocation proceedings, MERF shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to cure those alleged violations and/or concerns.” (Exhibit 5, Settlement Agreement, emphasis added). The language in the Settlement Agreement explicitly references an OIG investigation outside the parameters the Parties resolved.

- MERF policies and procedures manual, accounting manual, and related policies
- With regards to immigration related expenses, MERF has spent approximately \$1,036,417 in processing employment related immigration applications, including but not limited to legal fees and expenses for H-1B visas from 2002-2015. Although MERF has provided the District with some information, it has declined to provide the back-up documentation such as H-1B visa applications, H-1B visas granted, invoices and receipts for H-1B visa related expenses, and other immigration related applications, which would allow the OIG to determine whether the expenditures were appropriate.
- In its correspondence on August 22, 2016, MERF stated it would only make the following documents and information available for OIG to review at MERF's site (contrary to assertions by MERF related to some, but not all, categories, OIG has never received complete copies of these documents):
 - Lease agreements, discounted notes, contracts
 - Ownership of property leased or used
 - Source documents, e.g., invoices, receipts, etc., for bank records
 - Subsidiary journals for accounts receivable, intercompany loans, and adjusting journal entries, including source documents
 - Loan documents
 - Backup documents, loan agreements, Board approvals for inter-company and intra-company loans
 - List of donations and pledges
 - Grant applications
 - Grant awards and accounting of fund expenditure
 - Recruitment activities
 - Employment contracts
 - List of current vendors, contractors, and subcontractors
 - Current vendor and facility contracts
 - MPS student enrollee data
- On August 5, 2016, State Superintendent Tom Torlakson sent a correspondence to MERF requesting a series of documentation in order to respond to a complaint received by the California Department of Education regarding MERF. In that letter, Superintendent Torlakson noted that it is the CDE's understanding that the OIG has requested a series of documents from each of the MPS charter school's inception to the present date and that it is their understanding that MPS has declined to release these documents. (See Exhibit 13, Letter to Umit Yapanel and Caprice Young from Tom Torlakson, August 5, 2016).

By failing to provide timely documentation originally requested by the OIG back on July 29, 2014, MERF impeded the ability of the District to fully exercise general and fiscal oversight and responsibility in order to monitor the fiscal condition of MERF pursuant to

Education Code section 47604.32, and violated the terms of its District authorized charters and the requirement of Education Code section 47604.3 requiring that it “promptly respond to all reasonable inquiries, including, but not limited to, inquiries regarding financial records, from its chartering authority.”

2. Inconsistent Adherence to Board Approved Fiscal Policies and Procedures:

During the 2015-2016 oversight visit, the CSD noted that the school and the CMO need to more consistently follow its board-approved fiscal policies and procedures. Examples of this include that invoices be paid in a timely manner to avoid incurring late fees and interest charges, payments be supported by check requests, requisitions, or contracts, vendors be identified on the purchase orders, vendors be part of the organization’s approved list, three quotes be required for purchases exceeding the \$5,000 limit, and payments above the \$5,000 threshold be borne with the principal’s and the CFO’s signatures.

B. The petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all of the elements required in Education Code section 47605 (b) based on the following findings of fact:⁴

• **Governance Structure (Element 4)**

The petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the charter school’s governance structure.

- The petition allows for the delegation of Board duties/responsibilities to employees of MPS and unspecified entities that should be retained, including, but not limited to, hiring and evaluating the CEO; approving award of contracts in excess of delegated authority; and approving resolutions for requesting material revisions. Petition does not demonstrate the Board’s control of its fiduciary duty to the Charter School’s by not clearly distinguishing between the responsibilities that are retained by the Board and those which can be delegated.
- The Charter School fails to provide sufficient assurance that the Charter School will comply with the Brown Act. While the petition specifies that the Charter School will comply with the Brown Act, both the petition and the Magnolia Education and Research Foundation (dba Magnolia Public Schools) corporate Board’s Bylaws allow the corporate Board to conduct a meeting by teleconference without having at least a quorum of the members of the Board participate from locations within the boundaries of Los Angeles Unified School District, and may allow for practices that run contrary to fundamental principle of the Brown Act

⁴ Petitioner submitted the renewal petition on August 22, 2016. Petitioner originally communicated to the Charter Schools Division that it would not adhere to the District’s Required Language. On September 19, 2016, Petitioner communicated that it decided to include the District Required Language in the Petition. Although the petition submitted does not have all the District Required Language, the District is construing Petitioner’s September 19 communication as an agreement to include the required language. Accordingly, the reasonably comprehensive findings raised in this section pertain to remaining issues in the Petition. For this sections’ findings of fact, please refer to Exhibit 1, Petition.

that all meetings of the public body be open and accessible to interested stakeholders.

- The Charter School's corporate Board Bylaws submitted with the petition allow for practices that may run contrary to conflict of interest laws including Government Code section 1090 et seq. and District policies applicable to the Charter School. For instance, the Bylaws in Article XII, section 1 allow for approval of transactions in which a non-director designated employee (e.g., officers and other key decision-making employees) directly or indirectly has a material financial interest as the non-director designated employee files a statement of economic interest with the Corporation in conformance with the Conflict of Interest Code (see Conflict of Interest Policy section II, "Designated Employees" and page 1, 2nd paragraph of the Conflict of Interest Code). However, if an officer or key decision-making employee has a material interest in a contract/transaction entered into by the Board, this would not suffice to avoid violation of Govt. Code 1090 et seq. and District policies applicable to the Charter School.
 - The petition and Charter School's corporate board Bylaws (See specifically Article VII, sections 5 and 6) inconsistently specify how corporate Board Directors are selected. Also, although the petition specifies that Magnolia's governance structure provides for staggered terms which is accomplished through the Corporate Bylaws by appointing members of the Board at different times and for staggered terms, the process as described is not reflected in the Bylaws.
- **Employee Qualifications (Element 5)**
The petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of employee qualifications.

The petition includes an identical list of qualifications for a few key Charter School positions described in Element 5, including the Principal, even though some differentiation is expected since the positions have differing responsibilities, for example Dean of Academics, Dean of Students and Dean of Culture. Also, the petition does not describe the educational degree qualifications of all the key positions identified in the petition, as required for Element 5 in the District's Charter School Renewal Petition Independent Guide.

- **Admission Requirements (Element 8)**
The petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the charter school's admission requirements.
 - The petition does not include a reasonably comprehensive description of the manner in which the Charter School will implement a public random drawing process in the event that applications for enrollment exceed school capacity. Among other deficiencies, the petition does not describe how preference will be granted in the lottery to the student categories

listed in the petition, and unclearly identifies where the lottery will be held.

- The petition does not sufficiently describe the procedures the Charter School will follow to determine waiting list priorities based upon lottery results and to enroll students from the waiting list or the means by which the Charter School will notify parents/guardians of students who have been offered a seat as a result of the lottery or from the waiting list following a lottery, and the procedures and timelines under which parents/guardians must respond in order to secure admission.

- **Suspension and Expulsion Procedures (Element 10)**

The petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the charter school's student suspension and expulsion procedures.

- The petition's description of the Charter School's procedures for the discipline of students seems to conflict with the District's 2013 School Discipline Policy and School Climate Bill of Rights (applicable to LAUSD-authorized charter schools through Board's adoption of this Resolution) prohibiting student suspension and expulsion for "willful defiance." Specifically, the petition states that a Charter School student may be suspended or expelled for engaging in "repeated violations, defined as three or more, of the school's behavioral expectations..." The petition does not define behavioral expectations. Magnolia Public Schools Student/Parent Handbook ("Handbook") provides that the behavior expectations include: "Be Respectful," including "[f]ollow the teacher's directions." The Handbook defines "Behaving Disrespectfully towards Teachers or Staff" as: "Disrespect (i.e. arguing, talking back, etc.) and insubordination (failure to comply with directives) toward any member of the faculty or staff will not be tolerated." Violation of these behavioral expectations amounts to discipline on the grounds of "willful defiance" which is contrary to the District's 2013 School Discipline Policy and School Climate Bill of Rights. Moreover, the petition is inconsistent with Education Code section 48900(k)(1) which states that except as provided in Section 48910, a pupil enrolled in kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 3, inclusive, shall not be suspended for disruption of school activities or willful defiance and that pupil enrolled in kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive, shall not be grounds for expulsion.
- Since the Charter School's list of offenses for which suspension and recommended expulsion is discretionary includes "causing...serious physical injury to another person" there is concern that the Charter School's students may not be held accountable for their commission of such and offense and the safety of students, staff, and visitors to the school may be jeopardized.

- The listed offenses for student suspension and expulsion provided in the petition is inconsistent with the lists included in the Handbook. Clearly described/outlined grounds for which a student may (discretionary) and must (non-discretionary) is necessary to avoid inconsistent, capricious, and unfair student disciplinary practices and necessary to afford students adequate due process
- The petition does not provide a reasonably comprehensive description of the Charter School's student suspension and expulsion procedures. For instance, the petition inconsistently describes who acts as hearing body for student expulsion hearing, does not describe suspension appeal hearing procedures, and does not sufficiently describe its special procedures for expulsion hearings involving sexual assault or battery offenses. Clearly described/outlined procedures are necessary to avoid inconsistent, capricious, and unfair student disciplinary practices, and necessary to afford students adequate due process.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing, Staff recommends that the Renewal Petition be denied for the following reasons: (1) it is demonstrably unlikely that the Petitioners will successfully implement the program set forth in the Petition; and (2) the Petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of certain required elements set forth in Education Code section 47605, subdivision (b)(5)(A-O).

In reviewing the Charter School's Renewal Petition, the District has considered increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to grant the charter renewal. As stated in the comment to SB 1290, "This bill specifies that a charter authorizer must consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the school, as measured by the [Academic Performance Index (API)], 'as the most important factor' for renewal and revocation. This does not mean the charter school is automatically not renewed or revoked, but it does mean that the charter authority must consider this information as the most important factor in making its decision. In other words, the charter authority must give extra weight to this factor when it considers all the factors for renewal or revocation."

In regard to increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school: MSA-2 serves the following numerically significant pupil subgroups: 82% Latinos, 79% Students who Qualify for Free and Reduced Meal, 13% English Learners, and 18% Students with Disabilities.

1. The Charter School's record of academic performance does indicate that most of MSA-2's numerically significant student subgroups achieved growth in English Language Arts, but all numerically significant subgroups declined in Math.

Based on the past two years of CAASPP (SBAC) data:

- Latino students showed an increase of 4 percentage points in ELA and decline of 3 percentage points in Math.
 - Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students showed an increase of 5 percentage points in ELA and a decline of 1 percentage point in Math.
 - Students with Disabilities remained the same in ELA and decline of 2 percentage points in Math.
 - The English learner subgroup showed an increase of 2 percentage points in ELA and a 1 percentage point decline in Math.
2. As part of the District's extra consideration of MSA-2's increases in academic achievement, an analysis of MSA-2's 2016 CAASPP (SBAC) subgroup performance compared to subgroup performance of District resident schools ("Resident Schools") had been performed:
- When comparing the percentage of students who Met or Exceeded the performance standards, the Latino subgroup in ELA, is lower than 7 out of 12 Resident Schools; and in Math, MSA-2 is lower than 6 out of 12 resident schools. For the English Learner subgroup in ELA, MSA-2 exceeded 6 out of 11 Resident Schools; in Math, the Charter School is higher than 10 out of 11 Resident Schools. It should be noted that one Resident School had less than 10 English learners taking the CAASPP assessment which resulted in a score of an asterisk (*) in the category of English learner. For the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged subgroup in ELA, MSA-2 is lower than 6 out of 12 Resident Schools; in Math, the Charter School exceeded 6 out of 12 Resident Schools.

For the Students with Disabilities subgroup in ELA, MSA-2 is lower than 7 out of 12 Resident Schools; in Math, the Charter School exceeds 9 out of 12 Resident Schools.

3. Schoolwide 2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment data confirms that the performance of the Charter School is lower than the performance of the Resident Schools Median in ELA (35% compared to 47%). Conversely, the performance of the Charter School is higher than the performance of Resident Schools Median in Math (23% compared to 20%).

And, District further finds:

1. As described in the Charter Petition Review Checklist and Staff Report, the Petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions in several essential elements, including:
 - a. The governance structure of the school (Ed. Code, § 47605(b)(5)(C));
 - b. A description of the individuals to be employed by the charter school (Ed. Code, § 47605(b)(5)(E)); and
 - c. The admissions requirements of the school. (Ed. Code, §47605(b)(5)(H).)

- d. The suspension and expulsion procedures of the charter school (Ed. Code, § 47605(b)(5)(J)).
2. The Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Petition, due to the organization's continued and repeated failure to timely respond to reasonable requests for information and documentation from the District and limiting the District's ability to fully oversee the fiscal condition of MERF and the District authorized charter schools operated by MERF.

District staff gives the greater single weight to the consideration of the academic metrics and increases for the school and its subgroups. Although MSA-2's academic performance has demonstrated gains in English Language Arts for most subgroups, it is concerning that there was a decline in academic progress for all subgroups in Math. The cumulative gravity of the Charter School's Charter Management Organization's operational deficiencies and its ongoing pattern of failing to respond adequately to District inquires as noted in these findings of fact nonetheless substantially outweighs the academic growth achieved by some of the Charter School's student subgroups in ELA. In addition to confirming MERF's lack of capacity to operate in accordance with applicable law and the terms of the charter schools it operates, MERF's continued and repeated failure to timely respond to reasonable requests for information and documentation from the District and FCMAT impeded the District's ability as authorizer to fully exercise its oversight responsibilities in order to monitor the fiscal condition of MERF and the District authorized charter schools operated by MERF. The ability of the District to perform its oversight function is essential for the District to ensure compliance with laws and proper use of public funds by one of its authorized charter schools.

CONCLUSION

In order to deny the Petition on the grounds set forth above, Education Code section 47605, subdivision (b), requires the Board to make "written factual findings, specific to the particular petition, setting forth specific facts to support one or more" grounds for denying the Petition. Should the Board decide to deny the Petition, District Staff recommends that the Board adopt these Findings of Fact as its own.