



Board of Education Report

File #: Rep-165-16/17, **Version:** 1

Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 3

October 18, 2016

Charter Schools Division

Action Proposed:

Staff recommends denial of the renewal petition for Magnolia Science Academy 3 (MSA 3), located in Board District 7 and Local District South, and adoption of the attached *Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 3*.

Background:

MSA 3 was originally approved on May 8, 2007, under the name Magnolia Science Academy-Venice, and was authorized by the LAUSD Board of Education to serve 500 students in grades 6-12. The charter was renewed on March 13, 2012, to serve up to 500 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 3 submitted a renewal petition application to the Charter Schools Division seeking to renew its independent charter span school to serve 449 students in grades 6-12. The school is serving 448 students in grades 6-12 in Board District 7 and Local District South, and is currently co-located through Proposition 39 on the campus of Curtiss Middle School, located at 1254 E. Helmick Street, Carson, CA, 90746.

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.

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 3. 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 3*, 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 3*, staff’s recommendation is consistent with the requirements of SB 1290. The school’s record of academic performance does indicate that Magnolia Science Academy 3’s numerically significant student subgroups (Latino, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, African American, and Students with Disabilities) have achieved positive growth in academic performance. For example, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards on the 2016 SBAC ELA assessments in the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged and Latino subgroups increased by 20 and 26 percentage points, respectively, in comparison with the prior year’s performance. Although the District acknowledges the subgroup academic gains achieved at the school, the continuing operational deficiencies in the performance of the school and MERF, along with the pattern of insufficient responses to inquiries, nonetheless 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 3* 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 MSA 3 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 3 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 3*, Magnolia Science Academy 3'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 3*, Magnolia Science Academy 3 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 3*, and instead takes specific action to approve the charter petition, Magnolia Science Academy 3 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 3*.

Attachments:

Staff Assessment and Recommendation Report

Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 3

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 165 – 16/17
October 18, 2016

School Name:	Magnolia Science Academy 3			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:	8464			
Type of Site(s):	Proposition 39 Co-Location with Curtiss Middle School			
Site Address(es):	1254 E. Helmick St., Carson, CA 90746			
Board District(s):	7	Local District(s):	South	
Grade Levels Currently Served:	6-12	Current Enrollment:	448	
Grade Levels Authorized in Current Charter:	6-12	Enrollment Authorized in Current Charter:	500	
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 3</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 3 (“MSA3” or “Charter School”), located in Board District 7 and Local District South, to serve 500 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 3
Initial Authorization	On May 8, 2007, MSA3 was authorized by LAUSD Board of Education to serve 500 students in grades 6-12.
Most Recent Renewal	The charter was renewed on March 13, 2012, to serve up to 500 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 3. <i>“As a result of Magnolia Science Academy 3’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 30% of Magnolia Science Academy 3’s students scored Proficient/Advanced while the Median of LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE indicates that 34% of students scored proficient/advanced. Therefore, Magnolia Science Academy 3</i>

	<p><i>will meet or exceed the Median of LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE scoring Proficient/Advanced in Mathematics, based on the CST scores for the term of its charter. The Charter Schools Division will monitor this annually through its ongoing oversight.”</i></p> <p><i>Update: CST Mathematics data for 2012-2013 indicates that 24% of MSA 3’s students scored Proficient/Advanced while the Median of LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE indicates that of 39% of students scored Proficient/Advanced.</i></p>
Submission of Renewal Petition Application	MSA3 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.
Concurrent Request for Material Revision	N/A

B. Educational Program

	Magnolia Science Academy 3
Key Features of Educational Program	<p>MSA3 is a 6-12 span school that offers a Science Technology Engineering Arts and Mathematics (STEAM) instructional program that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Science – MSA3 has fully transitioned to NGSS and participates in the MPS STEAM Expo ◆ Technology – MSA3 is about 90% at a one-to-one ratio of chromebooks-to-students, with high-speed wireless internet available in all but 2 classrooms. ◆ Engineering – MSA3 offers both a middle school and high school robotics elective that sends teams to competitions ◆ Arts – MSA3 offers drama, graphic arts and music classes ◆ Mathematics – MSA3 has PowerMath intervention classes available to middle school students and students complete one interdisciplinary project per semester typically led by the grade-level science teachers
Program Components to Meet the Needs of English Learners	<p>MSA3 implements its own English Learner Master Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ An English Language Development (ELD) class is offered for students identified as English Learners based on California English Language Development Test (CELDT) results where students are at the beginning levels for language acquisition ◆ The school uses a research based framework called CHATS that helps teachers’ support EL growth in both content and language acquisition. The framework is made up of components that are broken up into five areas around the acronym CHATS: C-Content Reading Strategies; H-Higher Order Thinking Skills; A-Assessment; T-Total Participation Techniques; and S-Scaffolding Strategies
Program Components to Meet the Needs of	MSA3 identifies GATE students through teacher and/or administrator recommendations as well as work samples in its identification process. GATE teams, comprised of the GATE

GATE/High Achieving Students	coordinator or Special Education Teacher, Academic Dean, and General Education teacher, review all pieces of data and then make a determination of eligibility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSA3 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	MSA3 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 3	455	81%	1%	5%	49%	2%	44%	1%	0%	1%	1%	3%

*As of October 2015 Census Day

D. Charter School Operator

MSA3 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 3* and *Magnolia Science Academy 3 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 3, 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 3’s comparative performance on the CAASPP (SBAC) from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016 reflects a 21% increase of students who Met or Exceeded performance standards in English Language Arts (ELA) and a 9% increase of students who Met or Exceeded performance standards in Math. MSA 3’s 2015-2016 CAASPP SBAC results show levels of academic performance that are 15% above the Resident Schools Median in ELA and 6% above in Math. MSA 3 achieved a 2014-2015 Cohort Graduation Rate of 98%, which exceeds the LAUSD Similar Schools Median of 94% and the Resident Schools Median of 85%. Historically, under the former API system, in the 2012-2013 school year, the school did not meet its growth target, both schoolwide as well as for all significant subgroups and earned

a Statewide rank of 3 and a Similar Schools rank of 8. Please see attached *Magnolia Science Academy 3 Data Set*.

b. Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math

On the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 43% of MSA 3's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 28%. In Math, 22% of MSA 3's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 16%. On the 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 22% of MSA 3's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 24%. In Math, 13% of MSA 3's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 14%.

2014-2015 and 2015-2016 Smarter Balanced Assessment Achievement Data

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 #3	All Students	23	34	35	8	42	36	16	6
	African American	28	35	33	3	50	33	13	4
	Latino	20	33	35	12	34	40	18	7
	English Learners	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Soc-eco Disadvantaged	24	36	33	7	44	36	15	5
	Students with Disabilities	61	29	7	4	68	25	7	0
Similar Schools Median	All Students	34	30	29	8	46	31	15	7
Resident Schools Median	All Students	42	29	23	5	58	28	11	5
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 #3	All Students	44	34	19	3	50	37	10	3
	African American	44	33	22	1	52	38	7	3
	Latino	43	36	16	5	48	36	12	3
	English Learners	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Soc-eco Disadvantaged	46	35	17	3	54	36	8	2
	Students with Disabilities	87	13	0	0	77	19	3	0
Similar Schools Median	All Students	36	33	26	5	48	32	14	6
Resident Schools Median	All Students	49	29	20	4	61	26	11	3

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 3*, staff’s recommendation is consistent with the requirements of SB 1290. The school’s record of academic performance does indicate that Magnolia Science Academy 3’s numerically significant student subgroups (Latino, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, African American, and Students with Disabilities) have achieved positive growth in academic performance. For example, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards on the 2016 SBAC ELA assessments in the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged and Latino subgroups increased by 20 and 26 percentage points, respectively, in comparison with the prior year’s performance. Although the District acknowledges the subgroup academic gains achieved at the school, the continuing operational deficiencies in the performance of the school and MERF, along with the pattern of insufficient responses to inquiries, nonetheless 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 3* for further analysis.

e. English Learner Reclassification Rates

MSA 3’s 2015-2016 reclassification rate of 51% is higher than both Resident Schools Median at 15% and Similar Schools Median at 14%.

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 3	18	9	28%	27	0	0%	35	18	51%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	59	20	23%	72	13	18%	65	10	14%
Resident Schools Median	134	26	13%	148	27	17%	140	21	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 3	6-12	89%	81%	62%	71%	98%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	--	93%	89%	86%	87%	94%
Resident Schools Median	--	79%	75%	79%	74%	85%

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 3* for further detail.

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report Rating in Category of Governance*	2 Developing	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 3* for further detail.

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report Rating in Category of Organizational Management, Programs, and Operations	2 Developing	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 SUBGROUPS									
			Susp. Event Rate	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS					STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY				
								# 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 3	2.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	455	0	0	198	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	47	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	1.9%	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	482	4	11	17	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	62	1	4	1.5%	0.9%
Resident Schools Median	0.0%	1.1%	1.3%	1.2%	950	12	29	244	7	15	2.8%	2.8%	126	28	29	13.2%	1.9%

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 3	455	81%	1%	5%	49%	2%	44%	1%	0%	1%	1%	3%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	482	84%	1%	13%	80%	3%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Resident Schools Median	950	82%	1%	14%	62%	1%	27%	1%	2%	0%	1%	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 3	455	48	11%	90%	10%	3	--	--	1	--	1	--	7	--	34	2	--	--
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	482	58	13%	84%	16%	8	--	4	2	--	1	1	9	1	40	2	--	1
Resident Schools Median	950	131	14%	72%	28%	18	--	4	3	--	3	5	21	1	71	2	1	1

e. Additional Information

None

4. ***Fiscal Operations***

Magnolia Science Academy 3'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 has unresolved issues in this category. Its financial operations are 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 3*.

a. Summary

Magnolia Science Academy 3 has achieved the ratings of Proficient 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	3 Proficient	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 \$796,829 and net income of \$103,938. 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	\$239,649	\$495,537	\$692,891	\$796,829	\$976,776
Net Income/Loss	\$27,651	\$255,888	\$197,354	\$103,938	\$179,947
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 3 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. As of June 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 – 2015 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. To date, MERF has not fully complied with the terms of the Settlement Agreement. Please see *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 3*.

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 3, 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	777	754	785
Growth API	754	785	748
Growth Target	5	5	5
Growth	-23	31	-37
Met Schoolwide Growth Target	No	Yes	No
Met All Student Groups Target	No	Yes	No
Base API State Rank	4	5	5
Base API Similar Schools Rank	5	7	7
2013 Growth API State Rank	--	--	3
2013 Growth API Similar Schools Rank	--	--	8

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	5	-36	No	5	35	Yes	5	-16	No
American Indian or Alaska Native	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Filipino	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Latino	5	-5	No	5	42	Yes	A	-58	No
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
White	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Two or More Races	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
English Learners	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	5	-28	No	5	45	Yes	5	-38	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 3	754	785	31	785	748	-37
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	772	770	-2	772	768	-4
Resident Schools Median	706	693	-13	693	701	8

	2012-13 CST Comparison			
	English Language Arts		Mathematics	
	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below	Proficient & Advanced	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below	Proficient & Advanced
Magnolia Science Academy 3	50%	51%	76%	24%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	51%	50%	61%	39%
Resident Schools Median	63%	37%	75%	26%

	AYP Comparison								
	2012 AYP			2013 AYP			2014 AYP		
	# Criteria	# Met	% Met	# Criteria	# Met	% Met	# Criteria	# Met	% Met
Magnolia Science Academy 3	17	15	88%	17	8	47%	--	--	--
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	17	13	74%	17	10	55%	--	--	--
Resident Schools Median	25	13	55%	25	14	62%	25	16	62%

Magnolia Science Academy 3
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	School Demographic Characteristics														
												% Free/Reduced Lunch	% Sp Ed	% GATE	% EL	% RFP	% Latino	% White	% Amer	% Asian	% Fili	% Am Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More		
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		
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	0	
XR	6	8054	Bert Corona Charter	364	6-8	691	734	3	3	Yes	No	81	14	0	18	47	96	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	
XR	2	2024	PUC Excel Charter Academy	331	6-8	776	699	1	1	No	No	87	12	5	11	47	99	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	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	0	
XR	1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	369	5-8	823	790	5	9	No	No	79	11	0	1	5	10	0	89	0	0	0	0	1	0	
XR	6	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	350	6-8	855	843	7	10	Yes	No	88	13	7	13	52	95	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	
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	0	
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	0	
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	182	6-12	767	761	5	7	No	No	76	12	0	8	30	60	18	16	2	2	0	1	1	0	
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	490	6-8	714	763	4	5	Yes	Yes	94	7	0	16	47	98	2	0	0	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	0	
XR	2	8018	Synergy Kinetic Academy	466	6-8	804	784	5	8	No	No	95	9	11	20	52	96	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy & 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	0	
XR	1	8460	View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle	333	6-8	776	784	5	10	Yes	Yes	71	8	0	0	0	3	0	96	0	0	0	1	0	0	
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																										
				367	--	772	768	5	7	--	--	84	12	6	12	44	87	2	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	
Resident Schools																										
S	7	8103	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle	660	6-8	704	707	2	5	No	No	75	11	15	5	21	42	1	56	1	0	0	0	0	0	
S	7	8664	Gardena Senior High	1238	9-12	633	641	1	3	Yes	No	68	11	12	16	37	70	1	21	4	2	0	1	0	0	
S	7	8868	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory	1068	6-12	681	673	2	3	No	No	71	10	12	7	21	61	2	27	1	6	1	3	0	0	
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	1635	6-8	724	720	2	4	No	No	73	13	16	13	33	65	1	26	4	2	1	1	0	0	
S	7	8487	Stephen M. White Middle	1808	6-8	764	751	3	3	No	No	65	13	19	9	27	64	3	10	2	17	0	4	0	0	
S	7	8090	Andrew Carnegie Middle	885	6-8	737	729	2	5	No	No	76	13	14	7	17	50	2	22	2	16	0	8	0	0	
XR	7	8087	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	542	9-12	675	681	2	9	Yes	Yes	88	11	0	35	34	83	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	
S	7	8160	Samuel Gompers Middle	919	6-8	570	607	1	1	Yes	No	86	21	7	22	26	64	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	
XR	1	5180	Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle	583	6-8	593	629	1	2	Yes	Yes	76	17	0	19	20	50	0	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	
XR	1	5181	Animo Western Charter Middle	590	6-8	655	694	1	6	Yes	Yes	86	17	0	19	33	66	1	31	0	0	1	0	1	0	
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	1635	6-8	724	720	2	4	No	No	73	13	16	13	33	65	1	26	4	2	1	1	0	0	
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	154	K-6	800	814	6	10	Yes	Yes	99	11	6	12	11	35	0	64	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Resident Schools Median																										
				902	--	693	701	2	4	--	--	76	13	12	13	27	64	1	27	1	1	0	1	0	0	

Magnolia Science Academy 3
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	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	455	81%	1%	5%	49%	2%	44%	1%	0%	1%	1%	3%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE															
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	1442	80%	1%	13%	72%	5%	14%	3%	4%	0%	1%	1%
XR	6	8054	Bert Corona Charter	375	87%	0%	21%	45%	19%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
XR	2	2024	PUC Excel Charter Academy	321	95%	1%	18%	97%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	811	84%	2%	16%	75%	6%	13%	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%
XR	1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	367	88%	0%	4%	16%	0%	83%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
XR	6	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	351	84%	0%	14%	95%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	815	88%	2%	11%	90%	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	0%	0%
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	79%	2%	13%	82%	9%	3%	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	184	76%	1%	9%	78%	8%	10%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	493	94%	1%	14%	93%	6%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1546	68%	1%	9%	70%	15%	8%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%
XR	2	8018	Synergy Kinetic Academy	477	99%	0%	19%	97%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High	726	80%	0%	11%	97%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
XR	1	8460	View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle	424	83%	0%	1%	3%	0%	95%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				482	84%	1%	13%	80%	3%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Resident Schools															
S	7	8103	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle	544	83%	1%	6%	44%	1%	52%	0%	2%	0%	1%	0%
S	7	8664	Gardena Senior High	1586	81%	3%	13%	65%	2%	26%	3%	2%	0%	1%	1%
S	7	8868	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory	975	79%	2%	9%	62%	2%	24%	1%	5%	0%	3%	1%
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	1332	80%	1%	14%	64%	2%	27%	3%	2%	0%	1%	1%
S	7	8487	Stephen M. White Middle	1610	76%	2%	10%	62%	3%	10%	3%	16%	0%	4%	1%
S	7	8090	Andrew Carnegie Middle	924	73%	2%	9%	49%	3%	24%	2%	14%	0%	7%	2%
XR	7	8087	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	1684	94%	4%	26%	71%	0%	27%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
S	7	8160	Samuel Gompers Middle	557	92%	3%	25%	62%	0%	36%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
XR	1	5180	Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle	605	92%	0%	17%	55%	0%	41%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
XR	1	5181	Animo Western Charter Middle	626	94%	0%	21%	75%	0%	23%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	1332	80%	1%	14%	64%	2%	27%	3%	2%	0%	1%	1%
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	254	84%	0%	24%	44%	1%	53%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Resident Schools Median				950	82%	1%	14%	62%	1%	27%	1%	2%	0%	1%	1%

**Magnolia Science Academy 3
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	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	18	9	28%	27	0	0%	35	18	51%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE												
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	141	42	26%	168	30	18%	153	10	7%
XR	6	8054	Bert Corona Charter	62	11	13%	76	0	0%	64	12	19%
XR	2	2024	PUC Excel Charter Academy	38	27	39%	56	9	16%	57	9	16%
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	118	40	27%	126	32	25%	120	19	16%
XR	1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	12	7	54%	7	0	0%	9	0	0%
XR	6	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	44	23	36%	42	14	33%	38	5	13%
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	107	26	21%	139	48	35%	98	28	29%
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	56	9	15%	68	12	18%	66	20	30%
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	14	1	5%	25	0	0%	28	3	11%
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	76	19	19%	87	16	18%	74	21	28%
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	114	21	17%	131	33	25%	120	9	8%
XR	2	8018	Synergy Kinetic Academy	95	32	25%	105	23	22%	84	9	11%
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High	36	18	32%	51	12	24%	52	21	40%
XR	1	8460	View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle	1	0	0%	2	0	0%	2	0	0%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				59	20	23%	72	13	18%	65	10	14%
Resident Schools												
S	7	8103	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle	33	8	20%	35	6	17%	27	5	19%
S	7	8664	Gardena Senior High	230	28	11%	256	44	17%	203	24	12%
S	7	8868	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory	79	10	11%	95	24	25%	72	12	17%
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	213	31	13%	216	50	23%	174	25	14%
S	7	8487	Stephen M. White Middle	158	27	15%	159	33	21%	154	34	22%
S	7	8090	Andrew Carnegie Middle	61	19	26%	70	21	30%	62	14	23%
XR	7	8087	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	279	26	9%	497	34	7%	513	40	8%
S	7	8160	Samuel Gompers Middle	207	25	11%	191	30	16%	139	9	6%
XR	1	5180	Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle	109	25	19%	108	11	10%	113	18	16%
XR	1	5181	Animo Western Charter Middle	110	36	26%	136	15	11%	141	32	23%
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	213	31	13%	216	50	23%	174	25	14%
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	40	5	13%	76	1	1%	68	0	0%
Resident Schools Median				134	26	13%	148	27	17%	140	21	15%

Magnolia Science Academy 3 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 3	35	18	51.4%	51.4%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	65	10	14.5%	-3.7%
Resident Schools Median	140	21	0	-2.0%
District	164,349	19,952	12.1%	-4.5%

2014-15	2013-14 # EL	2014-15 # Reclassified	2014-15 Reclassification Rate
Magnolia Science Academy 3	27	0	0.0%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	72	13	18.2%
Resident Schools Median	148	27	17.2%
District	179,322	29,694	16.6%

2013-14	2012-13 # EL	2013-14 # Reclassified	2013-14 Reclassification Rate
Magnolia Science Academy 3	18	9	28.1%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	59	20	22.9%
Resident Schools Median	134	26	13.2%
District	170,797	25,532	13.9%

Magnolia Science Academy 3
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*	#	# VI
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	455	48	11%	90%	10%	3	--	--	1	--	1	--	7	--	34	2		--
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																					
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	1442	153	11%	78%	22%	21	--	--	2	--	2	--	18	1	101	1		--
XR	6	8054	Bert Corona Charter	375	60	16%	87%	13%	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	8	2	42	2		--
XR	2	2024	PUC Excel Charter Academy	321	48	15%	81%	19%	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	7	--	30	2		--
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	811	51	6%	69%	31%	9	--	4	--	--	2	--	4	--	31	--		1
XR	1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	367	45	12%	93%	7%	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	18	--	22	2		--
XR	6	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	351	46	13%	70%	30%	10	--	--	--	--	1	--	3	--	26	3		--
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	815	82	10%	78%	22%	16	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	60	1		1
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	86	18%	91%	9%	5	--	--	--	--	1	--	24	1	51	3		--
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	184	25	14%	84%	16%	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	--	12	3		--
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	493	53	11%	85%	15%	6	--	--	--	--	1	--	4	1	37	4		--
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1546	200	13%	81%	20%	24	--	--	5	--	2	1	28	3	133	--		--
XR	2	8018	Synergy Kinetic Academy	477	64	13%	84%	16%	7	--	--	1	--	1	--	10	1	43	1		--
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High	726	129	18%	85%	15%	15	--	--	--	--	3	--	20	1	90	--		--
XR	1	8460	View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle	424	56	13%	86%	14%	5	--	--	--	--	1	--	19	--	27	2		--
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																					
				482	58	13%	84%	16%	8	--	4	2	--	1	1	9	1	40	2		1
Resident Schools																					
S	7	8103	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle	544	39	7%	85%	15%	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	10	--	23	--		--
S	7	8664	Gardena Senior High	1586	223	14%	70%	30%	34	--	--	3	--	5	10	21	3	134	1		1
S	7	8868	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory	975	119	12%	76%	24%	13	--	--	2	--	1	1	23	1	67	1		--
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	1332	183	14%	72%	28%	40	--	--	3	--	--	--	22	1	109	1		--
S	7	8487	Stephen M. White Middle	1610	192	12%	73%	27%	30	--	--	1	--	2	--	25	--	111	4		1
S	7	8090	Andrew Carnegie Middle	924	143	15%	71%	29%	16	--	--	1	--	6	--	20	--	74	7		6
XR	7	8087	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	1684	284	17%	61%	38%	36	--	--	15	--	3	9	26	3	147	1		2
S	7	8160	Samuel Gompers Middle	557	112	20%	69%	31%	19	--	--	6	--	1	1	19	1	56	2		--
XR	1	5180	Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle	605	93	15%	76%	24%	13	--	--	6	--	--	--	16	1	53	2		--
XR	1	5181	Animo Western Charter Middle	626	93	15%	71%	29%	2	--	--	1	--	3	--	12	--	52	2		1
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	1332	183	14%	72%	28%	40	--	--	3	--	--	--	22	1	109	1		--
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	254	92	36%	22%	78%	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	3	16	2		1
Resident Schools Median																					
				950	131	14%	72%	28%	18	--	4	3	--	3	5	21	1	71	2		1

Magnolia Science Academy 3
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	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	372	5%	15%	30%	38%	13%	50%	51%	371	14%	35%	27%	17%	7%	76%	24%				
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%				
XR	6	8054	Bert Corona Charter	323	8%	10%	46%	26%	10%	64%	36%	340	4%	27%	36%	27%	6%	67%	33%				
XR	2	2024	PUC Excel Charter Academy	324	11%	19%	40%	21%	9%	70%	30%	326	7%	28%	33%	23%	8%	68%	31%				
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	812	5%	11%	35%	32%	17%	51%	49%	830	7%	21%	34%	32%	6%	62%	38%				
XR	1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	344	6%	13%	29%	36%	17%	48%	53%	345	5%	16%	28%	38%	13%	49%	51%				
XR	6	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	316	3%	7%	29%	38%	23%	39%	61%	320	2%	9%	20%	36%	34%	31%	70%				
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	810	5%	12%	33%	36%	15%	50%	51%	808	5%	16%	28%	35%	16%	49%	51%				
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	352	6%	12%	33%	30%	18%	51%	48%	350	10%	30%	29%	23%	7%	69%	30%				
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	181	5%	8%	31%	34%	21%	44%	55%	178	13%	30%	24%	24%	10%	67%	34%				
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	473	5%	11%	40%	31%	13%	56%	44%	473	7%	25%	30%	28%	10%	62%	38%				
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1365	5%	13%	36%	31%	14%	54%	45%	1357	8%	23%	30%	27%	12%	61%	39%				
XR	2	8018	Synergy Kinetic Academy	454	4%	12%	34%	37%	14%	50%	51%	454	4%	21%	30%	32%	12%	55%	44%				
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	1	8460	View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Mid	327	5%	10%	35%	35%	15%	50%	50%	326	7%	22%	26%	32%	13%	55%	45%				
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				348	5%	11%	35%	33%	15%	51%	50%	347.5	7%	22%	30%	30%	12%	61%	39%				
Resident Schools																							
S	7	8103	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle	602	8%	13%	38%	28%	13%	59%	41%	615	14%	30%	30%	20%	7%	74%	27%				
S	7	8664	Gardena Senior High	1157	14%	18%	36%	24%	8%	68%	32%	1000	30%	49%	14%	7%	1%	93%	8%				
S	7	8868	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory	988	11%	18%	36%	26%	8%	65%	34%	972	25%	34%	23%	14%	4%	82%	18%				
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	1466	8%	15%	37%	28%	12%	60%	40%	1481	11%	27%	26%	26%	9%	64%	35%				
S	7	8487	Stephen M. White Middle	1722	7%	13%	33%	32%	15%	53%	47%	1738	8%	23%	29%	29%	11%	60%	40%				
S	7	8090	Andrew Carnegie Middle	826	8%	18%	33%	31%	10%	59%	41%	835	9%	27%	30%	27%	7%	66%	34%				
XR	7	8087	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	504	21%	23%	32%	18%	5%	76%	23%	483	26%	41%	20%	12%	1%	87%	13%				
S	7	8160	Samuel Gompers Middle	817	22%	24%	32%	17%	5%	78%	22%	827	17%	34%	26%	18%	6%	77%	24%				
XR	1	5180	Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle	506	17%	26%	33%	21%	4%	76%	25%	506	13%	34%	32%	19%	3%	79%	22%				
XR	1	5181	Animo Western Charter Middle	506	8%	17%	42%	24%	9%	67%	33%	508	12%	31%	32%	20%	5%	75%	25%				
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	1466	8%	15%	37%	28%	12%	60%	40%	1481	11%	27%	26%	26%	9%	64%	35%				
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	139	6%	11%	35%	28%	21%	52%	49%	138	4%	12%	26%	32%	25%	42%	57%				
Resident Schools Median				822	8%	18%	36%	27%	10%	63%	37%	831	13%	31%	26%	20%	7%	75%	26%				

Magnolia Science Academy 3
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	% /Adv	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/F BB	% /Adv				
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	270	4%	10%	28%	37%	21%	42%	58%	270	9%	32%	31%	20%	9%	72%	29%				
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%				
XR	6	8054	Bert Corona Charter	340	9%	16%	37%	23%	14%	62%	37%	350	10%	36%	32%	16%	6%	78%	22%				
XR	2	2024	PUC Excel Charter Academy	329	6%	14%	32%	31%	17%	52%	48%	328	8%	23%	29%	28%	13%	60%	41%				
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	886	6%	14%	32%	30%	17%	52%	47%	913	4%	20%	37%	33%	7%	61%	40%				
XR	1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	341	4%	8%	24%	39%	25%	36%	64%	342	4%	11%	25%	42%	18%	40%	60%				
XR	6	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	315	4%	6%	24%	35%	30%	34%	65%	320	2%	6%	16%	37%	39%	24%	76%				
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	782	4%	10%	32%	37%	17%	46%	54%	783	5%	19%	27%	32%	17%	51%	49%				
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	307	4%	13%	34%	24%	25%	51%	49%	307	16%	35%	24%	20%	5%	75%	25%				
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	160	9%	8%	34%	21%	29%	51%	50%	160	8%	33%	25%	21%	13%	66%	34%				
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	473	8%	15%	34%	27%	16%	57%	43%	473	14%	33%	28%	18%	8%	75%	26%				
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1429	7%	17%	30%	28%	17%	54%	45%	1416	9%	24%	29%	26%	12%	62%	38%				
XR	2	8018	Synergy Kinetic Academy	457	2%	9%	34%	35%	20%	45%	55%	459	3%	22%	32%	32%	11%	57%	43%				
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	1	8460	View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Mid	365	3%	13%	33%	32%	19%	49%	51%	358	5%	23%	32%	30%	11%	60%	41%				
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				353	5%	13%	34%	31%	18%	51%	50%	354	7%	23%	29%	29%	13%	61%	41%				
Resident Schools																							
S	7	8103	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle	641	6%	17%	36%	30%	10%	59%	40%	647	15%	31%	29%	20%	5%	75%	25%				
S	7	8664	Gardena Senior High	1306	15%	21%	34%	21%	9%	70%	30%	1249	42%	41%	12%	4%	0%	95%	4%				
S	7	8868	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory	1007	8%	16%	35%	28%	12%	59%	40%	996	23%	35%	25%	15%	2%	83%	17%				
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	1683	9%	18%	33%	27%	15%	60%	42%	1697	12%	27%	24%	23%	13%	63%	36%				
S	7	8487	Stephen M. White Middle	1797	7%	13%	30%	31%	19%	50%	50%	1801	7%	21%	30%	30%	12%	58%	42%				
S	7	8090	Andrew Carnegie Middle	916	6%	17%	31%	32%	14%	54%	46%	919	6%	27%	28%	29%	11%	61%	40%				
XR	7	8087	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	471	20%	25%	35%	15%	5%	80%	20%	453	27%	33%	22%	15%	3%	82%	18%				
S	7	8160	Samuel Gompers Middle	978	24%	27%	29%	15%	4%	80%	19%	975	29%	37%	18%	11%	5%	84%	16%				
XR	1	5180	Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle	432	18%	26%	39%	13%	4%	83%	17%	418	21%	38%	26%	14%	2%	85%	16%				
XR	1	5181	Animo Western Charter Middle	466	10%	24%	38%	17%	11%	72%	28%	476	20%	33%	23%	18%	5%	76%	23%				
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	1683	9%	18%	33%	27%	15%	60%	42%	1697	12%	27%	24%	23%	13%	63%	36%				
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	136	4%	12%	26%	38%	20%	42%	58%	136	3%	16%	22%	33%	26%	41%	59%				
Resident Schools Median				947	9%	18%	34%	27%	12%	60%	40%	947	18%	32%	24%	19%	5%	76%	24%				

Magnolia Science Academy 3
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	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	6-12	89%	81%	62%	71%	98%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE									
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	6	8054	Bert Corona Charter	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	2	2024	PUC Excel Charter Academy	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	5-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	6	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	7-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	6-12	97%	87%	83%	83%	100%
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	6-12	88%	90%	88%	91%	88%
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	2	8018	Synergy Kinetic Academy	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	1	8460	View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				--	93%	89%	86%	87%	94%
Resident Schools									
S	7	8103	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
S	7	8664	Gardena Senior High	9-12	72%	75%	79%	78%	85%
S	7	8868	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory	6-12	79%	80%	79%	74%	89%
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
S	7	8487	Stephen M. White Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
S	7	8090	Andrew Carnegie Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	7	8087	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	9-12	80%	69%	67%	57%	62%
S	7	8160	Samuel Gompers Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	1	5180	Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
XR	1	5181	Animo Western Charter Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	6-8	--	--	--	--	--
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	K-6	--	--	--	--	--
Resident Schools Median				--	79%	75%	79%	74%	85%

**Magnolia Science Academy 3
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, students suspended, 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													
				Susp. Event Rate 2013-14	Susp. Event Rate 2014-15	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	African American Students	White Students	Hispanic Students	Other Students	Special Education	English Learners	Gifted/Talented	Students with Disabilities						
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	2.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	455	0	0	0	198	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	47	0	0	178	1	1	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																											
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	1442	1	1	1	195	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	178	1	1	178	1	1	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
XR	6	8054	Bert Corona Charter	0.5%	0.8%	2.4%	1.9%	375	9	38	0	3	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	59	1	4	59	1	4	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%
XR	2	2024	PUC Excel Charter Academy	2.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	321	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	47	0	0	47	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	0.0%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	811	4	13	0	109	1	2	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	107	13	13	107	13	13	12.1%	6.7%	0.9%
XR	1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	8.2%	7.0%	6.8%	5.7%	367	25	38	0	306	25	38	8.2%	6.9%	6.9%	6.9%	45	3	3	45	3	3	6.7%	6.7%	6.7%
XR	6	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	4.0%	7.4%	6.6%	0.6%	351	2	2	0	7	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	46	0	0	46	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	815	1	1	0	19	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	106	1	4	106	1	4	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	1.6%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	487	3	12	0	14	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	82	0	0	82	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	0	19	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24	0	0	24	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%	0.0%	54	0	0	54	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	1546	8	23	0	124	3	9	2.4%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	218	23	23	218	23	23	10.6%	0.9%	0.9%
XR	2	8018	Synergy Kinetic Academy	4.4%	3.0%	1.9%	1.9%	477	9	12	0	13	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	65	4	4	65	4	4	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High	5.5%	7.8%	1.0%	1.0%	726	7	9	0	6	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	126	3	4	126	3	4	2.4%	2.4%	2.4%
XR	1	8460	View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle	7.6%	4.3%	10.6%	8.7%	424	45	58	0	404	45	58	11.1%	9.2%	9.2%	9.2%	57	7	8	57	7	8	12.3%	10.5%	10.5%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																											
XR	1	8460	View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle	7.6%	4.3%	10.6%	8.7%	424	45	58	0	404	45	58	11.1%	9.2%	9.2%	9.2%	57	7	8	57	7	8	12.3%	10.5%	10.5%
Resident Schools																											
S	7	8103	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	544	0	0	0	282	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	54	0	0	54	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
S	7	8664	Gardena Senior High	0.0%	3.7%	1.6%	1.6%	1586	26	34	0	410	15	16	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	229	34	34	229	34	34	14.8%	3.9%	3.9%
S	7	8868	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory	0.0%	1.0%	0.3%	0.2%	975	3	15	0	237	3	15	1.3%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	112	15	16	112	15	16	13.4%	0.9%	0.9%
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	0.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	1332	12	24	0	359	7	15	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	194	24	25	194	24	25	12.4%	0.0%	0.0%
S	7	8487	Stephen M. White Middle	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	1610	5	14	0	162	2	5	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	191	14	14	191	14	14	7.3%	1.0%	1.0%
S	7	8090	Andrew Carnegie Middle	1.2%	0.6%	0.8%	0.8%	924	7	33	0	221	1	3	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	140	33	33	140	33	33	23.6%	1.4%	1.4%
XR	7	8087	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	19.3%	9.5%	6.7%	5.6%	1684	112	274	0	454	84	228	18.5%	15.0%	15.0%	15.0%	315	41	97	315	41	97	13.0%	10.8%	10.8%
S	7	8160	Samuel Gompers Middle	0.0%	8.9%	11.3%	7.7%	557	63	85	0	199	47	65	23.6%	14.6%	14.6%	14.6%	106	85	298	106	85	298	80.2%	14.2%	14.2%
XR	1	5180	Animus Phillip Wheatley Charter Middle	37.3%	34.5%	24.0%	14.2%	605	145	197	0	250	112	149	44.8%	26.0%	26.0%	26.0%	95	31	46	95	31	46	32.6%	22.1%	22.1%
XR	1	5181	Animus Western Charter Middle	48.6%	33.5%	27.6%	14.2%	626	173	214	0	143	102	127	71.3%	34.3%	34.3%	34.3%	92	41	50	92	41	50	44.6%	22.8%	22.8%
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	0.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	1332	12	24	0	359	7	15	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	194	24	25	194	24	25	12.4%	0.0%	0.0%
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	254	5	5	0	135	5	5	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	82	5	5	82	5	5	6.1%	2.4%	2.4%
Resident Schools Median																											
XR	1	5180	Animus Phillip Wheatley Charter Middle	37.3%	34.5%	24.0%	14.2%	605	145	197	0	250	112	149	44.8%	26.0%	26.0%	26.0%	95	31	46	95	31	46	32.6%	22.1%	22.1%
XR	1	5181	Animus Western Charter Middle	48.6%	33.5%	27.6%	14.2%	626	173	214	0	143	102	127	71.3%	34.3%	34.3%	34.3%	92	41	50	92	41	50	44.6%	22.8%	22.8%
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	0.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	1332	12	24	0	359	7	15	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	194	24	25	194	24	25	12.4%	0.0%	0.0%
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	254	5	5	0	135	5	5	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	82	5	5	82	5	5	6.1%	2.4%	2.4%
Resident Schools Median																											
XR	1	5180	Animus Phillip Wheatley Charter Middle	37.3%	34.5%	24.0%	14.2%	605	145	197	0	250	112	149	44.8%	26.0%	26.0%	26.0%	95	31	46	95	31	46	32.6%	22.1%	22.1%
XR	1	5181	Animus Western Charter Middle	48.6%	33.5%	27.6%	14.2%	626	173	214	0	143	102	127	71.3%	34.3%	34.3%	34.3%	92	41	50	92	41	50	44.6%	22.8%	22.8%
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	0.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	1332	12	24	0	359	7	15	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	194	24	25	194	24	25	12.4%	0.0%	0.0%
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	254	5	5	0	135	5	5	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	82	5	5	82	5	5	6.1%	2.4%	2.4%
Resident Schools Median																											
XR	1	5180	Animus Phillip Wheatley Charter Middle	37.3%	34.5%	24.0%	14.2%	605	145	197	0	250	112	149	44.8%	26.0%	26.0%	26.0%	95	31	46	95	31	46	32.6%	22.1%	22.1%
XR	1	5181	Animus Western Charter Middle	48.6%	33.5%	27.6%	14.2%	626	173	214	0	143	102	127	71.3%	34.3%	34.3%	34.3%	92	41	50	92	41	50	44.6%	22.8%	22.8%
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	0.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	1332	12	24	0	359	7	15	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	194	24	25	194	24	25	12.4%	0.0%	0.0%
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	254	5	5	0	135	5	5	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	82	5	5	82	5	5	6.1%	2.4%	2.4%
Resident Schools Median																											
XR	1	5180	Animus Phillip Wheatley Charter Middle	37.3%	34.5%	24.0%	14.2%	605	145	197	0	250	112	149	44.8%	26.0%	26.0%	26.0%	95	31	46	95	31	46	32.6%	22.1%	22.1%
XR	1	5181	Animus Western Charter Middle	48.6%	33.5%	27.6%	14.2%	626	173	214	0	143	102	127	71.3%	34.3%	34.3%	34.3%	92	41	50	92	41	50	44.6%	22.8%	22.8%
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	0.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	1332	12	24	0	359	7	15	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	194	24	25	194	24	25	12.4%	0.0%	0.0%
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	254	5	5	0	135	5	5	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	82	5	5	82	5	5	6.1%	2.4%	2.4%
Resident Schools Median																											
XR	1	5180	Animus Phillip Wheatley Charter Middle	37.3%	34.5%	24.0%	14.2%	605	145	197	0	250	112	149	44.8%	26.0%	26.0%	26.0%	95	31	46	95	31	46	32.6%	22.1%	22.1%
XR	1	5181	Animus Western Charter Middle	48.6%	33.5%	27.6%	14.2%	626	173	214	0	143	102	127	71.3%	34.3%	34.3%	34.3%	92	41	50	92	41	50	44.6%	22.8%	22.8%
S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	0.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	1332	12	24	0	359	7	15	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	194	24	25	194	24	25	12.4%	0.0%	0.0%
S	7	2247																									

**Magnolia Science Academy #3
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 2014-15	Percent Met AMAO 1 2013-14	Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2014-15	Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2014-15				
																					Less than 5 years			
XR 7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy #3	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	29	16	55.2%	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	29	12	41.4%	--	--					
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																								
S 7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle School	Middle School	Middle School	136	136	100.0%	50	36.8%	49.7%	25	5	20.0%	--	118	29	24.6%	--	36.6%					
XR 6	8054	Bert Corona Charter School	Middle School	Middle School	63	28	44.4%	--	--	48.6%	2	--	--	--	61	13	21.3%	--	40.0%					
XR 2	2024	PUC Excel Academy	Middle School	Middle School	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--					
W 4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle School	Middle School	Middle School	124	124	100.0%	51	41.1%	58.1%	14	5	35.7%	--	114	35	30.7%	--	41.5%					
XR 1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	9	2	22.2%	--	--	--	0	--	--	--	9	--	--	--	--					
XR 6	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	Middle School	Middle School	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--					
C 5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle School	Middle School	Middle School	96	96	100.0%	59	61.5%	67.7%	23	6	26.1%	--	77	32	41.6%	--	47.8%					
XR 3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy #2	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	65	0	0.0%	--	--	56.0%	14	7	50.0%	--	51	22	43.1%	--	41.7%					
XR 4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy #4	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	16	13	81.3%	8	61.5%	--	2	--	--	--	22	8	36.4%	--	--					
XR 5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell @ South Region MS #2A	Middle School	Middle School	75	0	0.0%	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	72	30	41.7%	--	31.7%					
S 7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle School	Middle School	Middle School	112	112	100.0%	29	25.9%	50.8%	19	1	5.3%	--	104	19	18.3%	--	40.5%					
XR 2	8018	Synergy Kinetic Academy	Middle School	Middle School	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--					
XR 6	8426	PUC Triumph Academy and High School	Middle School	Middle School	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--					
XR 1	8460	View Park Prep Accelerated Middle School Charter	Middle School	Middle School	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--					
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																								
75	28	81.3%	50	41.1%	53.4%	14	5	26.1%	--	72	26	33.6%	40.5%											
Resident Schools																								
S 7	8103	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle School	Middle School	Middle School	24	24	100.0%	10	41.7%	--	3	--	--	--	21	6	28.6%	--	--					
S 7	8664	Gardena Senior High	Senior High School	Senior High School	172	172	100.0%	67	39.0%	48.1%	46	4	8.7%	11.3%	139	32	23.0%	--	34.5%					
S 7	8868	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory School	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	65	62	95.4%	27	43.5%	60.3%	22	2	9.1%	--	46	15	32.6%	--	47.9%					
S 7	8352	Robert E Peary Middle School	Middle School	Middle School	168	168	100.0%	79	47.0%	45.8%	28	4	14.3%	--	153	55	35.9%	--	33.2%					
S 7	8487	Stephen M White Middle School	Middle School	Middle School	130	130	100.0%	70	53.8%	51.4%	33	3	9.1%	--	108	40	37.0%	--	31.5%					
S 7	8090	Andrew Carnegie Middle School	Middle School	Middle School	58	58	100.0%	32	55.2%	57.1%	16	7	43.8%	--	48	20	41.7%	--	40.4%					
XR 7	8087	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	Senior High School	Senior High School	296	202	68.2%	100	49.5%	38.2%	115	11	9.6%	20.0%	277	59	21.3%	--	17.7%					
S 7	8160	Samuel Gompers Middle School	Middle School	Middle School	122	122	100.0%	59	48.4%	63.0%	26	2	7.7%	--	108	38	35.2%	--	35.5%					
XR 1	5180	Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle School	Middle School	Middle School	72	42	58.3%	--	--	51.8%	10	--	--	--	86	23	26.7%	--	20.9%					
XR 1	5181	Animo Western Charter Middle School	Middle School	Middle School	135	84	62.2%	--	--	43.4%	11	2	18.2%	--	136	47	34.6%	--	17.2%					
S 7	8352	Robert E Peary Middle School	Middle School	Middle School	168	168	100.0%	79	47.0%	45.8%	28	4	14.3%	--	153	55	35.9%	--	33.2%					
S 7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	Elementary School	Elementary School	66	66	100.0%	18	27.3%	21.7%	45	10	22.2%	10.9%	25	3	12.0%	--	--					
Resident Schools Median																								
126	103	100.0%	63	47.0%	48.1%	27	4	12.0%	11.3%	108	35	33.6%	40.5%											

Magnolia Science Academy #3
2014-15 and 2015-16 Smarter Balanced Assessment Achievement Data

2015-16		LD	BD	Loc Code	School	Subgroup	English Language Arts				Mathematics			
							% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
XR	7	8464		Magnolia Science Academy #3	All Students	23	34	35	8	42	36	16	6	
					African American	28	35	33	3	50	33	13	4	
					Latino	20	33	35	12	34	40	18	7	
					English Learners	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
					Soc-eco	24	36	33	7	44	36	15	5	
					Disadvantaged	61	29	7	4	68	25	7	0	
					Students with Disabilities									
LAUSD similar Schools from CDE														
S	7	8127		Alexander Fleming Middle School	All Students	29	30	31	9	39	31	18	12	
XR	6	8054		Bert Corona Charter School	All Students	40	34	23	4	51	34	12	4	
XR	2	2024		PUC Excel Academy	All Students	47	26	22	5	53	30	12	5	
W	4	8038		Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle School	All Students	33	31	31	5	54	28	12	6	
XR	1	8458		KIPP Academy of Opportunity	All Students	34	27	28	10	43	33	17	7	
XR	6	8212		PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	All Students	36	30	28	5	43	30	16	11	
C	5	8066		Luther Burbank Middle School	All Students	27	31	33	9	37	29	19	15	
XR	3	8461		Magnolia Science Academy #2	All Students	34	31	27	8	49	27	14	9	
XR	4	8011		Magnolia Science Academy #4	All Students	28	33	30	8	55	30	13	2	
XR	5	5166		Magnolia Science Academy Bell @ South Region M	All Students	32	28	30	10	45	34	15	7	
S	7	8104		Richard Henry Dana Middle School	All Students	39	29	25	6	46	31	13	10	
XR	2	8018		Synergy Kinetic Academy	All Students	24	31	37	8	34	35	19	11	
XR	6	8426		PUC Triumph Academy and High School	All Students	32	28	32	8	39	34	20	7	
XR	1	8460		View Park Prep Accelerated Middle School Charter	All Students	52	29	16	2	74	23	2	1	
				LAUSD similar Schools from CDE Median	All Students	34	30	29	8	46	31	15	7	
Resident Schools														
S	7	8103		Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle School	All Students	42	28	26	4	53	29	13	5	
S	7	8664		Gardena Senior High	All Students	35	30	29	6	66	24	8	2	
S	7	8868		Rancho Dominguez Preparatory School	All Students	37	30	24	8	46	32	15	6	
S	7	8352		Robert E Peary Middle School	All Students	47	28	21	4	58	26	11	5	
S	7	8487		Stephen M White Middle School	All Students	37	31	28	5	46	32	14	8	
S	7	8090		Andrew Carnegie Middle School	All Students	41	32	22	5	55	29	11	5	
XR	7	8087		Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	All Students	41	23	29	7	71	18	9	1	
S	7	8160		Samuel Gompers Middle School	All Students	68	20	11	1	77	17	5	1	
XR	1	5180		Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle School	All Students	56	27	15	1	74	20	5	1	
XR	1	5181		Animo Western Charter Middle School	All Students	42	32	23	2	58	33	9	1	
S	7	8352		Robert E Peary Middle School	All Students	47	28	21	4	58	26	11	5	
S	7	2247		Avalon Gardens Elementary	All Students	33	30	21	15	42	34	18	6	
				Resident Schools Median	All Students	42	29	23	5	58	28	11	5	

2014-15

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	Subgroup	English Language Arts				Mathematics			
					% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy #3	All Students	44	34	19	3	50	37	10	3
				African American	44	33	22	1	52	38	7	3
				Latino	43	36	16	5	48	36	12	3
				English Learners	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
				Soc-eco Disadvantaged	46	35	17	3	54	36	8	2
				Students with Disabilities	87	13	0	0	77	19	3	0
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE												
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle School	All Students	36	31	26	7	46	32	15	8
XR	6	8054	Bert Corona Charter School	All Students	29	37	31	2	53	29	14	4
XR	2	2024	PUC Excel Academy	All Students	42	31	24	4	50	35	12	3
W	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle School	All Students	36	32	29	3	54	31	12	4
XR	1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	All Students	38	33	24	5	47	35	14	4
XR	6	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	All Students	38	33	25	4	41	31	19	9
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle School	All Students	30	34	30	6	41	32	18	9
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy #2	All Students	34	36	24	5	41	33	16	10
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy #4	All Students	30	34	32	4	53	34	7	5
XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell @ South Region M	All Students	28	34	30	7	44	35	15	6
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle School	All Students	37	31	25	6	48	29	14	9
XR	2	8018	Synergy Kinetic Academy	All Students	24	33	35	7	40	32	19	9
XR	6	8426	PUC Triumph Academy and High School	All Students	45	33	20	2	59	22	14	5
XR	1	8460	View Park Prep Accelerated Middle School Charter	All Students	42	37	18	3	64	30	4	1
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median					36	33	26	5	48	32	14	6
Resident Schools												
S	7	8103	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle School	All Students	41	31	25	4	54	30	11	5
S	7	8664	Gardena Senior High	All Students	27	32	31	10	64	18	16	2
S	7	8868	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory School	All Students	34	30	30	5	50	29	15	7
S	7	8352	Robert E Peary Middle School	All Students	49	27	20	4	62	23	11	4
S	7	8487	Stephen M White Middle School	All Students	38	30	26	5	53	28	13	6
S	7	8090	Andrew Carnegie Middle School	All Students	41	33	22	4	51	32	12	5
XR	7	8087	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	All Students	54	29	14	3	75	16	8	1
S	7	8160	Samuel Gompers Middle School	All Students	64	25	9	1	74	17	8	1
XR	1	5180	Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle School	All Students	60	28	12	0	72	23	5	1
XR	1	5181	Animo Western Charter Middle School	All Students	53	28	17	2	59	31	9	1
S	7	8352	Robert E Peary Middle School	All Students	49	27	20	4	62	23	11	4
S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	All Students	49	29	15	8	53	29	17	1
Resident Schools Median					49	29	20	4	61	26	11	3

**FINDINGS OF FACT IN SUPPORT OF DENIAL OF THE
RENEWAL CHARTER PETITION FOR
MAGNOLIA SCIENCE ACADEMY 3
BY THE LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

BOARD OF EDUCATION REPORT #165-16/17
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 (“MSA-3” or “Charter School”) charter petition for a term of five years. The school serves 448 students in grades 6-12 in Board District 7 and Local District South, and is currently co-located through Proposition 39 on the campus of Curtiss Middle School, located at 1254 E. Helmick Street, Carson, CA 90746.

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 3 has met at least one of the minimum academic performance criteria, 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 3 Data Set).

Magnolia Science Academy 3 achieved a moderate to strong overall record of academic achievement and growth. Its 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) results show levels of academic performance that are above the Resident Schools Median in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics. Historically, under the former API system, in the 2012-2013 school years, the Charter School earned a Statewide rank of 3 and a Similar Schools rank of 8. (Exhibit 2,

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.

Magnolia Science Academy 3 Data Set and Exhibit 3 - Magnolia Science Academy 3 SBAC Data).

In 2015-2016, MSA-3's English Learner reclassification rate of 51%, was higher than both the Similar and Resident School Median rates. (Exhibit 2, Magnolia Science Academy 3 Data Set).

B. Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math

On the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 43% of MSA-3's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 28%. In Math, 22% of MSA-3 students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 16%. On the 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 22% of MSA-3's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is less than the Resident Schools Median of 24%. In Math, 13% of MSA-3's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 14%. (Exhibit 3 - Magnolia Science Academy 3 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-3 with the recognition that this performance is the most important factor when deciding whether to renew the charter. MSA-3 serves the following numerically significant pupil subgroups: 81% students who qualify for Free and Reduced Meals; 49% Latinos, 44% African-Americans, and 11% Students with Disabilities. (Exhibit 2 - Magnolia Science Academy 3 Data Set).

The Charter School's record of academic performance indicates that all numerically significant student subgroups at MSA-3 achieved growth in the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC). For example, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards on the 2016 SBAC ELA assessments in the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged and Latino subgroups increased by 20 and 26 percentage points, respectively, in comparison with the prior year's performance. It is reasonable to conclude that Charter School students in the subgroups that achieved academic growth benefited as a result of the growth. (Exhibit 3, Magnolia Science Academy 3 SBAC Data).

As part of the District's extra consideration of MSA-3's increases in academic achievement, an analysis of MSA-3'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 in ELA,

MSA-3 was higher than all 11 Resident schools; in Math, MSA-3 exceeds 9 out of 11 Resident Schools. (Exhibit 4, Magnolia Science Academy 3 SBAC Resident Schools Subgroup Data).

Schoolwide 2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment data confirms that the performance of the Charter School is higher than the performance of the Resident Schools Median in ELA (43% compared to 28%). Additionally, the performance of the Charter School is higher than the performance of Resident Schools Median in Math (22% compared to 16%). (Exhibit 3, Magnolia Science Academy 3 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 the Charter School’s student subgroups. 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 3 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-3 is Demonstrably Unlikely to Successfully Implement the Programs Set Forth in the Petition

The District's oversight of MSA-3 has revealed that MSA-3 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 MERFs 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
 - 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

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.

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 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

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 section's findings of fact, please refer to Exhibit 1, Petition.

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-1 serves the following numerically significant pupil subgroups: 81% students who qualify for Free and Reduced Meals; 49% Latinos, 44% African-Americans, and 11% Students with Disabilities.

1. The Charter School's record of academic performance indicate that all numerically significant student subgroups at MSA-3 achieved growth in the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) when compared to subgroup performance of District Resident Schools Median. For example, the percentage of students Meeting or Exceeding standards on the 2016 SBAC ELA assessments in the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged and Latino subgroups increased by 20 and 26 percentage points, respectively, in comparison with the prior year's performance. It is reasonable to conclude that Charter School students in the subgroups that achieved academic growth benefited as a result of the growth.
2. As part of the District's extra consideration of MSA-3's increases in academic achievement, an analysis of MSA-3'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 in ELA, MSA-3 was higher than all 11 Resident schools; in Math, MSA-3 exceeds 9 out of 11 Resident Schools.

3. Schoolwide 2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment data confirms that the performance of the Charter School is higher than the performance of the Resident Schools Median in ELA (43% compared to 28%). Additionally, the performance of the Charter School is higher than the performance of Resident Schools Median in Math (22% compared to 16%).

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-3's academic performance has demonstrated gains in all subgroups, 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 the Charter School's student subgroups. 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.