
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Connie Leyva, Chair

2019 - 2020 Regular

Bill No: AB 1505 **Hearing Date:** July 10, 2019
Author: O'Donnell
Version: July 5, 2019
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: Ian Johnson

Subject: Charter schools: petitions

SUMMARY

This bill makes various changes relating to charter school authorizations, appeals, and renewals, clarifies the teacher credentialing requirements of charter schools teachers, and places a two-year moratorium on nonclassroom-based charter schools.

BACKGROUND

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Charter Schools Act of 1992, providing for the establishment of charter schools in California for the purpose, among other things, of improving student learning and expanding learning experiences for pupils who are identified as academically low achieving.
- 2) Authorizes anyone to develop, circulate, and submit a petition to establish a charter school, and requires charter developers to collect certain signatures in support of the petition, as specified. A governing board must grant a charter if it is satisfied that the charter is consistent with sound educational practice. A governing board is precluded from denying a petition unless it makes written factual findings that the petition fails to meet one or more of the following:
 - a) The charter school presents an unsound educational program.
 - b) The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program described in the petition.
 - c) The petition does not contain the number of required signatures.
 - d) The petition does not contain an affirmation it will be nonsectarian, nondiscriminatory, shall not charge tuition, and other affirmations, as specified.
 - e) The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of the 16 required elements of a charter petition.
- 3) Authorizes a petitioner to submit a petition directly to a county board of education to establish a charter school that will serve pupils for whom the county office of

education would otherwise be responsible for providing direct education and related services.

- 4) Authorizes a county board of education to approve a petition for the establishment of a countywide charter school that operates at one or more sites within the geographic boundaries of the county that provides instructional services that are not provided by a county office of education.
- 5) Establishes an appeals process for charter schools. Under current law, if a school district governing board denies a petition, a petitioner may appeal to the county board of education. If the county board of education also denies the petition, the petitioner is authorized to submit the petition to the State Board of Education (SBE) for approval.
- 6) Authorizes the SBE to approve petitions for state charter schools that operate at multiple sites throughout the state.

ANALYSIS

This bill:

- 1) Extends the timeline to approve or deny a new charter school petition an additional 30 days.
- 2) Specifies that a charter petition is deemed received by a school district or county board of education when the petitioner submits the complete petition.
- 3) Requires the governing board of a school district or county board of education to publish all staff recommendations regarding a charter petition at least 15 days before the public hearing at which the board will either grant or deny the charter. Specifies that petitioners shall have an opportunity to present evidence and testimony to the governing board.
- 4) Requires all charter petitions to include:
 - a) The names and relevant qualifications of all persons whom the petitioner nominates to serve on the charter governing board for schools operated by, or as, a nonprofit public benefit corporation.
 - b) A clear explanation of why a new or expanding charter school's proposed model cannot be accomplished within the school district structure of neighborhood public schools.
- 5) Allows school districts to deny a petition to create or expand a charter school if the charter school is demonstrably unlikely to serve the interests of the entire community in which the school is proposing to locate. A finding under this provision must detail specific facts and circumstances that analyze and consider both of the following:

- a) The extent to which the proposed charter school would substantially undermine existing services, academic offerings, or programmatic offerings, including consideration of the fiscal impact of the proposed charter school.
 - b) Whether the proposed charter school would duplicate a program currently offered within existing neighborhood schools and the existing program has sufficient capacity for the pupils proposed to be served.
- 6) Allows school districts to deny a petition to create or expand a charter school if the district is not positioned to absorb the fiscal impact of the proposed charter school, which includes any of the following circumstances:
- a) The district has a qualified interim certification and the county superintendent of schools, in consultation with the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team, certifies that approving the charter school would result in the district having a negative interim certification.
 - b) The district has a negative interim certification.
 - c) The district is under state receivership.
- 7) Specifies that a charter petition submitted to a county board of education on appeal containing new or different “material terms” shall be immediately remanded back to the denying school district for reconsideration within 30 days. If the school district denies the petition, the petitioner may elect to resubmit the petition on appeal to the county board of education.
- 8) Defines “material terms” to mean the signatures, affirmations, disclosures, documents, and descriptions included in the charter petition, but does not include administrative updates due to changes in circumstances based on the passage of time related to fiscal affairs, facilities arrangements, or state law.
- 9) Allows a petitioner denied by the county board of education to appeal that denial to the SBE within 30 days, as specified. If the appeal contains new or different material terms, the SBE shall remand the petition back to the county board of education.
- 10) Requires the SBE’s Advisory Commission on Charter Schools to hold a public hearing to review the appeal and submit a recommendation to the SBE whether there is sufficient evidence to hear or summarily deny review of the appeal. Upon hearing an appeal, the SBE may reverse the determination of the county board of education upon a determination that there was an abuse of discretion. If the denial of a charter petition is reversed by the SBE, the county board of education shall become the chartering authority.
- 11) Requires charter school teachers to hold a Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) certificate, permit, or other document required for the teacher’s certificated assignment, unless the teacher holds a certificate of clearance and does not teach a course in English, math, science, social science,

elementary school, or in certain special education settings. Exempts teachers employed by a charter school before January 1, 2020 assigned to teach noncore, noncollege preparatory courses from this requirement.

- 12) Requires the CTC to develop a certificate of clearance or other equivalent document for noncore, noncollege preparatory courses in charter schools.
- 13) Eliminates the authority to establish a statewide benefit charter school and specifies that an existing statewide benefit charter school may continue to operate until the date on which the charter is up for renewal, at which point the charter school shall submit a petition for renewal to the governing board of the school district within the boundaries of which the charter school is located.
- 14) Establishes additional charter renewal criteria based on the performance of the charter school on the state and local indicators included in the state's evaluation rubrics. Specifically:
 - a) The chartering authority shall not deny renewal of a charter school, and may renew the charter for a period of between five and seven years, if the charter school received, for two consecutive years immediately preceding the renewal decision, the two highest performance levels on all the state indicators and the chartering authority does not make an adverse finding based on the renewal charter petition.
 - b) The chartering authority shall not renew a charter school if the charter school received, for two consecutive years immediately preceding the renewal decision, the two lowest performance levels on all the state indicators, unless the chartering authority makes a written factual finding that continued operation of the charter school is in the best interest of pupils and the charter school is making meaningful steps to address the underlying cause of low performance. Upon making such a determination, the charter school may be renewed for a period of two years.
 - c) The chartering authority shall consider denying a charter renewal if the charter school received, for four consecutive years immediately preceding the renewal decision, the two lowest performance levels on all the state indicators, unless the chartering authority makes a written factual finding that continued operation of the charter school is necessary based on an identified extraordinary need in the community and the charter school is making meaningful steps to address the underlying cause of low performance, as reflected in a written plan adopted by the charter governing board. Upon making such a determination, the charter school may be renewed for a period of two years.
 - d) For all other charter schools, the chartering authority shall consider the performance of all groups of pupils served by the charter school on the state and local indicators and provide greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance. The chartering authority may deny a renewal upon making a written finding that closure of the school is in the best interest of pupils and that its decision provided greater weight

to performance on measurements of academic performance. An approval of a renewal shall be for a period of five years.

- 15) Prohibits the approval of a petition for the establishment of a new nonclassroom-based charter school from January 1, 2020 to January 1, 2022 with the following exceptions:
 - a) Except for a nonclassroom-based charter school that was granted approval of its petition and was providing educational services to pupils before July 1, 2019 under either of the following circumstances:
 - i) If Assembly Bill 1507 becomes operative and the charter school is required to submit a petition to the governing board of a school district in an adjacent county in which its existing resource center is located, or to retain current program offerings and enrollment.
 - ii) If a charter school is required to submit a petition to a school district in which a resource center is located in order to comply with the court decision in Anderson Union High School District v. Shasta Secondary Home School, and the petition is necessary to retain current program offerings or enrollment.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author, “The Charter Schools Act has largely been untouched since it was enacted in 1992. School districts have been required to approve charter schools unless the charter petition fails to adequately address the required elements. This has led to unprecedented growth of charter schools in California. Today, charter schools outnumber school districts in this state. School districts currently have limited options in regards to authorizing, renewing, and revoking charter schools. This bill seeks to strengthen the ability of charter authorizers to hold charter schools accountable for both academic and fiscal outcomes.

It is time for a correction in state law to return charter school authorization and oversight to communities where the charter schools are located. This measure ensures that charter schools are authorized and overseen by school districts and county offices of education, who are the elected officials that best understand the educational needs of their local students, thus improving proper oversight. The bill gives school districts greater authority to choose which charter schools are approved in their community, and to consider the fiscal impact of the charter school on the current students in the district. Further, this bill clarifies oversight responsibilities by requiring districts to consider the financial stability of the charter school during renewal. Lastly, the bill corrects an inconsistency in the law, and requires that charter schools receive valuable technical assistance on the same timeline as currently provided for school districts, when they are facing academic challenges.”

- 2) ***Charter school overview.*** Charter schools are public schools that provide instruction in any combination of grades kindergarten through 12. In 1992, the

state enacted legislation allowing charter schools in California to offer parents an alternative to traditional public schools and encourage local leaders to experiment with new educational programs. Except where specifically noted otherwise, California law exempts charter schools from many of the statutes and regulations that apply to school districts. Generally, all charter schools must (1) provide nonsectarian instruction, (2) charge no tuition, and (3) admit all interested students up to school capacity. To both open and continue operating, a charter school must have an approved charter setting forth a comprehensive vision for the school.

Over the last decade, charter school enrollment has grown steadily. In 2006, 560 charter schools served about 200,000 students (3.5 percent of the state's K-12 enrollment). By 2016, over 1,200 charter schools served about 580,000 students (almost 10 percent of the state's K-12 enrollment). Most charter schools are small, compared to traditional public schools, and located in urban areas. The median charter school enrolls about 250 students, whereas the median traditional public school enrolls about 525 students. Together, nine Bay Area counties, Los Angeles County, and San Diego County account for more than 60 percent of all charter schools and charter school enrollment in the state.

Charter schools can be conversions of existing public schools or new startup schools. About 15 percent of charter schools are conversions, with the remaining 85 percent being startups. Of these, about 80 percent offer traditional, classroom-based instruction and 20 percent offer some form of independent study, such as distance learning or home study.

- 3) **Charter school authorization.** Groups that are interested in creating a charter school must adhere to a state prescribed application process. A charter petition must be signed by a sufficient number of interested teachers or parents and must set forth a comprehensive vision for the school, including its educational program, student outcome measurements, student discipline policy, employee policies, governance structure, and fiscal plans. Petitions must be submitted to an authorizer, which in most cases is the school district in which the charter school will be located. Groups can also submit petitions to the county office of education or the state for charter schools that will serve multiple districts or multiple counties.

Existing law requires an authorizer to approve a charter application, unless it makes a written finding that: (1) the proposed educational program is unsound, (2) the petitioners are unlikely to successfully implement their program, (3) there are insufficient signatures, (4) the proposed school violates one of the three basic requirements for all charter schools, or (5) the petition does not include a reasonably comprehensive vision for the school. A charter school that is rejected by its district may appeal to its county office of education, and if rejected there, may appeal to the state.

- 4) **Charter school oversight.** A charter school must promptly respond to all reasonable inquiries from its chartering authority, the county office of education that has jurisdiction over the school's chartering authority, or from the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Each chartering authority is also required

to: (1) identify at least one staff member as a contact person for the charter school, (2) visit each charter school annually, (3) ensure that each charter school complies with reporting requirements, (4) monitor the fiscal condition of each charter school under its authority, and (5) provide timely notification to the State Department of Education if an existing charter is renewed, revoked, or ceased. Charter schools must annually submit reports to its chartering authority and county superintendent of schools including budget information, interim financial reports, and audits. The chartering authority is tasked with using any financial information it obtains from the charter school to assess the fiscal condition of the charter school.

- 5) ***Findings and recommendations from recent informational hearing.*** On October 23, 2017, this Committee held an informational hearing on charter school authorization in California. The hearing covered the authorization process, with perspectives shared by charter school practitioners, charter authorizers, the Legislative Analyst, and the state's Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team. Notable findings and recommendations from the panelists were as follows:
- a) *California has many authorizers each overseeing few charter schools, making it difficult to develop systemic authorizer expertise.* California represents 1/3 of all authorizers and 18 percent of all charter schools in the nation. Of the state's authorizers, 90 percent are school districts, with 85 percent overseeing five or fewer charter schools (half oversee only one charter school).
 - b) *Charter schools usually close for fiscal reasons.* More than 80 percent of charter school closures are due to financial mismanagement.
 - c) *Current oversight fee levels do not support meaningful oversight.* For most authorizers, the oversight fees paid by charter schools do not provide substantial resources, because most authorizers oversee fewer than five charter schools that tend to be small. This prohibits most authorizers from staffing full-time charter offices, resulting in oversight engagement that is sporadic, distracted, and a contributor to staff turnover for the authorizer.
 - d) *Charter schools have changed over time, but the approval process has not.* The growth of the charter school sector has brought multi-school networks operated by charter management organizations and more blended learning models. Yet, the charter petition and the approval process has not changed. The content found in petitions has become "boilerplate", undermining the purpose and value of the approval process. Further, petitions lack sufficient financial, operational, and governance information for authorizers to effectively determine which petitioners are "demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program".
 - e) *Meaningful upfront charter evaluations are critical because schools that do not start strong rarely improve.* Research shows that charter schools that begin with unclear plans and insufficient resources almost never improve.

However, the schools may not be forced to close for two or three years, exacerbating the negative impact on students, parents, and taxpayers. This makes the quality of the information in petitions and the capacity of authorizers to do meaningful evaluations on the front end even more important.

- f) *Charter authorizers can face timeline challenges.* To evaluate a petition effectively, authorizers need staff with knowledge about education, assessments, special education, English-learners, school finance, human resources, and governance. With no control of when petitions will be submitted, meeting the current review timelines can be challenging for authorizers. For example, a petition that is submitted in early November gives an authorizer roughly 20 working days to arrange its multi-disciplinary team, review the petition, and present a report to its board.
 - g) *Charter renewal process does not reconcile initial promises with results.* When a charter school applies for renewal, it simply updates its original petition, even though what is most important is how well the charter school performed on the promises that were made. This represents a disconnect between the statutory standard for charter renewal and the state's new continuous improvement accountability structure.
 - h) *Conflicts of interest can influence charter petition decisions.* When evaluating charter petitions, district officials can, at times, be motivated by retaining or recapturing student enrollment, even if their district schools are underperforming. This inherent conflict speaks to the value of the current appeal process.
 - i) *Capacity interviews should be required.* While some authorizers already conduct capacity interviews, panelists stated that the increasingly boilerplate nature of charter petitions warrants that these interviews be part of the statutory process. These interviews are now viewed as the only effective way of truly assessing petitioner capacity.
 - j) *The functions of annual oversight should be clarified in law.* Existing law requires authorizers to monitor the fiscal condition of charter schools, but it does not say how. Because the details are left to be determined by each authorizer, there is wide variety in what oversight looks like throughout the state. Some authorizers are quite involved (bordering on intrusive) and others do little more than process paperwork.
- 6) ***Charter growth correlates with poverty in California.*** Even though only about 10 percent of California's 6.2 million public school students attend a charter school, the state's charter school enrollment has more than doubled over the last ten years. While charter school growth is often portrayed as a statewide fight over students and territories, charter enrollment data appears to show that most charter growth has occurred in very specific regions of the state. In fact, over the last ten years, more than half of California's school districts authorized no new charter schools at all. The areas of the state in which charter growth has been

most substantial tend to be areas where most students are from low-income families, with particular charter concentration occurring in big urban areas.

- 7) ***Charter School Task Force report.*** The Governor has previously stated that rising charter school enrollments in some urban districts are having real impacts on those districts' ability to provide essential support and services for their students. The Governor requested the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to convene a group of experts to closely examine the impact of charter school growth on district budgets and to provide a report and recommendations by July 1, 2019. The task force included 11 individuals—5 representing school labor groups, 4 representing charter schools, and 2 LEA superintendents.

On June 6, 2019, the SPI submitted the California Charter School Policy Task Force Report to the Governor. The report includes the following recommendations for which there was unanimous support:

- a) Extend the timeline to approve or deny a new charter school petition an additional 30 days.
- b) Create a statewide entity to develop standards for providing oversight to charter schools and provide training for authorizers.
- c) Include students transferring to charters schools in the average daily attendance "hold harmless" calculation for school districts.
- d) Provide additional discretion when considering a new charter school authorization and amend the role of CDE in oversight.

The report also includes the following recommendations for which there was majority support:

- a) Enact a one-year moratorium on the establishment of virtual charter schools.
- b) Remove the California State Board of Education from hearing appeals of charter petition denials.
- c) Limit the authorization of new charter schools to local districts with an appeals process that takes place at the County Board of Education only when there was an error by the district governing board.
- d) Prohibit districts from authorizing charter schools located outside of district boundaries.
- e) Allow authorizers to consider fiscal impact as part of the authorization process.
- f) Establish clear guidelines for use by authorizers and by charter applicants for new charter petitions.

- g) Update Education Code requirements to reflect current state accountability.

The report also notes that amending current law such that school districts “may” approve charter petitions instead of school districts “shall” approve charter schools, as specified, was not supported by the majority.

- 8) ***How will a charter petitioner know the extent to which their program can or cannot be accomplished within the school district structure?*** Current law allows charter school authorizers to any petition that does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of various aspects directly pertaining to the proposed charter school—the education program and its goals, the measurable pupil outcomes to be used, the school’s governance structure, its health and safety procedures, admissions policies, auditing practices, student disciplinary procedures, employee rights, dispute resolution, and procedures to be used if the charter school closes. There is only one description that must be included that does not directly pertain to the charter school itself—the public school alternatives for pupils residing within the school district who choose not to attend charter schools.

This bill would add a second required description that does not directly pertain to the charter school—a clear explanation of whether and to what extent the proposed model cannot be accomplished within the school district structure of neighborhood public schools. Is it reasonable to expect a charter petitioner to be able to provide a comprehensive explanation about the capabilities and/or willingness of a school district to offer a specific type of program? Given that every school district has unique circumstances affecting their ability to offer courses (e.g. fiscal constraints, other local priorities, lack of qualified personnel, etc.), and that the variables affecting each individual program differ, it seems that few charter petitioners will be able to meet this standard. Should not meeting this standard be a basis for denying an otherwise strong charter petition?

- 9) ***Should a school district be able to deny a charter school based on its fiscal impact both objectively and/or subjectively?*** Existing law does not authorize a school district to deny a charter petition solely because of the fiscal impact that the charter school would have on the district. Given that state funding for LEAs is based on the number of students served, there is no question that when students leave traditional public schools to attend charter schools, the school district’s finances suffer.

As currently drafted, this bill would establish two options for school districts to deny a charter petition based on the financial impact to the district—an objective option and a subjective one.

Based on objective criteria, all school districts submit interim financial reports to their county superintendent about their ability to meet their financial obligations in the current and two subsequent budget years. This bill would allow a school district to deny a charter school if the district: (1) has a qualified interim certification and the county superintendent of schools, in consultation with FCMAT, certifies that approving the charter school would result in the district

having a negative certification, (2) has a negative interim certification, or (3) is in state receivership.

Second, the bill would allow a school district to deny a charter school based on, in part, the extent to which the fiscal impact of the proposed charter school would substantially undermine existing services, academic offerings, or programmatic offerings. Because the bill does not establish what, at minimum, “substantially undermining” means, it is likely that denials on this basis would be highly subjective.

Given the inherent conflict between school districts and charter schools as it relates to student attendance and financial resources, and that lack of clarity around charter authorization criteria is a common critique, would a subjective option for denial based on fiscal impact make tensions even worse in this area? Further, would the option of denying a charter school based on a subjective assessment of the fiscal impact to the school district render most, if not all, charter petitions deniable? The Committee may wish to consider whether expanding the objective criteria for denial based on financial impact to include districts that have a positive interim certification and demonstrate that approving a charter school would result in them having a qualified certification would be a more balanced approach, in lieu of creating a subjective financial impact denial option.

- 10) ***Limiting the generous appeals process at the state level and prohibiting charter petitioners from changing their application throughout the process.*** Compared to the rest of the nation, California’s charter school authorization laws are generally described as robust and relatively generous. While the vast majority of charter schools are authorized by districts, the appeals process is exercised frequently. From 2003 to 2017, for example, the Santa Clara County Office of Education approved 17 of the 25 charter petitions it received on appeal from districts. Further, the SBE has granted nearly three-quarters of the petitions it’s received on appeal to date.

While it is difficult to know why so many appeals have been approved over the years, part of the reason is likely that state law does not require county boards or the SBE to review whether school district governing boards wrongfully denied a petition in deciding whether to grant it. Instead, it allows petitions to be considered as though they were being seen for the first time, and for prospective charter school operators to include new information and address some of the flaws that contributed to the original denial.

By requiring charter petitions submitted on appeal that contain new or different materials terms to be immediately remanded back to the school district for reconsideration, this bill will ensure that districts, counties, and the state are all evaluating the same petition with access to the same information. Further, by only allowing the SBE to reverse the determination of a county board of education upon determining that there was an abuse of discretion, this bill will align charter appeals at the state level with other more typical appeals, such as those pertaining to student expulsions and student transfers.

11) ***Treatment of charter school teacher misassignments moving forward.***

Current law requires that teachers in charter schools hold a certificate, permit, or other document equivalent to that which a teacher in other public schools would be required to hold and expresses the intent of the Legislature that charter schools be given flexibility with regard to noncore, non-college preparatory courses. However, current law does not define what noncore, non-college preparatory courses include.

Based on sample data of specific charter schools, it appears that charter school teacher misassignments have never been monitored in a meaningful or systematic way. It would seem that lack of clarity within state law about which charter school teachers must hold certificates, what the equivalent of a certificate required by a public school teacher means, and how often charter school authorizers must verify charter school teacher assignments is at least partly to blame. This bill would provide much needed clarity by specifying that charter school teachers must hold a CTC certificate, permit, or other document required for the teacher's certificated assignment. Further, the bill clarifies the intent of Legislature related to charter school noncore, non-college preparatory courses by specifying that individuals not teaching English, math, science, social science, most elementary school courses, or teaching in certain special education settings must hold at least a certificate of clearance.

However, as currently drafted this bill would not apply to any charter school teacher employed before January 1, 2020 assigned to teach a noncore, noncollege preparatory course. Would providing a transition period for existing charter school teachers to obtain the proper credentials by a certain date be a better approach?

12) ***The state should take a pause to better understand nonclassroom-based charter schools.***

Nonclassroom-based charter schools are unique in that they deliver instruction outside of the traditional classroom setting. Nonclassroom-based instruction includes home-schooling and various forms of independent study, such as computer-based instruction distance-learning. These schools tend to serve nontraditional students compared to those enrolled in classroom-based charter schools, including students seeking personalized instruction and a pace tailored to their needs.

As stated in the California Charter School Policy Task Force Report, a temporary freeze "...on new virtual charter schools will give advocates time to study issues related to the establishment of virtual charter schools, such as their operational practices and performance, and to make further recommendations to ensure students are receiving appropriate full-time instruction, supervised by a certificated teacher."

Notwithstanding the benefit that these schools can have for certain students, there are clear examples of misuse of public funds by these schools due to the nature of the instruction they provide. For example, the California Virtual Academies and three Insight Schools were found to be improperly accounting for Common Core education funds, to the tune of \$2 million. Given these concerns, a pause on further expansion of these models is warranted.

- 13) ***Updating the charter renewal criteria is long overdue, but is the K-12 accountability system designed to encourage continuous improvement and innovation or punish under-performing schools?*** Charter schools are required by law to renew the charter term by the entity that approved the charter petition for a period not to exceed five years. As part of the state's transition to a new standards-based assessments, the SBE suspended the calculation of the Academic Performance Index (API) in March 2014, and the Legislature later repealed the requirement for the API to be calculated moving forward.

In determining whether or not to grant a charter renewal, a charter authorizer must consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor. Several factors for determining pupil academic achievement are based on the old API, rendering them inoperative for charter renewals at this time.

This bill would establish charter school renewal criteria based on state and local indicators under the state's K-12 accountability system—specifically the evaluation rubric as displayed by the California School Dashboard.

While updating the charter renewal criteria is long overdue, using the state's accountability system as the basis for determining whether a charter school will be renewed or forced to close down is a departure from how the system has been characterized to date. Since its inception, the stated goal of the school accountability system has been to use a more comprehensive set of student performance measures in a way that is focused on innovation, continuous improvement, and support. Does using this system as the basis for closing down under-performing charter schools square with that goal? Given that charter schools were created, in part, to increase school choice, should their student outcomes be compared to those of the other neighborhood schools in the community when considering their renewal? Would placing such high stakes on the academic performance of charter school students exacerbate concerns of charter schools targeting students with the highest performance?

SUPPORT

California School Employees Association (co-sponsor)
 California Teachers Association (co-sponsor)
 California Labor Federation (co-sponsor)
 American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
 Berkeley City Council
 California-Hawaii State Conference of the NAACP
 California State Association of Electrical Workers
 California State Pipe Trades Council
 California State PTA
 Democratic Party of Orange County
 Educators for Democratic Schools
 Orange County Department of Education
 San Diego Unified School District
 Santa Ana Unified School District

Wellstone Democratic Renewal Club
Western States Council Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation

OPPOSITION

Able Charter Schools
Academia Avance
Ace Charter Schools
Aerostem Academy Charter School
Afisha Media Group
Alder Grove Charter School
Alliance College-Ready Public Schools
Alma Fuerte Public School
Alpha Public Schools
Alta Public Schools
Anahuacalmecac World School
Apex Academy
APlus+
Ari Community Services
Arts in Action Community Charter Schools
Aspire Public Schools
Audeo Charter School
Bach Viet Association
Barona Band of Mission Indians
Baypoint Preparatory Academy
Bella Mente Montessori Academy
Bright Star Schools
Bullis Charter School
Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians
California Black Chamber of Commerce Foundation
Caliber Schools
California Charter Schools Association
California Connections Academy
California Pacific Charter Schools
Camino Nuevo Charter Academy
Campo Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Champs Charter High School of the Arts
Charter Schools Development Center
Chemehuevi Indian Tribe
Chico Country Day School
Chime Institute
Citizens of the World Charter School
City Charter Schools
Collegiate Charter High School of Los Angeles
Community School for Creative Education
Core Charter School
Creative Arts Charter School
Da Vinci Connect
Da Vinci Schools
Desert Trails Preparatory Academy

Ednovate
Education for Change
Eel River Charter School
El Sol Science and Arts Academy
Elk Grove Charter School
Endeavor College Prep
Environmental Charter Schools
Envision Education
Epic Charter School
Escuela Popular
Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Excelencia Charter Academy
Excelsior Charter Schools
Extera Public Schools
Fenton Charter Public Schools
Forest Charter School
Gabriella Charter Schools
Gateway College and Career Academy
Gateway Community Charters
Girls Athletic Leadership Schools Los Angeles
Global Education Collaborative
Gorman Learning Charter Network
Greater Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce
Green Dot Public Schools California
Grimmway Schools
Grossmont Secondary School
Growth Public Schools
Guajome Schools
Hawking STEAM Charter School
Heritage Peak Charter School
high Tech Los Angeles
Highlands Community Charter School
Icef Public Schools
Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel
Ilead California Charter Schools
Inaja-Cosmit Band of Indians
Ingenium Schools
Inspire Charter Schools
International School for Science and Culture
Isana Academies
Ivy Academia Entrepreneurial Charter School
James Jordan Middle School
Jamul Indian Village a Kumeyaay Nation
John Muir Charter Schools
Julian Charter School
Kairos Public Schools
Kavod Charter School
Kid Street Learning Center Charter School
Kinetic Academy
KIPP Bay Area Public Schools

KIPP Bayview Academy
KIPP Bayview Elementary
KIPP Bridge Academy
KIPP LA Public Schools
La Jolla Band of Luiseño Indians
La Posta Band of Mission Indians
La Verne Elementary Preparatory Academy
La Vida Charter School
Language Academy of Sacramento
Larchmont Charter School
Lashon Academy
Leadership Public Schools
League of California Cities
Learn4Life Assurance Learning Academy
Leonardo da Vinci Health Sciences Charter School
Libertas College Preparatory Charter School
Lighthouse Charter School
Lighthouse Community Public Schools
Literacy First Charter Schools
Los Angeles Academy of Arts and Enterprise
Los Angeles International Charter School
Los Angeles Leadership Academy
Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla and Cupeño Indians
Los Feliz Charter School for the Arts
Magnolia Public Schools
Making Waves Academy
Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians
Mirus Secondary School
Multicultural Learning Center
National Action Network
Navigator Schools
New Academy of Sciences and Arts
New Designs Charter School
New Horizons Charter Academy
New Los Angeles Charter Schools
New West Charter
Norton Science and Language Academy
Nova Academy Early College High School
Oakland Unity High School
Odyssey Charter Schools
Olive Grove Charter School
Orange County Academy of Sciences and Arts
Orange County Educational Arts Academy
Pacific Charter Institute
Pacific Community Charter School
Pacoima Charter School
Pala Band of Mission Indians
Palisades Charter High School
Partnerships to Uplift Communities Schools

Pauma Band of Luiseño Indians
Perseverance Prep
Pivot Charter Schools
Plumas Charter School
Public Safety Academy of San Bernardino
Puente Charter School
Redwood Academy of Ukiah
Redwood Preparatory Charter
Resolute Academy
Rex and Margaret Fortune School of Education
Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians
Rio Valley Charter School
Rocketship Public Schools
Rocklin Academy Family of Schools
Ross Valley Charter School
Sacramento Area League of Associated Muslims
Sacramento Black Chamber of Commerce
Sacramento Music Summit "The Creative Exchange"
Sacramento Valley Charter School
Samueli Academy
San Diego Cooperative Charter Schools
San Diego Global Vision Academy
San Jose Charter Academy
San Jose Conservation Corps & Charter School
San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians
Santa Rosa Academy
Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians
Scholarship Prep Charter School
Sebastopol Independent Charter
Shasta Charter Academy
Sherman Thomas Charter School
SIATech
Silicon Schools Fund
SOAR Charter Academy
Soleil Academy
Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association
Springs Charter School
St Hope Public Schools
STEM Prep Schools
Stream Charter School
Summit Leadership Academy High Desert
Summit Public Schools
Sutter Peak Charter Academy
Sweetwater Secondary School
Sycamore Academy of Science and Cultural Arts
Sycamore Creek Community Charter School
Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Taylion Academy
Teach Public Schools
The Academies

The Charter School of San Diego
The Foundation for Hispanic Education
The New School of San Francisco
The Preuss School UCSD
Thrive Public Schools
Tree of Life Charter School
Twin Ridges Home Study Charter School
University High School
University Preparatory Academy
Urban Discovery Academy
Valley Charter School
Valley Industry and Commerce Association
Vaughn Next Century Learning Center
Ventura Charter School of Arts and Global Education
Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Village Charter Academy
Visions in Education
Vista Charter Public Schools
Voices College Bound Language Academies
Vox Collegiate of Los Angeles
Western Sierra Charter Schools
Westlake Charter School
Willits Charter School
Willow Creek Academy
Wish Charter Schools
Yes Charter Academy
Young, Minney & Corr, LLP
Youth Policy Institute Charter Schools

-- END --