

Board of Education Report

File #: Rep-163-16/17, Version: 1

Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy October 18, 2016 Charter Schools Division

Action Proposed:

Staff recommends denial of the renewal petition for Magnolia Science Academy (MSA or MSA 1), which is located in Board District 6 and Local District Northwest, and adoption of the attached *Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy*.

Background:

Magnolia Science Academy was originally approved on November 13, 2001, and was authorized by LAUSD's Board of Education to serve 525 students in grades 6-12. The charter was renewed on March 13, 2012, to serve up to 525 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 submitted a renewal petition application to the Charter Schools Division seeking to renew its independent charter span school to serve 925 students in grades 6-12. The school serves 538 students in grades 6-12 in Board District 6 and Local District Northwest, and is currently located on a private site at 18238 Sherman Way, Reseda, CA 91335.

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

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

<u>Statutory Framework</u>

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. 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*, 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, staff's recommendation is consistent with the requirements of SB 1290. Magnolia Science Academy 1's numerically significant student subgroups are Latino, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, African American, English Learners, and Students with Disabilities. The school's English Learner subgroup which constitutes 12% of its total student population has demonstrated consistently poor levels of academic performance that show little sign of improvement. On the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics CAASPP Assessments, no English Learner Met or Exceeded the Standards in ELA and Mathematics in either year. In comparing growth, using the same years, on Nearly Met and Not Met bands in ELA CAASPP, data shows that no progress was made in the EL subgroup; 19% of students performed at Nearly Met and 81% of students performed at Not Met in both years. Math CAASPP data shows that some progress was made in the EL subgroup in the Not Met category; 15% of students performed at Nearly Met in the 2014-2015 school year and 19% of students performed at Nearly Met in the 2015-2016 school year, this decreased the Not Met band by 4 percentage points in the 2015-2016 school year. 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 1 for further analysis.

Due Diligence

File #: Rep-163-16/17, Version: 1

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

A Public Hearing was held on September 20, 2016.

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

Expected Outcomes:

Magnolia Science Academy 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*, Magnolia Science Academy'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*, Magnolia Science Academy 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*, and instead takes specific action to approve the charter petition, Magnolia Science Academy would be authorized to continue to operate as an LAUSD authorized charter school for a charter term beginning July 1, 2017. Within 30 days, the Board requires that the school submit to the Charter Schools Division a revised renewal petition that meets all LAUSD requirements, including but not limited to a reasonably comprehensive description of all fifteen required elements and compliance with current District Required Language.

Policy Implications:

There are no policy implications at this time.

Budget Impact:

There is no budget impact.

Issues and Analysis:

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

Attachments:

Staff Assessment and Recommendation Report Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy

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 163–16/17 October 18, 2016

School Name:	Magnolia Science A	cademy 1		BOARD IS					
Type of Charter School:	Start-Up Independe		REQUIRED TO TAKE ACTION						
CMO/Network:	Magnolia Public Scl	BY:							
Location Code:	8454			October 18, 2016					
Type of Site(s):	Private Site								
Site Address(es):	18238 Sherman Way	y, Reseda, CA 91335							
Board District(s):	6	Local District(s):	North	west					
Grade Levels Currently Served:	6-12	Current Enrollment:	538						
Grade Levels Authorized in Current Charter:	6-12	Enrollment Authorized in Current Charter:	525						
STAFF Recommendation:	Denial								
SUMMARY OF Staff Findings	 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: Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the educational program set forth in the petition. The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all required elements. Please see Findings of Fact in Support of Recommendation of Denial of the Renewal Charter Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 1 for further 								
PROPOSED BENCHMARKS:	detail. Please also see "Staff Review and Assessment" section below. N/A								

STAFF ASSESSMENT

I. ACTION PROPOSED

Staff recommends denial of the renewal petition for Magnolia Science Academy 1 ("MSA or MSA 1" or "Charter School"), located in Board District 6 and Local District Northwest, to serve 925 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

	Magnolia Science Academy 1
Initial Authorization	On November 13, 2001 Magnolia Science Academy was initially authorized by LAUSD Board of Education to serve 525 students in grades 6-12.
Most Recent Renewal	The charter was renewed on March 13, 2012, to serve up to 525 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	N/A
Submission of Renewal Petition Application	MSA1 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

A. School History

B. Educational Program

	Magnolia Science Academy 1
Key Features of Educational Program	 MSA1 is a 6-12 span school that offers a Science Technology Engineering Arts and Mathematics (STEAM) instructional program that includes: Science – MSA has a partnership with Mt. Wilson Observatory where the school's science department works with their team of scientists to design curricular aligned trips using the NGSS. The school's Robotics Program is now being offered as an A-G approved course for high school students in addition to being offered daily after school. Technology – is used to personalize learning and integrate all subjects in project-based learning opportunities in a fun and meaningful way. The technology curriculum develops critical thinking skills as students explore a variety of ways to solve problems in various content areas. Arts Instruction - focuses on developing students' creativity, imagination, discipline, and self-expression through drawing and fine arts, music, drama and improvisation, and dance. College Pathways Program - provides students with the emotional and instrumental support students need to graduate college and career ready. By providing students with college awareness starting in middle school and college guidance throughout high school, students are able to see the importance of advancing their education and becoming positive contributors to society.
Program Components to Meet the Needs of English Learners	 MSA1 implements its own English Learner Master Plan. Teachers implement Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) to scaffold content area instruction for English learners. The school uses Rosetta Stone to support language acquisition and FLEX Literacy which is a Reading and Language Arts Intervention system for struggling readers. Push-in and pull-out services are also provided for either one-on one or small-group instructional support.
Program Components to Meet the Needs of GATE/High Achieving Students	 MSA1 identifies GATE students through teacher and/or administrator recommendations as well as work samples in its identification process. GATE teams, comprised of the GATE coordinator or Special Education Teacher, Academic Dean, and General Education teacher, review all pieces of data and then make a determination of eligibility: MSA1 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.

C. Student Population

School	Total	% F/R		0/ 51	%	%	% Af.	%	04 5:1:	% Am	% Pacific	% Two or
School	Enroll #	Meal	% GATE	% EL	Latino	White	Amer.	Asian	% Fili.	Indian	Island	More
Magnolia Science Academy	540	91%	1%	12%	84%	7%	1%	4%	3%	0%	0%	0%

*As of October 2015 Census Day

D. Charter School Operator

MSA1 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 <u>not</u> 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 1* and *Magnolia Science Academy 1 Data Set.* Please also see staff review below.

A. <u>Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?</u>

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 1, petitioners are <u>not</u> demonstrably likely to successfully implement the educational program set forth in the renewal petition.

1. Student Achievement and Educational Performance

a. Summary

Magnolia Science Academy's comparative performance on the CAASPP (SBAC) from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016 reflects an 8% increase of students who Met or Exceeded performance standards in English Language Arts (ELA) and a 7% increase of students who Met or Exceeded performance standards in Math. Although Magnolia Science Academy has an overall moderate to strong schoolwide record of academic outcomes, the school's English Learner subgroup, which constitutes 12% of its total student population, has demonstrated consistently poor levels of academic performance that show little sign of improvement. On the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics CAASPP Assessments, no English Learner Met or Exceeded the Standards in ELA and Mathematics in either year. Magnolia Science Academy achieved a 2014-2015 Cohort Graduation Rate of 98%, which was higher than the LAUSD Similar Schools Median of 88% and the Resident Schools Median of 86%. Historically, under the former API system, in the 2013-2014 school year, the school did not meet growth targets for any of its significant subgroups and earned a Statewide rank of 7 and a Similar Schools rank of 10. Please see attached Magnolia Science Academy Data Set.

b. Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math

On the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 43% of MSA 1's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 58%. In Math, 31% of MSA 1's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 20%. On the 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 35% of MSA 1's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 44%. In Math, 24% of MSA 1's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 44%. In Math, 24% of MSA 1's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 16%.

2015-16		En	glish Lan	guage Ar	ts		Mathe	matics	
School	Subgroup All Students African American Latino English Learners Soc-eco Disadvantaged Students with Disabilities All Students All Students Subgroup	% Standard	% Standard	% Standard	% Exceeds	% Standard	% Standard	% Standard	% Exceeds
School	Subgroup	Not Met	Nearly Met	Met	Standard	Not Met	Nearly Met	Met	Standard
Magnolia Science Academy	All Students	26	31	33	10	33	36	16	15
	African American								
	Latino	29	33	31	7	35	39	15	11
	English Learners	81	19	0	0	81	19	0	0
		28	31	32	9	34	37	16	13
		67	22	10	0	76	16	6	2
Similar Schools Median	All Students	13	21	38	28	35	28	23	13
Resident Schools Median	All Students	16	25	36	22	51	27	13	7
2014-15		En	iglish Lan	guage Ar	ts		Mathe	matics	
School	Subgroup	% Standard	% Standard	% Standard	% Exceeds	% Standard	% Standard	% Standard	% Exceeds
School	Subgroup	Not Met	Nearly Met	Met	Standard	Not Met	Nearly Met	Met	Standard
Magnolia Science Academy	All Students	32	32	28	7	38	38	15	9
	African American								
	Latino	35	32	27	6	42	38	14	6
	English Learners	81	19	0	0	85	15	0	0
	Soc-eco Disadvantaged	33	32	28	7	39	39	14	8
	Students with Disabilities	57	34	9	0	79	19	2	0
Similar Schools Median	All Students	14	25	35	22	38	30	21	10
Resident Schools Median	All Students	21	29	33	11	56	28	12	4

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

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 1, staff's recommendation is consistent with the requirements of SB 1290. Magnolia Science Academy 1's numerically significant student subgroups are Latino, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, African American, English Learners, and Students with Disabilities. The school's English Learner subgroup which constitutes 12% of its total student population has demonstrated consistently poor levels of academic performance that show little sign of improvement. On the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics CAASPP Assessments, no English Learner Met or Exceeded the Standards in ELA and Mathematics in either year. In comparing growth, using the same years, on Nearly Met and Not Met bands in ELA CAASPP, data shows that no progress was made in the EL subgroup; 19% of students performed at Nearly Met and 81% of students performed at Not Met in both years. Math CAASPP data shows that some progress was made in the EL subgroup in the Not Met category; 15% of students performed at Nearly Met in the 2014-2015 school year and 19% of students performed at Nearly Met in the 2015-2016 school year, this decreased the Not Met band by 4 percentage points in the 2015-2016 school year. 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 1 for further analysis.

e. English Learner Reclassification Rates

MSA 1's 2015-2016 reclassification rate of 33% is higher than both Resident Schools Median at 14% and Similar Schools Median at 17%.

MSA's reclassification criteria are the following:

- CELDT Overall score of 4 or 5 <u>and</u> 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	13-14		14-15	14-15		15-16	15-16
	12-15 EL #*	Reclass	Reclass	13-14 EL #	Reclass	Reclass	14-15 EL #	Reclass	Reclass
	#'	#	Rate		#	Rate		#	Rate
Magnolia Science Academy	45	26	36%	72	21	29%	64	21	33%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	349	36	10%	339	57	26%	242	34	17%
Resident Schools Median	279	47	12%	297	61	20%	293	33	14%

f. <u>CAHSEE Passage and Graduation Rates [HS only]</u>

Magnolia Science Academy LAUSD Similar Schools Median Resident Schools Median	6-12 	95% 88%	93% 87% 87%	98% 89% 87%	95% 88% 83%	98% 88% 86%
	Span	% Passed Math	% Passed ELA	% Passed Math	% Passed ELA	Rate
School	2014-15 Grade	2012-13 CAHSEE Grade 10	2012-13 CAHSEE Grade 10	2013-14 CAHSEE Grade 10	2013-14 CAHSEE Grade 10	2014-15 Cohort Graduation

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 *	3 Proficient	3 Proficient

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

h. <u>Additional Information</u> 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 1 for further detail.

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report	2	3
Rating in Category of Governance *	Developing	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 1 for further detail.

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

*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. <u>School Climate and Student Discipline</u>

				2015-16				2015-16 SUBGROUPS									
								AFRICAN	AMERICA	N STUDENT	S		STUDEN	TS WITH	DISABILITY		
School	Susp. Event Rate 2013- 14	Susp. Event Rate 2014- 15	Susp. Event Rate	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	# Enrolled	# Eve nts 2015-16	· · ·	Event Rate	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16		Event Rate	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16
Magnolia Science Academy	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	540	1	5	3	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	84	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	2340	10	18	110	2	2	1.8%	1.8%	237	18	18	8.4%	0.4%
Resident Schools Median	0.0%	0.9%	1.4%	1.1%	1434	20	32	58	3	4	5.8%	4.9%	260	32	32	12.3%	2.6%

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	540	91%	1%	12%	84%	7%	1%	4%	3%	0%	0%	0%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	2340	72%	3%	10%	63%	11%	4%	8%	2%	0%	0%	1%
Resident Schools Median	1434	85%	5%	19%	83%	6%	4%	3%	3%	0%	0%	1%

*As of October 2015 Census Day

d. Special Education

School	OCT 2015 Enroll #	•	Sp Ed Enroll %	% High Incidenc e	% Low Inciden ce	# AUT	# DB	# DEAF	# ED	# EMD	# НОН	# MR	# OHI*	# OI	# SLD*	# SLI*	# TBI	# VI
Magnolia Science Academy	540	85	16%	89%	11%	7	1			1	2		9		60	7		
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	2340	232	9%	79%	21%	28		ł	4		2	6	27	2	121	2	1	11
Resident Schools Median	1434	211	15%	77%	22%	26	-	1	3		3	1	34	2	138	3	2	2

e. <u>Additional Information</u> None

4. Fiscal Operations

Magnolia Science Academy'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 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.

147

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report	3	2
Rating in Category of Fiscal Operations	Proficient	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 \$2,227,218 and net income of \$3,302. 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	\$923,215	\$1,415,789	\$2,223,916	\$2,227,218	\$3,197,834
Net Income/Loss	(\$175,459)	\$492,574	\$808,127	\$3,302	\$970,616
Transfers In/ <mark>Out</mark>	\$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 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. <u>2014 2015 Independent Audit Report</u> Audit Opinion: Unmodified Material Weakness: None Reported Deficiency/Finding: None Reported
- d. <u>Other Significant Fiscal Information</u> 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*.

C. <u>Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?</u>

For reasons more fully set forth in the Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 1, the petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all required elements.

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

Magnolia Science Academy

Loc. Code: **8454** CDS Code: **6119945**

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	800	807	805
Growth API	807	805	797
Growth Target	А	А	А
Growth	7	-2	-8
Met Schoolwide Growth Target	Yes	Yes	No
Met All Student Groups Target	No	No	No
Base API State Rank	8	8	8
Base API Similar Schools Rank	10	10	10
2013 Growth API State Rank			7
2013 Growth API Similar Schools Rank			10

Subgroup API	Growth Target	Growth	Met Target	Growth Target	Growth	Met Target	Growth Target	Growth	Met Target
African American or Black									
American Indian or Alaska Native									
Asian									
Filipino									
Latino	5	7	Yes	5	-4	No	5	-7	No
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander									
White	А	2	Yes						
Two or More Races									
English Learners	5	-20	No	5	-28	No	5	-101	No
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	5	4	No	5	-5	No	5	2	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 Com	nparison		
	2011	2012	11-12	2012	2013	12-13
	Base API	Growth API	Growth	Base API	Growth API	Growth
Magnolia Science Academy	807	805	-2	805	797	-8
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	747	770	23	770	778	8
Resident Schools Median	714	725	11	735	744	9

		2012-13 CST	Comparison	
	English La	nguage Arts	Mathe	ematics
	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below Basic	Proficient & Advanced	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below	Proficient & Advanced
Magnolia Science Academy	46%	54%	Basic 59%	42%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	41%	59%	73%	27%
Resident Schools Median	54%	47%	81%	19%

			AYP Con	nparison					
		2012 AYP			2013 AYP			2014 AYP	
	# Criteria	# Met	% Met	# Criteria	# Met	% Met	# Criteria	# Met	% Met
Magnolia Science Academy	17	9	53%	17	9	53%			
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	22	15	68%	18	12	81%	18	13	61%
Resident Schools Median	21	11	55%	21	12	57%	21	13	62%

Magnolia Science Academy	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.

20.00	1*1 dainet	*\ indicato	كمعاصمهم فمعاطيتهم فمحاطمه فالمحاد والمعارفين والمراقب المحاليات والمحاربة المحارفة والمحادية والمحاد والمحاد والمحاد والمحادة والم	1040: The 201	2 ctatani	to and cim	low cohool	r vanhe ave	+ the final cot	· of cante con														
These	e ranks a	are basea	These ranks are based on the 2013 Growth API data.	TOT				in cuint c		da revina reb					Sc	hool De	School Demographic Characteristics	hic Char	acterist	ics				
9	BD	Loc Code	School	2013 Enrolled # on 1st Day of Testing	Conf	2012 Base G API	2013 Growth S API I	2013 State S Rank S	2013 Mi Similar Sc Schools T Rank T	Met 2013 N Sch-wide Si Target -	Met 2013 5 Subgroup F Targets	% Free/ Reduced % Lunch	% Sp Ed 9	% GATE	HEI %	% RFEP %	% Latino	% White	% Af. Amer	% Asian	% Fili	% Am % Indian Is	% Pacific % Island N	% Two or More
XR	9	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	432	6-12	805	797	7	10	No	No	88	12	0	10	50	76	10	1	5	9	0	0	0
LAU:	SD Simi	ilar Scho	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																					
ΝN	e	8590 0	Grover Cleveland Charter High	2581	9-12	789	808	∞	10	Yes	No	67	11	32	15	37	63	15	5	13	4	0	0	0
ш	5	8701	International Studies Learning Center at Legacy High School Comple	742	6-12	731	758	5	3	Yes	No	84	7	19	11	47	97	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
U	5	8750	John Marshall Senior High	1954	9-12	738	758	5	4	Yes	No	67	10	30	14	45	62	12	2	10	13	1	0	0
8	1	8760 1	Middle College High	319	9-12	801	807	8	10	Yes	No	81	0	24	1	32	65	0	34	0	0	0	0	0
NE	3	8786	North Hollywood Senior High	2216	9-12	770	778	9	8	Yes	No	73	6	29	13	42	70	16	4	7	2	1	0	0
U	2	8853 (Orthopaedic Hospital	661	9-12	780	786	7	6	Yes	No	88	3	23	7	74	95	1	3	1	0	0	0	0
NE	9	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	2142	9-12	762	767	9	7	Yes	No	100	11	32	16	44	62	11	5	14	8	0	0	0
LAU	SD Simil	ilar Scho	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	1954		770	778	9	8		-	81	6	29	13	44	65	11	4	7	2	0	0	0
Resi	Resident Schools	chools																						
ΝN	9	8814	Reseda Senior High	1344	9-12	752	748	5	6	No	No	64	15	17	16	42	74	12	9	4	3	0	0	0
ΝN	з	8259	William Mulholland Middle	1447	6-8	713	716	2	2	No	No	80	17	15	19	42	87	5	5	2	1	0	0	0
NN	3	8283	Northridge Middle	863	6-8	769	744	3	6	No	No	100	21	12	20	46	83	5	4	5	2	0	0	0
NN	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	794	9-12	744	764	9	8	Yes	Yes	68	14	15	8	36	64	20	5	4	9	1	1	0
ΝN	3	8590 (Grover Cleveland Charter High	2581	9-12	789	808	8	10	Yes	No	67	11	32	15	37	63	15	5	13	4	0	0	0
NN	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	925	9-12	686	724	4	3	Yes	Yes	64	15	19	7	33	63	18	7	5	7	1	0	0
ΝN	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	1305	6-8	735	764	4	8	Yes	No	100	19	14	18	43	83	4	5	9	2	0	0	0
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1775	6-12	648	657	2	2	Yes	No	73	15	10	26	48	90	2	3	2	3	0	0	0
XR	ю	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	2256	9-12	722	734	4	8	Yes	No	86	12	6	14	43	81	7	7	2	2	0	0	0
ΝN	ю	8571 0	Canoga Park Senior High	1319	9-12	696	694	3	8	No	No	73	15	12	23	45	84	5	5	з	2	0	0	0
NE	9	8636	8636 John H. Francis Polytechnic	2217	9-12	746	753	5	10	Yes	No	100	11	14	17	54	91	2	1	2	3	0	0	0
Resi	dent Sch	Resident Schools Median	edian	1344	1	735	744	4	8	:	1	73	15	14	17	43	83	5	5	4	æ	0	0	0

Magnolia Science Academy OCTOBER 2015 CALPADS DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

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

INIS	ם Bage נ	alspiay:	ווווא למצב מואלומאא א-דב בוו טווווובוון חעוווטבו מוומ לברכווומצבא טו אבובנו אשציטעף	ups as of october 2013 Cerisus Day	כדחק זפמי	Lensus D	dy.								
ΓD	BD	Loc Code	School	Total Enroll #	% F/R Meal	% GATE	% EL 9	% Latino % White	% White	% Af. Amer.	% Asian	% Fili.	% Am Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More
XR	9	8454	8454 Magnolia Science Academy	540	91%	1%	12%	84%	7%	1%	4%	3%	%0	%0	0%
LAUS	D Simi	lar Scho	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE												
MN	3	8590	8590 Grover Cleveland Charter High	3202	65%	5%	11%	60%	17%	5%	13%	4%	%0	%0	1%
ш	5	8701	International Studies Learning Center at Legacy High School Comp	863	%06	%0	8%	%66	%0	%0	%0	%0	%0	%0	%0
J	5	8750	John Marshall Senior High	2340	72%	3%	10%	59%	14%	1%	13%	10%	%0	%0	1%
Ν	1	8760	Middle College High	387	72%	%0	1%	61%	1%	36%	%0	%0	1%	%0	1%
NE	3	8786	North Hollywood Senior High	2610	72%	4%	11%	70%	15%	4%	8%	2%	%0	%0	1%
J	2	8853	Orthopaedic Hospital	839	%06	%0	6%	93%	1%	3%	%0	1%	%0	%0	%0
NE	9	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	2594	77%	6%	12%	63%	11%	4%	13%	8%	%0	%0	1%
LAUS.	D Simi	lar Scho	AUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	2340	72%	3%	10%	63%	11%	4%	8%	2%	%0	%0	1%
Resid	Resident Schools	hools													
NN	9	8814	8814 Reseda Senior High	1597	79%	7%	19%	77%	10%	4%	4%	3%	%0	%0	%0
NN	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	1162	91%	4%	23%	87%	6%	4%	2%	2%	%0	%0	%0
MN	з	8283	Northridge Middle	839	80%	8%	28%	80%	6%	4%	6%	3%	%0	1%	1%
NN	з	8513	Northridge Academy High	1072	71%	1%	5%	67%	18%	3%	3%	7%	%0	%0	1%
MN	з	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	3202	65%	5%	11%	60%	17%	5%	13%	4%	%0	%0	1%
MN	з	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	1201	61%	2%	6%	59%	22%	5%	3%	7%	1%	%0	2%
MN	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	862	91%	4%	26%	83%	4%	4%	6%	2%	%0	%0	1%
NE	9	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1769	91%	7%	24%	88%	2%	3%	2%	3%	%0	%0	0%
XR	з	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	3278	85%	5%	11%	83%	7%	4%	2%	3%	%0	%0	1%
MN	з	8571	Canoga Park Senior High	1434	82%	7%	22%	84%	6%	4%	2%	2%	1%	%0	0%
NE	9	8636	John H. Francis Polytechnic	2875	89%	4%	14%	92%	3%	1%	2%	3%	%0	%0	0%
Resid	ent Sci	Resident Schools Median	edian	1434	85%	5%	19%	83%	6%	4%	3%	3%	%0	%0	1%

Magnolia Science Academy RECLASSIFICATION RATES

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

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	12-13 EL #*	13-14 Reclass #	13-14 Reclass Rate	13-14 EL #	14-15 Reclass #	14-15 Reclass Rate	14-15 EL #	15-16 Reclass #	15-16 Reclass Rate
XR	6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	45	26	36%	72	21	29%	64	21	33%
LAUS	D Sim	ilar Sch	ools from CDE							-		
NW	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	448	61	12%	402	93	23%	332	49	15%
Е	5	8701	International Studies Learning Center at Legacy High School Comp	91	14	13%	89	25	28%	69	17	25%
С	5	8750	John Marshall Senior High	389	37	8%	345	88	26%	242	40	17%
W	1	8760	Middle College High	3	0	0%	4	2	50%	1	4	400%
NE	3	8786	North Hollywood Senior High	349	36	9%	339	57	17%	285	34	12%
С	2	8853	Orthopaedic Hospital	54	10	15%	55	21	38%	40	18	45%
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	389	46	10%	414	88	21%	371	56	15%
LAUS	D Sim	ilar Sch	ools from CDE Median	349	36	10%	339	57	26%	242	34	17%
Resid	ent So	chools										
NW	6	8814	Reseda Senior High	277	39	12%	297	61	21%	293	33	11%
NW	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	279	47	15%	294	55	19%	224	49	22%
NW	3	8283	Northridge Middle	174	61	27%	194	41	21%	187	27	14%
NW	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	70	12	15%	85	17	20%	72	24	33%
NW	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	448	61	12%	402	93	23%	332	49	15%
NW	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	84	11	11%	88	16	18%	67	15	22%
NW	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	232	61	22%	290	77	27%	240	28	12%
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	481	63	12%	493	86	17%	435	61	14%
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	496	50	11%	416	0	0%	412	76	18%
NW	3	8571	Canoga Park Senior High	370	29	7%	358	63	18%	321	22	7%
NE	6	8636	John H. Francis Polytechnic	502	47	8%	491	108	22%	439	63	14%
Resid	ent So	chools N	1edian	279	47	12%	297	61	20%	293	33	14%

Magnolia Science Academy 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	Reclassification Rate	Change from Prior Year
Magnolia Science Academy	64	21	32.8%	3.6%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	242	34	16.5%	-9.0%
Resident Schools Median	293	33	0	-5.6%
District	164,349	19,952	12.1%	-4.5%

2014-15	2013-14 # EL	2014-15 # Reclassified	2014-15 Reclassification Rate
Magnolia Science Academy	72	21	29.2%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	339	57	25.5%
Resident Schools Median	297	61	20.0%
District	179,322	29,694	16.6%

2013-14	2012-13 # EL	2013-14 # Reclassified	2013-14 Reclassification Rate
Magnolia Science Academy	45	26	36.1%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	349	36	10.0%
Resident Schools Median	279	47	12.1%
District	170,797	25,532	13.9%

Magnolia Science Academy 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 (*).

									ľ	ĺ											ĺ
Γ	BD	Loc Code	School	OCT 2015 Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll %	% High Incidence	% Low #	# AUT	# DB	# DEAF	#ED	EMD H	# HOH	MR	# #HO		srD*	# SLI*	TBI	I/ #
XR	9	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	540	85	16%	89%	11%	7	1	ı	ı	ı	2	1	6	1	60	7	1	1
LAU	SD Sim	nilar Scho	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE											•						•	
ŇN	m	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	3202	313	10%	82%	18%	41	1	1	ε	1	1	1	34	:	217	9	:	;
ш	ъ	8701	International Studies Learning Center at Legacy High School Comple	863	68	8%	%06	10%	5	1	ı	ı	1	1	:	6	1	50	2	:	:
U	2	8750	John Marshall Senior High	2340	232	10%	61%	39%	31		-	4	-	4	10	20	2	121	1	2	20
8	1	8760	Middle College High	387	3	1%	33%	67%	:	1	-	2	1	:	:	-	:	1	-	:	:
NE	£	8786	North Hollywood Senior High	2610	247	%6	%6 <i>L</i>	21%	25		-	6	-	2	;	37	2	152	5	1	2
U	2	8853	Orthopaedic Hospital	839	31	4%	87%	13%	2	1	-	-	1	1	:	7	1	19	1	:	:
NE	9	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	2594	239	%6	79%	21%	37	1	I	4	I	2	1	35	1	155	1	1	1
LAU	SD Sim	nilar Scho	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	2340	232	%6	79%	21%	28	1	ı	4	ı	2	9	27	2	121	2	1	11
Resi	dent St	Resident Schools												•						•	
ŇN	9	8814	Reseda Senior High	1597	321	20%	55%	45%	50	1	1	30	1	:	1	38	æ	138	1	:	;
MN	ŝ	8259	William Mulholland Middle	1162	141	12%	%LL	23%	18		1	-	1	5	:	19	2	86	4	:	1
NΝ	e	8283	Northridge Middle	839	177	21%	%52	25%	15		-	1	-	:	:	14	-	117	2	2	;
NΝ	e	8513	Northridge Academy High	1072	175	16%	%08	20%	30	-	-	-	-	1	-	39	2	101		1	-
NΝ	e	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	3202	313	10%	82%	18%	41		-	3		1	;	34	-	217	9	:	;
NΝ	ŝ	8688	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	1201	211	18%	%7 <i>L</i>	28%	20	1	-	3	1	:	1	36	2	113	2	:	10
MN	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	862	172	20%	%LL	22%	25		-	-	1	1	:	12	1	117	4	:	:
NE	9	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1769	274	15%	88%	12%	26	1	1	æ	:	1	1	31	3	207	2	:	:
XR	ŝ	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	3278	400	12%	83%	17%	41	1	I	7	1	4	1	68	1	261	4	:	:
NΝ	m	8571	Canoga Park Senior High	1434	210	15%	%08	20%	18	1	I	4	I	;	1	15	1	154	:	-	1
NE	9	8636	John H. Francis Polytechnic	2876	378	13%	%LL	23%	30	1	I	3	1	4	6	45	3	247	-	2	2
Resi	dent St	Resident Schools Median	edian	1434	211	15%	%LL	22%	26	1	1	3	1	3	1	34	2	138	3	2	2

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

											ľ								ĺ
							2013 CST ELA	ST ELA							2013 CST MATH	т матн			
LD	BD	Loc. Code	School Name	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/FB B	% Prof /Adv	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/FB B	% Prof /Adv
XR	9	8454	8454 Magnolia Science Academy	421	5%	10%	31%	32%	22%	46%	54%	420	3%	23%	33%	26%	16%	59%	42%
LAUS	Sim Sim	ilar Scho	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																
ΝN	3	8590	8590 Grover Cleveland Charter High	2406	5%	10%	24%	29%	32%	39%	61%	2258	7%	23%	25%	29%	16%	55%	45%
ш	5	8701	International Studies Learning Center at Legacy	602	%9	11%	34%	34%	16%	51%	50%	704	11%	29%	33%	21%	6%	73%	27%
U	5	8750	John Marshall Senior High	1835	%8	11%	25%	%0E	26%	44%	26%	1720	18%	37%	22%	17%	7%	%LL	24%
Ν	1	8760	Middle College High	318	%0	2%	28%	46%	21%	33%	67%	313	18%	43%	25%	13%	2%	86%	15%
NE	3	8786	North Hollywood Senior High	2135	%2	%6	25%	30%	29%	41%	59%	2130	14%	32%	26%	18%	10%	72%	28%
U	2	8853	Orthopaedic Hospital	658	3%	%L	30%	39%	21%	40%	%09	648	14%	39%	25%	18%	3%	78%	21%
NE	9	8893	8893 Van Nuys Senior High	2004	%8	11%	23%	25%	32%	42%	57%	1978	16%	31%	20%	22%	11%	67%	33%
LAUS	SD Sim	ilar Scho	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	1835	%9	10%	25%	%0E	26%	41%	29%	1720	14%	32%	25%	18%	7%	73%	27%
Resid	Resident Schools	chools																	
ΝN	9	8814	Reseda Senior High	1233	5%	10%	32%	34%	19%	47%	53%	1140	20%	37%	24%	15%	4%	81%	19%
ΝN	3	8259	8259 William Mulholland Middle	1295	%9	16%	37%	28%	13%	89%	41%	1322	11%	34%	28%	19%	8%	73%	27%
ΝN	3	8283	Northridge Middle	741	4%	14%	43%	29%	10%	61%	39%	766	3%	23%	32%	30%	11%	58%	41%
ΝN	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	741	2%	8%	32%	40%	18%	42%	58%	739	11%	39%	31%	16%	3%	81%	19%
MN	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	2406	5%	10%	24%	29%	32%	39%	61%	2258	7%	23%	25%	29%	16%	55%	45%
ΝN	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	845	2%	6%	34%	36%	21%	42%	57%	851	29%	42%	21%	8%	1%	92%	9%
NN	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	1197	7%	13%	37%	30%	13%	57%	43%	1208	4%	16%	30%	38%	12%	50%	50%
NE	9	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1603	12%	19%	37%	22%	6%	68%	31%	1622	21%	36%	25%	15%	3%	82%	18%
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	2060	%9	13%	35%	32%	15%	54%	47%	1994	12%	43%	29%	14%	2%	84%	16%
ΝN	3	8571	Canoga Park Senior High	1198	%6	15%	34%	29%	14%	58%	43%	1158	17%	39%	25%	16%	3%	81%	19%
NE	6	8636	John H. Francis Polytechnic	1917	5%	11%	35%	31%	18%	51%	49%	1829	10%	32%	28%	23%	6%	70%	29%
Resic	lent Sc	Resident Schools Median	edian	1233	2%	13%	35%	30%	15%	54%	47%	1208	11%	36%	28%	16%	4%	81%	19%

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

																			ĺ
							2012 CST ELA	- ELA						2(2012 CST MATH	ИАТН			
P	BD	Loc. Code	School Name	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv B	% B/BB/F BB	% Prof /Adv	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/F BB	% Prof /Adv
XR	9	8454	8454 Magnolia Science Academy	457	4%	10%	27%	34%	25%	41%	59%	457	%9	%72	25%	30%	17%	53%	47%
LAUS	SD Sim	ilar Sch	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																
NΝ	ε	8590	8590 Grover Cleveland Charter High	2466	%9	12%	24%	27%	30%	42%	57%	2175	%9	17%	27%	34%	16%	50%	50%
ш	2	8701	International Studies Learning Center at Legacy	602	%9	13%	34%	28%	19%	53%	47%	717	12%	33%	30%	21%	%5	75%	26%
U	2	8750	John Marshall Senior High	1982	%6	14%	27%	25%	25%	50%	50%	1845	21%	34%	23%	16%	%9	78%	22%
3	1	8760	Middle College High	275	1%	%5	31%	37%	25%	37%	62%	273	22%	37%	32%	%6	1%	91%	10%
NE	ε	8786	North Hollywood Senior High	2190	%L	11%	26%	25%	32%	44%	57%	2157	16%	31%	27%	18%	%6	74%	27%
U	2	8853	Orthopaedic Hospital	643	%E	%9	31%	38%	22%	40%	%09	634	16%	35%	29%	17%	3%	80%	20%
NE	9	8893	8893 Van Nuys Senior High	2017	10%	13%	22%	23%	31%	45%	54%	1892	17%	26%	23%	22%	13%	%99	35%
LAUS	SD Sim	nilar Sch	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	1982	%9	12%	27%	27%	25%	44%	57%	1845	16%	33%	27%	18%	%9	75%	26%
Resid	Jent St	Resident Schools																	
ΝN	9	8814	Reseda Senior High	1303	%L	12%	31%	28%	23%	50%	51%	1165	14%	34%	28%	17%	%9	76%	23%
ΝN	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	1471	%L	15%	33%	27%	17%	55%	44%	1499	12%	31%	31%	19%	8%	74%	27%
ΝN	3	8283	Northridge Middle	740	4%	13%	36%	33%	14%	53%	47%	758	4%	18%	30%	36%	11%	52%	47%
ΝN	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	877	3%	10%	33%	33%	22%	46%	55%	763	13%	41%	29%	14%	3%	83%	17%
ΝN	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	2466	%9	12%	24%	27%	30%	42%	57%	2175	6%	17%	27%	34%	16%	50%	50%
ΝN	3	8688	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	627	%8	12%	32%	28%	19%	52%	47%	775	27%	39%	23%	%6	1%	89%	10%
NΝ	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	1320	10%	18%	33%	25%	14%	61%	39%	1321	6%	20%	32%	30%	11%	58%	41%
NE	9	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1792	11%	21%	37%	22%	10%	%69	32%	1784	21%	40%	24%	12%	3%	85%	15%
XR	з	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	1752	6%	13%	35%	31%	15%	54%	46%	1592	17%	42%	28%	12%	2%	87%	14%
NΝ	3	8571	Canoga Park Senior High	1249	10%	18%	32%	25%	15%	60%	40%	1223	20%	37%	24%	15%	3%	81%	18%
NE	9	8636	John H. Francis Polytechnic	1843	%9	13%	31%	30%	19%	50%	49%	1770	14%	32%	27%	21%	7%	73%	28%
Resid	dent Sc	Resident Schools Median	Aedian	1320	%L	13%	33%	28%	17%	53%	47%	1321	14%	34%	28%	17%	%9	76%	23%

Magnolia Science Academy 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).

Р	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	9	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	6-12	95%	%86	%86	95%	98%
LAUS	D Simil	lar School	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE						
ΝN	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	9-12	92%	87%	%88	87%	85%
ш	5	8701	International Studies Learning Center at Legacy High School Com	6-12	84%	%68	92%	89%	92%
U	5	8750	John Marshall Senior High	9-12	88%	83%	%68	85%	84%
$^{\wedge}$	1	8760	Middle College High	9-12	95%	%96	64%	%96	%66
NE	ŝ	8786	North Hollywood Senior High	9-12	86%	87%	83%	84%	88%
U	2	8853	Orthopaedic Hospital	9-12	92%	64%	%†6	95%	95%
NE	9	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	9-12	86%	%98	%88	88%	86%
LAUS	D Simi	lar Schools	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	1	88%	%18	%68	88%	88%
Resid	Resident Schools	hools							
ΝM	9	8814	Reseda Senior High	9-12	%06	86%	85%	82%	84%
NN	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	6-8	-	-		-	1
ΝM	3	8283	Northridge Middle	6-8	1	1	I	1	I
ΝM	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	9-12	92%	91%	88%	87%	94%
ΝM	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	9-12	92%	87%	88%	87%	85%
ΝM	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	9-12	86%	%06	89%	92%	91%
ΝM	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	6-8	-	-	-		I
NE	9	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	6-12	71%	71%	73%	20%	83%
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	9-12	86%	87%	84%	83%	91%
ΝM	3	8571	Canoga Park Senior High	9-12	71%	70%	83%	76%	75%
NE	9	8636	John H. Francis Polytechnic	9-12	94%	88%	%06	83%	87%
Resid	ent Sch	Resident Schools Median	ian	-	88%	87%	87%	83%	86%

	Ĥ
	z
	щ
>	2
Ē	-
5	Z
۳	5
ĕ	20
ğ	\underline{s}
<	z
d)	<u>۳</u>
ğ	
	Ě
ie.	10
.0	
S	7
a.	×
=	$\underline{\circ}$
2	<u>–</u>
5	Q
ä	Ŷ
÷.	ų,
2	0

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.

STUDENTS WITH DIS. # Events # Days 2015- 16 2015-16 16 0 0 66 77 1 7 21 26 21 26 21 26 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 28 139 38 139 38 139 38 139 37 48 24 25 35 48 24 24 25 24 35 32																2015-16 SUBGROUPS	REGEDUPS				
Extend State freem <								2	015-16				AFRICAN #	MERICAN S	rudents			STUDEN	TS WITH DIS	ABILITY	
Megnolia Science Academy 14 0.7 <th>9</th> <th></th> <th>Loc Code</th> <th>School</th> <th>usp. Event Su Rate 2013- Ri</th> <th></th> <th>Event ite</th> <th>ngle Std. Susp. %</th> <th></th> <th># Events</th> <th># Days</th> <th># Enrolled</th> <th># Events 2015-16</th> <th># Days 2015- 16</th> <th>t i</th> <th>Single Std. Susp % 2015</th> <th># Enrolled</th> <th># Events 2015-16</th> <th># Days 2015- 16</th> <th>/ent 15-</th> <th>Single Std. Susp % 2015-</th>	9		Loc Code	School	usp. Event Su Rate 2013- Ri		Event ite	ngle Std. Susp. %		# Events	# Days	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015- 16	t i	Single Std. Susp % 2015	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015- 16	/ent 15-	Single Std. Susp % 2015-
Mathematical sector function Mathematical sector function <th< th=""><th>XR</th><th>y</th><th>8454</th><th>Magnolia Science Academy</th><th>14 0 2%</th><th></th><th>70.0%</th><th>0.2%</th><th>540</th><th>-</th><th>Ľ</th><th>"</th><th>-</th><th>-</th><th>0 0%</th><th>10 00%</th><th>84</th><th>-</th><th>-</th><th>qT</th><th>01%</th></th<>	XR	y	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	14 0 2%		70.0%	0.2%	540	-	Ľ	"	-	-	0 0%	10 00%	84	-	-	qT	01%
Grower Clevel Clever Clevel Clever Clever Clever Clever Clever Clever Clever </th <th>LAUSE</th> <th>) Similar S</th> <th>Schools f</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>~~~~</th> <th></th> <th>2</th> <th>•</th> <th>,</th> <th>,</th> <th>•</th> <th>></th> <th>~~~~</th> <th>200</th> <th>5</th> <th>></th> <th>, ,</th> <th></th> <th>200</th>	LAUSE) Similar S	Schools f				~~~~		2	•	,	,	•	>	~~~~	200	5	>	, ,		200
International Studies training Center at Ligacy High School Comp 00% 02% 01%	MN	e	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	0.0%	3.0%	1.4%	1.1%	3202	44	66	146	4	4	2.7%	2.7%	330	66	17	20.0%	4.2%
	ш	2	8701		0.0%		0.1%	0.1%	863	1	1	ŕ	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	67	1	7	1.5%	0.0%
Modie College High00%0.0%0.7%1.6%1.6%1.6%1.04.3%4.3%3.3%1.01.0North Hollwood Sentor High0.0%0.3%0.4% <td< th=""><th>U</th><td>5</td><td>8750</td><td>John Marshall Senior High</td><td>0.0%</td><td></td><td>0.5%</td><td>0.5%</td><td>2340</td><td>11</td><td>21</td><td>35</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0.0%</td><td>0.0%</td><td>237</td><td>21</td><td>26</td><td>8.9%</td><td>0.4%</td></td<>	U	5	8750	John Marshall Senior High	0.0%		0.5%	0.5%	2340	11	21	35	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	237	21	26	8.9%	0.4%
Morth Hollwood Senior High00%03%03%04%04%26101118142218%18%2841818Orth Mole Senior High00%03% <th>8</th> <td>1</td> <td>8760</td> <td>Middle College High</td> <td>0.0%</td> <td></td> <td>1.6%</td> <td>1.6%</td> <td>387</td> <td>9</td> <td>10</td> <td>140</td> <td>9</td> <td>10</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>m</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> <td>333.3%</td> <td>0.0%</td>	8	1	8760	Middle College High	0.0%		1.6%	1.6%	387	9	10	140	9	10	4.3%	4.3%	m	10	10	333.3%	0.0%
	NE	3	8786	North Hollywood Senior High	0.0%		0.4%	0.4%	2610	11	18	114	2	2	1.8%	1.8%	284	18	18	6.3%	1.8%
Van Nuys Senior High(0%	U	2	8853	Orthopaedic Hospital	0.0%		0.1%	0.1%	839	1	1	27	0	0	%0'0	0.0%	31	1	1	3.2%	0.0%
m CDE Mediation 0.0% 0.3% 0.4% 0.4% 0.4% 2.30 10 18 10 2 1.8% 1.8% 2.37 18 Reeds Sentor High 0.0% 1.1% 2.1% 1.8%	NE	9	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	0.0%		0.4%	0.3%	2594	10	23	110	5	8	4.5%	4.5%	274	23	23	8.4%	0.7%
Reed Serior High Constrained L1% L1% <thl1%< th=""> L1% L1%<th>LAUSL</th><th>D Similar S</th><th>Schools f.</th><th>rom CDE Median</th><th>0.0%</th><th></th><th>0.4%</th><th>0.4%</th><th>2340</th><th>10</th><th>18</th><th>110</th><th>2</th><th>2</th><th>1.8%</th><th>1.8%</th><th>237</th><th>18</th><th>18</th><th>8.4%</th><th>0.4%</th></thl1%<>	LAUSL	D Similar S	Schools f.	rom CDE Median	0.0%		0.4%	0.4%	2340	10	18	110	2	2	1.8%	1.8%	237	18	18	8.4%	0.4%
Researced Sentor High 00% 11% 21% 18% 1597 34 58 69 4 9 58% 43% 349 58 William Mulcilien	Reside	ent Schoo	slc																		
WillierUnder the field0.0%11%2.6%2.1%11623038413377.3%4.9%1833838Northridge Madler0.0%0.0%0.7%1.5%1.5%1.5%1.5%1.5%1.5%1.3%3338Northridge Madler0.0%0.0%0.7%0.4%1.5%1.5%1.5%1.7%1.21.21.2Northridge Adder0.0%0.0%0.7%0.4%1.1%3.20244661.4642.7%2.7%2.131.5Sever Clevelard Charter High0.0%0.7%0.7%0.7%1.20181.6442.7%2.7%2.131.5Sever Clevelard Charter High0.0%0.6%0.7%0.7%1.20181.64442.7%2.7%2.131.5Sever Clevelard Charter High0.0%0.7%0.7%0.7%1.20181.6442.7%2.7%2.1%1.5Solut Sever Clevelard Charter High0.0%0.7%0.7%0.7%1.1%1.6444772.7%2.1%2.1%1.62.42.452.7%2.7%2.1%2.45555	NN	9	8814	Reseda Senior High	0.0%	1.1%	2.1%	1.8%	1597	34	58	69	4	6	5.8%	4.3%	349	58	59	16.6%	2.3%
Northridge Middle 0.0% 0.4% 15% 15% 13 32 30 3 7 10.0% 10% 177 32 17 32 17 32 32 Northridge Adademy diff 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 10.7 17 13 11	NN	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	0.0%		2.6%	2.1%	1162	30	38	41	3	3	7.3%	4.9%	183	38	139	20.8%	3.3%
Morthridge Academy High 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 172 11 37 0 0 0.0% 172 11 11 Grower Leekend Chrief High 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 1002 66 146 4 6 0 0.0% 2.7% 330 66 66 66 7 7 7 12 <	NN	с	8283	Northridge Middle	0.0%		1.5%	1.5%	839	13	32	30	m	7	10.0%	10.0%	177	32	32	18.1%	4.0%
Grower Cleveland Charter High 0.0% 3.0% 1.4% 1.1% 3.202 4.4 6.6 1.46 4 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 3.30 6.6 6 1.4 6 1.4 6 1.4 6 1.4 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 2.1% 1.5 1.5 1.5 6.4 3 5 4.7% 2.7%<	NN	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	0.0%		0.4%	0.4%	1072	4	11	37	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	172	11	11	6.4%	0.6%
Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences 0.0% 0.4% 0.7% 0.7% 1.201 8 15 6.4 3 5 4.7% 4.7% 2.13 15	MN	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	0.0%		1.4%	1.1%	3202	44	66	146	4	4	2.7%	2.7%	330	66	77	20.0%	4.2%
Join A Stitter Middle 11% 2.8% 2.3% 2.1% 862 2.0 2.4 33 2 6.1% 6.1% 176 2.4 2.4 Robert Futor Cluege Preparatory 0.0% 0.6% 1.2% 1.7% 1.76 2.4 33 2 3 6.1% 6.1% 176 2.4 24 Robert Futor Cluege Preparatory 0.0% 0.6% 1.2% 1.7% 1.7% 1.7% 2.8 33 8 3 14 13 13 19 9.0% 8.3% 4.16 33 4 5.2% 2.60 33 4 36 35 4 35 4 35 4 35 4 35 4 35 4 35 4 35 4 45 35 45 45 35 4 45 35 45 45 35 45 45 35 45 45 35 45 45 35 45 45 35	NN	3	8688	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	0.0%		0.7%	0.7%	1201	8	15	64	3	5	4.7%	4.7%	213	15	16	7.0%	0.9%
Robert Futor College Preparatory 0.0% 0.6% 1.2% 1.0% 1.6% 1.2% 1.2% 1.6% 2.2% 2.6%	MN	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	1.1%	2.8%	2.3%	2.1%	862	20	24	33	2	ŝ	6.1%	6.1%	176	24	25	13.6%	2.8%
Birmingham Community Charter High 5.0% 3.5% 2.7% 2.2% 3.278 87 114 145 13 19 9.0% 8.3% 416 35 6.5 4 6.5 5.5% 6.5% 6.5% 6.5% 7.5% 7.5% 6.5% 6.5% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5% 7.5% 7	Ч	9	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	0.0%	0.6%	1.2%	1.0%	1769	22	33	58	ŝ	4	5.2%	5.2%	269	33	40	12.3%	2.6%
Canoga Park Senior High 0.0% 0.9% 1.2% 1.1% 1.44 1.7 2.4 6.3 4 5 6.3% 6.3% 2.60 2.4 Multifrance Polytechnic 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 1.0% 1.43 1.7 2 2 2 6.3% 6.3% 2.60 2.4 Multifrance Polytechnic 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 1.0% 1.43 20 3 4 5.5% 4.9% 2.60 3 5 5 3 4 5.6% 2.60 3 5 5 5 3 4 5.6% 3.60 3 5 5 5 5 3 4 5.6% 3.60 3 5	XR	с	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	5.0%	3.5%	2.7%	2.2%	3278	87	114	145	13	19	%0.6	8.3%	416	35	48	8.4%	6.0%
John H, Francis Polytechnic 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 386 5 John H, Francis Polytechnic 0.1% 0.0% 0.0% 1.4% 1.1% 1.434 20 32 58 3 4 5.8% 4.9% 260 32	NN	3	8571	Canoga Park Senior High	0.0%		1.2%	1.1%	1434	17	24	63	4	5	6.3%	6.3%	260	24	24	9.2%	1.9%
0.0% 0.9% 1.4% 1.1% 1.434 2.0 3.2 5.8 3 4 5.8% 4.9% 2.60 3.2 3	NE		8636	John H. Francis Polytechnic	0.1%		0.0%	0.0%	2876	1	5	29	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	386	5	5	1.3%	0.0%
	Reside	ent Schoo	ols Media	u	0.0%		1.4%	1.1%	1434	20	32	58	3	4	5.8%	4.9%	260	32	32	12.3%	2.6%

Suspension Events: The number of suspensions issued by the school Suspension burneer of asystem for an innote of days streat for a stream of the school or subgroup by the total enrollment of the school or subgroup (events/enrollment) Suspension Event Rate: The rate is calculated by dividing the total number of suspension events for the school or subgroup (events/enrollment) Single Student Suspension %: The percent of students in the school or subgroup that have been suspended one or more times (students suspension events)

158

Magnolia Science Academy 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.

Image: problemImage:																			
AMOLE TAMORE CONFLICTA Contract Tamore Contract Table														AMAO) 2 - Attainin	ng English Pro	oficiency		
Static bit bitStatic bitNumer bit bit bitNumer bit bitNumer bit bitNumer bit bitNumer bit bitNumer bit bitNumer bit bitNumer bit bitNumer bit bit bitNumer bit bit bitNumer bit bit bitNumer bit bit <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>AN</th> <th>MAO 1 - Ar</th> <th>nual Grow</th> <th>vth</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Less tha</th> <th>in 5 years</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>5 Years</th> <th>or More</th> <th></th>							AN	MAO 1 - Ar	nual Grow	vth			Less tha	in 5 years			5 Years	or More	
genolisience Actedimy genolisience	P				School Type	Number of Annual CELDT Takers	Number in Cohort	Percent with Prior CELDT Scores	Number Met AMAO 1	Percent Met AMAO 1 2014-15		Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2014-15	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14	Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2014-15	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14
	XR			Magnolia Science Academy	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	63	0	0.0%	1	1	I	7		;	ı	56	19	33.9%	46.6%
ower Correland Charter High School Sender High School	LAUSE	D Simila	ar Schools	from CDE															
tendioal subtle semificationedSame shore (hortangree)GeGoGoGoGoGoGoGoGoGoGoGoGoGoIn hortanal Semirity SchoolSemirity SchoolGAAA	NN		8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High School	Senior High School	287	274	95.5%	160	58.4%	57.7%	124	15	12.1%	26.8%	193	84	43.5%	41.8%
Imate differenceSender High School20021087.86.16.17.06.16.16.26.38.3Inder High SchoolSender High School244.06.11.06.1	ш	5	8701	International Studies Learning Center		99	99	100.0%	30	45.5%	69.8%	1	:	:	:	65	26	40.0%	50.6%
dide college high school sentor high school dat 1 <td>J</td> <td>5</td> <td>8750</td> <td>John Marshall Senior High</td> <td>Senior High School</td> <td>240</td> <td>237</td> <td>98.8%</td> <td>112</td> <td>47.3%</td> <td>56.3%</td> <td>76</td> <td>18</td> <td>23.7%</td> <td>30.4%</td> <td>181</td> <td>62</td> <td>34.3%</td> <td>36.6%</td>	J	5	8750	John Marshall Senior High	Senior High School	240	237	98.8%	112	47.3%	56.3%	76	18	23.7%	30.4%	181	62	34.3%	36.6%
oth hollwood Serier HighSerier High School246248146450%150160%141%179173235%173tholdwood Serier High Medical MagnetMagnet-Seri Contained (Senior)373697.3%17175160%161%173	×	1	8760	Middle College High School	Senior High School	4	4	100.0%	1	-	-	0	-			4	-	1	
thopadic Hospital Sanior High Medical MagnetMagnet Safe focanianed (Senior)373	NE	3	8786	North Hollywood Senior High	Senior High School	249	248	%9.66	114	46.0%	43.9%	104	10	9.6%	14.1%	179	51	28.5%	34.2%
n Nuy Selicity	U	2	8853			37	36	97.3%	27	75.0%	68.8%	5	1	1	I	32	20	62.5%	68.0%
matrix for form 240 231 93.64 13.14 13.84 20.64 179 73 36.64 matrix form matrix form senior high school 201 2015 <td>NE</td> <td></td> <td>8893</td> <td></td> <td>Senior High School</td> <td>305</td> <td>303</td> <td>99.3%</td> <td>162</td> <td>53.5%</td> <td>56.4%</td> <td>162</td> <td>25</td> <td>15.4%</td> <td>14.4%</td> <td>181</td> <td>71</td> <td>39.2%</td> <td>45.5%</td>	NE		8893		Senior High School	305	303	99.3%	162	53.5%	56.4%	162	25	15.4%	14.4%	181	71	39.2%	45.5%
Senior High Senior High School Z10 Senior High Z13% Z13% <thz1%< th=""> Z13%</thz1%<>	LAUSL	D Simila	ar Schools	from CDE Median		240	237	99.3%	113	50.4%	57.1%	76	17	13.8%	20.6%	179	57	39.6%	43.7%
sede 3 end r HighSenior High School2102078.6.%798.8.%10087.3%13.3%13.9%13.9%24.5%24.5%r film Mulholland Middle School20720710.0%8.1%51.7%6.117.7%11.5%17.9%17.	Reside	ent Sch	tools																
fillam Mulholland Middle School207207100.0%10751.7%51.7%6117.7%11.5%	NN		8814	Reseda Senior High	Senior High School	210	207	98.6%	62	38.2%	50.8%	110	8	7.3%	21.3%	139	34	24.5%	37.0%
orthridge Middle School middle School 170 170 100 8 50.5% 45.7% 48 9 18.8% 25.0% 142 46 32.4% orthridge Acdemy Senior High School 76 76 70 100.0% 46 56.7% 48.8% 11 8 72.7% 65 30 46.2% 46.2% ore Cleveland Charter High School Senior High School 28 71 124 15 124 132 45 45.3% 43.3% 43.3% 43.3% 43.3% 45.3%	NN	_	8259	William Mulholland Middle School	Middle School	207	207	100.0%	107	51.7%	51.7%	62	11	17.7%	11.5%	171	64	37.4%	43.8%
orthridge cademy Senior High School Ted Ted Res Res Ted Res Ted Res Ted Res	NN		8283	Northridge Middle School	Middle School	170	170	100.0%	86	50.6%	45.7%	48	6	18.8%	25.0%	142	46	32.4%	32.7%
rower Cleveland Charter High School Senior High School Z87 Z14 S57.% 124 124 12 12.1% 26.8% 133 843 43.5% 1 sile Vacademy of Arts and Sciences Senior High School 43 95.3% 84.3 57.7% 11 7 65.6% 133 843 43.3% 13 16.3% 23 19 59.4% 53.4% 13 7 16.3% 21 61 28.9% 43.3% 14 26.6% 193 28.9% 43.3% 14 7 16.3% 211 61 28.9% 7 16.3% 17.0% 211 61 28.9% 7 54.4% 54.4% 54.4% 14.4 16.4	NN		8513	Northridge Academy Senior High	Senior High School	76	76	100.0%	46	60.5%	48.8%	11	8	72.7%	1	65	30	46.2%	32.1%
alley Academy of Arts and Sciences Senior High School 43 41 95.3% 44.3% 11 7 65.6% 32 19 59.4% n A Sutter Middle School 238 238 100.7% 108 45.4% 53.4% 43 7 16.3% 21.75% 211 61 28.9% n A Sutter Middle School Span Schools (Not Magnets) 394 393 99.7% 161 41.2% 131 20 13.7% 211 61 28.9% 7 short Futhon College Preparatory School Span Schools (Not Magnets) 394 393 161 41.2% 131 20 13.7% 211 80 26.6% 7 81.9% 15.3% 15.3% 213 20 26.6% 7 28.9% 7 15.6% 16.7 80 26.6% 7 21.3% 21.3% 21.3% 21.6% 26.6% 26.6% 7 21.3% 21.9% 28.1% 26.6% 26.6% 26.6% 26.6% 26.6% 26.6	NN		8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High School	Senior High School	287	274	95.5%	160	58.4%	57.7%	124	15	12.1%	26.8%	193	84	43.5%	41.8%
In A Sutter Middle School 238 100.0% 108 45.4% 52.4% 43 7 16.3% 21.5% 211 61 28.9% 5 ober Future Ollege Preparatory School Span Schools (Not Magnets) 394 393 99.7% 161 41.0% 43.5% 131 20 15.3% 211 80 26.6% 7 7 15.3% 17.0% 301 80 26.6% 7 7 15.3% 17.0% 301 80 26.6% 7 7 16 23.3% 16.6% 7 16.4% 7 16.4% 17.0% 301 80 26.6% 7 7 15.3% 17.0% 301 80 26.6% 7 7 15.4% 16.7% 16.6% 7 16.6% 7 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% 16.6% <t< td=""><td>NN</td><td></td><td>8898</td><td>Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences</td><td>Senior High School</td><td>43</td><td>41</td><td>95.3%</td><td>28</td><td>68.3%</td><td>44.3%</td><td>11</td><td>7</td><td>63.6%</td><td>I</td><td>32</td><td>19</td><td>59.4%</td><td>32.1%</td></t<>	NN		8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	Senior High School	43	41	95.3%	28	68.3%	44.3%	11	7	63.6%	I	32	19	59.4%	32.1%
Obsert Futer College Preparatory School Span Schools (Not Magnets) 394 393 99.7% 161 41.0% 41.3 20 15.3% 17.0% 301 80 26.6% rmingham Community Charter High School Senior High School 336 336 100.0% 173 51.5% 48.9% 146 23 15.3% 248 97 391.% 80 36.6% 331.% 31.5% 38.9% 17 36.9% 37 56.4% 52.1% 86 11 12.8% 11.0% 115 40 34.8% non das ParkSenior High Senior High School 314 17 86.7% 55.1% 86 11 12.8% 11.0% 11.9% 40 34.8% h n H Francis Polytechnic Senior High Senior High School 381 39.7% 166 43.7% 48.9% 86 11 15.3% 11.0% 10.7% 10.4% 14.8% 14.8% 14.8% 14.8% 14.9% 14.8% 14.8% 14.8% 14.8% 14.9%	NN		8406	John A Sutter Middle School	Middle School	238	238	100.0%	108	45.4%	52.4%	43	7	16.3%	27.5%	211	61	28.9%	39.2%
rmingham Community Charter High School Senior High School 336 100.0% 173 51.5% 48.9% 146 23 13.3% 248 97 39.1% 13.4% snoge Park Senior High Senior High School 174 172 98.9% 97 56.4% 52.1% 86 11 12.8% 11.0% 115 40 34.8% 14.4% 12.8% 11.0% 11.0% 115 40 34.8% 14.4% 13.4% 11.0% 11.0% 11.0% 11.4% 13.4% 14.	NE	9	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory School		394	393	99.7%	161	41.0%	44.2%	131	20	15.3%	17.0%	301	80	26.6%	28.6%
anoga Park Senior High Senior High School 174 172 98.9% 97 56.4% 52.1% 86 11 12.8% 11.0% 115 40 34.8% 1 hn H Francis Polytechnic Senior High Senior High School 381 380 99.7% 166 43.7% 48.1% 139 19 11.2% 287 90 31.4% hn H Francis Polytechnic Senior High Senior High School 381 380 99.7% 166 43.7% 48.1% 139 19 11.2% 287 90 31.4% 1	XR	e	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High School	Senior High School	336	336	100.0%	173	51.5%	48.9%	146	23	15.8%	13.3%	248	97	39.1%	32.6%
hn H Francis Polytechnic Senior High Senior High School 381 380 99.7% 166 43.7% 48.1% 139 19 11.2% 287 90 31.4% hn H Francis Polytechnic Senior High Senior High School 381 39.7% 107 51.5% 48.1% 139 19 11.2% 287 90 31.4% Anti-Antice Senior High 200 207 99.7% 107 51.5% 48.9% 86 11 15.8% 170 61 34.8%	NN		8571	Canoga Park Senior High	Senior High School	174	172	98.9%	97	56.4%	52.1%	86	11	12.8%	11.0%	115	40	34.8%	32.2%
210 207 99.7% 107 51.5% 48.9% 86 11 15.8% 171 61 34.8%	NE		8636	John H Francis Polytechnic Senior High	Senior High School	381	380	99.7%	166	43.7%	48.1%	139	19	13.7%	11.2%	287	90	31.4%	36.9%
	Reside	ent Schu	ools Medi	an		210	207	99.7%	107	51.5%	48.9%	86	11	15.8%	17.0%	171	61	34.8%	32.7%

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

LD	01.0103				English Lan	English Language Arts		•	Mathe	Mathematics	
	BD C I	Loc Code	Subgroup	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
XR	6 8	8454 Magnolia Science Academy	All Students	26	31	33	10	33	36	16	15
			African American	:	:	:	:	:	:	1	:
			Latino	59	33	31	7	35	39	15	11
			English Learners	81	19	0	0	81	19	0	0
			Soc-eco Disadvantaged	28	31	32	6	34	37	16	13
			Students with Disabilities	29	22	10	0	76	16	9	2
LAUSD Sim	ilar Scho	AUSD Similar Schools from CDE									
ΝN	3 8	8590 Grover Cleveland Charter High School	All Students	6	22	38	31	33	28	27	12
ш	5 8	8701 International Studies Learning Center	All Students	24	26	35	15	41	28	20	11
U	5 8	8750 John Marshall Senior High	All Students	15	19	36	30	40	24	23	13
Μ	1 8	8760 Middle College High School	All Students	0	15	54	31	31	35	32	1
NE	3 8	8786 North Hollywood Senior High	All Students	19	22	32	27	38	25	20	18
J	2 8	8853 Orthopaedic Hospital Senior High Medical Magne	All Students	9	19	47	28	34	30	22	14
NE	6 8	8893 Van Nuys Senior High	All Students	13	21	43	23	35	28	25	13
LAUSD Sim	ilar Scho	.AUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	All Students	13	21	38	28	35	28	23	13
Resident Schools	chools										
ΝN	6 8	8814 Reseda Senior High	All Students	15	25	36	24	46	24	20	11
NN	3 8	8259 William Mulholland Middle School	All Students	37	28	27	7	52	25	13	6
NN	3 8	8283 Northridge Middle School	All Students	45	26	23	5	55	24	13	8
NN	3 8	8513 Northridge Academy Senior High	All Students	16	21	36	27	41	33	21	5
NN	3 8	8590 Grover Cleveland Charter High School	All Students	6	22	38	31	33	28	27	12
NN	3 8	8898 Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	All Students	12	20	45	22	54	30	12	4
NN	4 8	8406 John A Sutter Middle School	All Students	41	33	23	3	57	25	13	5
NE	6 8	8142 Robert Fulton College Preparatory School	All Students	45	31	20	4	64	27	8	2
XR	3 8	8557 Birmingham Community Charter High School	All Students	14	22	40	24	44	31	19	7
NN	3 8	8571 Canoga Park Senior High	All Students	13	24	38	26	51	29	13	7
NE	6 8	8636 John H Francis Polytechnic Senior High	All Students	22	26	33	19	44	25	19	12
Resident Schools Median	chools M	edian	All Students	16	25	36	22	51	27	13	7

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

2014-15	4-15					English Lan	English Language Arts			Mathe	Mathematics	
ΓD	BD	Loc Code	School	Subgroup	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
XR	9	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	All Students	32	32	28	7	38	38	15	6
				African American				1	-	1		1
				Latino	35	32	27	9	42	38	14	9
				English Learners	81	19	0	0	85	15	0	0
				Soc-eco	55	37	86	7	30	30	V1	×
				Disadvantaged	ĥ	72	07		60	60	ţ	D
				Students with Disabilities	57	34	6	0	79	19	2	0
LAUSD 5	Similar S	AUSD Similar Schools from CDE	im CDE									
ΝN	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High School	All Students	12	24	33	30	37	31	22	10
ш	5	8701	International Studies Learning Center	All Students	35	26	29	10	47	30	16	7
C	5	8750	John Marshall Senior High	All Students	17	22	35	26	38	22	54	16
Ν	1	8760	8760 Middle College High School	All Students	14	28	39	18	57	30	12	1
NE	3	8786	8786 North Hollywood Senior High	All Students	11	25	34	30	35	29	18	18
J	2	8853	Orthopaedic Hospital Senior High Medical Magne	All Students	6	19	50	22	41	33	21	9
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	All Students	18	27	35	20	35	27	23	14
LAUSD 2	Similar S	Schools fro	AUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	All Students	14	25	35	22	38	30	21	10
Residen	Resident Schools	slo										
ΝN	9	8814	Reseda Senior High	All Students	18	29	40	13	61	23	12	4
ΝN	3	8259	8259 William Mulholland Middle School	All Students	44	31	21	3	61	21	12	5
ΝN	3	8283	8283 Northridge Middle School	All Students	41	35	21	2	58	29	6	4
ΝN	3	8513	8513 Northridge Academy Senior High	All Students	15	29	35	20	47	28	21	5
ΝN	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High School	All Students	12	24	33	30	37	31	22	10
NN	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	All Students	8	24	49	19	51	31	15	3
NN	4	8406	John A Sutter Middle School	All Students	51	29	18	2	56	29	11	5
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory School	All Students	52	29	16	3	68	23	7	2
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High School	All Students	24	34	31	11	67	20	10	3
ΝN	3	8571	Canoga Park Senior High	All Students	20	27	42	11	55	32	11	2
NE	9	8636	8636 John H Francis Polytechnic Senior High	All Students	21	31	34	14	43	26	23	6
Residen	it School.	Resident Schools Median		All Students	21	29	33	11	56	28	12	4

PLOC	PLOC School Name	Board District	Test	Grade	Subgroup ID	Students with Scores	Percentage Standard Not Met	Percentage Standard Nearly Met	Percentage Standard Met	Percentage Standard Exceeded
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	ELA	9	EL	16	81%	19%	%0	%0
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	ELA	7	EL	7				
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	ELA	∞	EL	9				
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	ELA	11	EL	m				
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	MATH	9	EL	16	88%	13%	%0	%0
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	MATH	7	EL	7				
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	MATH	∞	EL	9				
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	MATH	11	EL	ß				
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	ELA	9	RFEP	45	24%	27%	33%	16%
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	ELA	7	RFEP	53	25%	36%	36%	4%
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	ELA	∞	RFEP	58	24%	38%	31%	7%
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	ELA	11	RFEP	47	%6	30%	45%	17%
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	MATH	9	RFEP	45	29%	33%	20%	18%
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	MATH	7	RFEP	53	26%	51%	13%	6%
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	MATH	∞	RFEP	58	38%	31%	12%	19%
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	MATH	11	RFEP	47	19%	40%	26%	15%
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	ELA	9	SPED	15	80%	13%	%L	%0
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	ELA	7	SPED	12	58%	42%	%0	%0
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	ELA	8	SPED	14	71%	14%	14%	%0
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	ELA	11	SPED	8				
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	MATH	9	SPED	15	63%	%0	%0	7%
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	MATH	7	SPED	12	58%	33%	8%	%0
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	MATH	∞	SPED	14	79%	14%	7%	%0
8454	Magnolia Sci Acad	9	MATH	11	SPED	8				

In the Z013 Growth API data. 2013 2013 2013 2013 Solidar Solidar Me 2013 2012 2013 2013 Similar Schools Me 2014 Enrolled # Conf Base Growth State Schools Schools Tr 01 1st Day API API Rank Rank Schools Tr 43.2 6-12 759 756 4 5 10 365 6-12 759 761 5 7 10 10 372 6-12 755 748 3 8 7 10 182 6-12 757 761 5 7 7 10 236 6-12 757 761 5 7 7 10 235 6-12 757 761 5 7 7 10	and similar schools ranks are				4						
2013 2013 <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Schoo</td><td>School Demographic Characteristics</td><td>aphic Cha</td><td>racterist</td><td>tics</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>				Schoo	School Demographic Characteristics	aphic Cha	racterist	tics			
432 6-12 805 797 7 10 365 6-12 759 756 4 5 372 6-12 785 748 3 8 182 6-12 757 761 5 7 236 6-12 843 759 4 5 7	Met 2013 % Free/ Subgroup Reduced Targets Lunch	d % Sp Ed % GATE		% EL % RFE	% RFEP % Latino	% White	% Af. Amer	% Asian	% Fili %	% Am % Pacific Indian Island	ic % Two or More
365 6-12 759 756 4 5 372 6-12 785 748 3 8 182 6-12 767 761 5 7 236 6-12 843 759 4 5 7	No 88	12	0 10	0 50	76	10	1	5	9	0	0
372 6-12 785 748 3 8 182 6-12 767 761 5 7 236 6-12 843 759 4 5 7	No 67	16	0 15	5 31	71	13	5	4	4	0 1	2
182 6-12 767 761 5 7 236 6-12 843 759 4 5	No 72	10	0 5	19	44	2	51	1	1	0 1	1
236 6-12 843 759 4 5	No 76	12	0 8	30	60	18	16	2	2	0 1	1
	No 85	6	0 17	7 48	81	9	з	5	5	0	0
Magnolia Science Academy 6 126 6- 8 845 828 7 7 7 Yes	No 48	10	0 3	14	50	20	15	e	9	2 1	e
Magnolia Science Academy 7 116 K- 5 906 904 9 10 Yes	Yes 73	16	1 15	5 20	61	23	2	2	5	0	e
Magnolia Science Academy Bell 490 6-8 714 763 4 5 Yes	Yes 94	7	0 16	5 47	98	2	0	0	0	0 0	0
301 795 762 5 7	75	11	0 13	3 31	99	12	4	4	5	0 1	1

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS 2012 BASE API AND 2013 GROWTH API DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION This page displays the 2012 Base API, 2013 Growth API, school ranks and the demographic information from the 2013 Growth API report.

Report updated on: 6/24/2016 163

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS OCTOBER 2015 CALPADS DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

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

2		Loc		Total Enroll	% F/R	0/ CVTE	0/ EI	0/ 1 -+: 0/ 1/// 0/	0/ 11/14:41	% Af.	0/ Acian	0/ F:I:	% Am	% Pacific	% Two or
3		Code	3CH001	#	Meal	% GAIE	70 EL	‰ Launo	≫ wnite	Amer.	70 ASIdf1	70 FIII.	Indian	Island	More
XR	9		8454 Magnolia Science Academy	540	91%	1%	12%	84%	7%	1%	4%	3%	%0	%0	%0
XR	ю	8461	8461 Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	%62	2%	13%	82%	%6	3%	2%	2%	%0	%0	1%
XR	7	8464	8464 Magnolia Science Academy 3	455	81%	1%	5%	49%	2%	44%	1%	%0	1%	1%	3%
XR	4	8011	8011 Magnolia Science Academy 4	184	76%	1%	%6	78%	8%	10%	1%	1%	%0	1%	1%
XR	9	8012	8012 Magnolia Science Academy 5	148	89%	4%	28%	82%	8%	5%	1%	4%	%0	%0	1%
XR	1	8013	8013 Magnolia Science Academy 6	165	84%	1%	15%	85%	3%	10%	1%	%0	%0	%0	1%
XR	з	8014	8014 Magnolia Science Academy 7	291	74%	2%	32%	%99	19%	5%	2%	3%	%0	%0	2%
XR		5166	5 5166 Magnolia Science Academy Bell	493	94%	1%	14%	93%	6%	%0	1%	%0	%0	%0	%0
Schoc	Schools Median	dian		373	83%	1%	14%	82%	7%	5%	1%	2%	%0	%0	1%

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS RECLASSIFICATION RATES

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. This page displays the number of English learners (ELs) on Census Day, the number of students reclassified since the prior Census Day, beginning in 2013-14, the state moved the collection of official EL and Reclassification counts from Spring Census to Fall Census. The number reclassified by the number of prior year ELs. These data have historically been collected as of Spring Census Day. However, and the reclassification rate for each specified year. The reclassification rate, displayed in percentage, is calculated by dividing the 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.

9	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	9	8454	8454 Magnolia Science Academy	45	56	36%	72	21	29%	64	21	33%
XR	3	8461	8461 Magnolia Science Academy 2	56	6	15%	89	12	18%	99	20	30%
XR	7	8464	8464 Magnolia Science Academy 3	18	6	28%	27	0	%0	35	18	51%
XR	4	8011	8011 Magnolia Science Academy 4	14	1	5%	25	0	%0	28	3	11%
XR	6	8012	8012 Magnolia Science Academy 5	41	8	18%	48	10	21%	34	2	6%
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	8	1	14%	12	3	25%	19	8	42%
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	42	15	40%	96	23	24%	74	0	0%
XR	5	5166	5166 Magnolia Science Academy Bell	76	19	19%	87	16	18%	74	21	28%
Schools Median	Is Me	alian		42	6	19%	28	11	20%	50	13	29%

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS RECLASSIFICATION OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

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

			2015-16	
		2015-16 #	Reclassification Ch	Change from Prior
2015-16	2014-15 # EL	Reclassified	Rate	Year
Schools Median	50	13	0	%2'6
District	164,349	19,952	12.1%	-4.5%

		# 17 7 700	2014-15	
2014-15	2013-14 # EL	Reclassified	Rate	
Schools Median	58	11	19.6%	
District	179,322	29,694	16.6%	

			2013-14
		2013-14 #	Reclassification
2013-14	2012-13 # EL	Reclassified	Rate
Schools Median	42	6	18.7%
District	170,797	25,532	13.9%

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

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

9	BD	Loc Code	School	OCT 2015 Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll %	% High Incidence	% Low Incidence	# AUT	# DB	# DEAF	# ED	# EMD	# HOH # MR EMD	MR	# #IHO	# OI	SLD* S	# SLI*	# TBI	I> #
XR	6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	540	85	16%	89%	11%	7	:	1	1	1	2	:	- 6	-	60	7	-	1
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	98	18%	91%	%6	5	:	:	-	:	1	-	24 2	1	51	3	-	-
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	455	48	11%	%06	10%	3	-	-	1	-	1	-	7		34	2	-	-
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	184	25	14%	84%	16%	4	1	-	-	-	I	-	- 9	-	12	3	-	-
XR	9	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	148	28	19%	93%	7%	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	4 -	-	20	2	-	-
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	165	27	16%	78%	22%	2	-	-	-	-	4	-	11 -	-	6	1	-	-
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	291	36	12%	94%	6%	2	-	1	-	-	I	-	3	-	8	23	-	-
XR	5	5166	5166 Magnolia Science Academy Bell	493	53	11%	85%	15%	9	1	1	1	-	1	-	4	1	37	4	-	-
Schoo	Schools Median	dian		373	42	15%	%68	11%	4	:	:	1	:	1	:	7	1	27	3	:	1

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

37%

63%

10%

25%

28%

28%

8%

289

53%

48%

20%

33%

31%

11%

5%

289

Schools Median

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

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

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

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS HIGH SCHOOL DATA

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

XR 6 8454 Magnolia Science Academy 6-12 95% 93% 95% 95% XR 3 8461 Magnolia Science Academy 2 6-12 97% 87% 83% 83% 83% XR 7 8464 Magnolia Science Academy 3 6-12 89% 81% 62% 71% XR 4 8011 Magnolia Science Academy 4 6-12 88% 90% 88% 91% XR 6 8012 Magnolia Science Academy 5 6-12 88% 92% 88% 91% XR 1 8013 Magnolia Science Academy 5 6-12 85% 92% 87% 96% XR 1 8013 Magnolia Science Academy 5 6-12 85% 92% 87% 96% XR 1 8013 Magnolia Science Academy 6 6-8 $ $	ΓD	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
4461 Magnolia Science Academy 2 6-12 97% 87% 83% 83% 4464 Magnolia Science Academy 3 6-12 89% 81% 62% 8 6011 Magnolia Science Academy 4 6-12 88% 90% 88% 8 6012 Magnolia Science Academy 5 6-12 88% 90% 88% 8 6013 Magnolia Science Academy 6 6-8 6014 Magnolia Science Academy 7 K-5 <	XR	9	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	6-12	%56	93%	%86	95%	88%
4464 Magnolia Science Academy 3 6-12 89% 81% 62% 8 6011 Magnolia Science Academy 4 6-12 88% 90% 88% 8 6012 Magnolia Science Academy 5 6-12 85% 92% 87% 7 8013 Magnolia Science Academy 6 6-8 8014 Magnolia Science Academy 7 K-5 8014 Magnolia Science Academy 7 K-5 <	XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	6-12	%26	87%	83%	83%	100%
(011 Magnolia Science Academy 4 6-12 88% 90% 88% 89% 89% 89% 89% 89% 89% 89% 89% 89% 89% 89% 89% 89% 89% 89% 80% 89% 80% 89% 80% 89% 80%	XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	6-12	%68	81%	62%	71%	88%
(012 Magnolia Science Academy 5 6-12 85% 92% 87% 87% (013 Magnolia Science Academy 6 6-8 16 Magnolia Science Academy 7 K-5 16 16 Magnolia Science Academy 8ell 6-8 16 16 16 16 16 16 Magnolia Science Academy 8ell 6-8 16	XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	6-12	%88	%06	88%	91%	88%
8013 Magnolia Science Academy 6 6- 8 8014 Magnolia Science Academy 7 K- 5 8014 Magnolia Science Academy 7 K- 5 8016 Magnolia Science Academy Bell 6- 8 166 Magnolia Science Academy Bell 6- 8	XR	6	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	6-12	85%	92%	87%	96%	1
t014 Magnolia Science Academy 7 K- 5 15 16 Magnolia Science Academy Bell 6- 8 <td>XR</td> <td>1</td> <td>8013</td> <td>Magnolia Science Academy 6</td> <td>6-8</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>-</td> <td>1</td>	XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	6-8		1	1	-	1
166 Magnolia Science Academy Bell 6- 8	XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	K- 5		-	-	-	
89% 90% 87%	XR	5		Magnolia Science Academy Bell	8-9		1	-	-	1
	School	ls Med	ian		:	%68	%06	87%	91%	88%

OUT-OF-SCHOOL SUSPENSION EVENTS MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS

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.

								301E 16							2015-16 SUBGROUPS	BGROUPS				
												AFRICAN A	AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS	TUDENTS	_		STUDEN	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY	ABILITY	
Γ	BD	Loc Code	School	Susp. Event Rate 2013- 14	Susp. Event Susp. Rate 2013- Event Rate	Susp. Event Single Std. Rate Susp. %		# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015- 16	Susp. Event Single Std. Rate 2015- Susp % 201	Susp. Event Single Std. Rate 2015- Susp % 2015- # Enrolled	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015- 16		Susp. Event Single Std. Rate 2015- Susp % 2015- 16
XR	9	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	540	1	5	£	,	:	Q 1	Q 1	84		:	Q 1	2 :
XR	m	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	1.6%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	487	е	12	14	-	1	-		82	-	-	-	;
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	2.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	455	0	0	198	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	47	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	%6'9	2.6%	%0'0	0.0%	184	0	0	19	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	24	0	0	%0'0	0.0%
XR	9	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	2.9%	1.9%	%0'0	0.0%	148	0	0	7	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	28	0	0	%0'0	0.0%
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	0.7%	%9'0	%9'0	0.6%	165	1	1	17	1	1	5.9%	5.9%	27	1	-		;
XR	£	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	%0.0	%0'0	%0'0	0.0%	291	0	0	14	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	34	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%	54	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Schoc	Schools Median	ian		1.2%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	373	0	0	14	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	41	0	0	%0'0	0.0%

Suspension Events: The number of suspensions issued by the school Suspension Days: The total number of days issued for all suspension events Suspension Events. The rate is calculated by dividing the total number of suspension events for the school or subgroup by the total enrollment of the school or subgroup (events/enrollment) Single Student Suspension %: The percent of students in the school or subgroup by the total enrollment of the school or subgroup (events/enrollment) Single Student Suspension %: The percent of students in the school or subgroup that have been suspended one or more times (students suspended/enrollment)

171

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

													AMA0 2	2 - Attaining	AMAO 2 - Attaining English Proficiency	oficiency		
						AM	AO 1 - Ani	AMAO 1 - Annual Growth	÷			Less thai	Less than 5 years			5 Years or More	or More	
LD	D BD) Loc Code	School	School Type	Number of Annual CELDT Takers	Number Percent of Annual Number in with Prior CELDT Cohort CELDT Takers Scores	Percent with Prior CELDT Scores	Number Met AMAO 1	Percent Met AMAO 1 2014-15	Percent Met Ni AMAO 1 2013-14	Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2014-15	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14	Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2014-15	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14
XR	R 6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	63	0	0.0%	:	:		7		:		56	19	33.9%	46.6%
XR	R 3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy #2	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	65	0	%0:0	1	1	56.0%	14	7	50.0%	;	51	22	43.1%	41.7%
XR	R 7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy #3	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	29	16	55.2%	-	1	1	1	1		;	29	12	41.4%	
XR	R 4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy #4	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	16	13	81.3%	8	61.5%	-	2			:	22	8	36.4%	-
XR	R 6	8012	Magnolia Science Academy #5	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	27	22	81.5%	4	18.2%	59.5%	12	0	%0.0	:	22	4	18.2%	46.3%
XR	R 1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy #6	Middle School	20	0	%0:0		:	-	7			;	15	7	46.7%	
XR	R 3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy #7	Elementary School	06	06	100.0%	53	58.9%	66.2%	91	35	38.5%	37.5%	5	:		
XR	R 5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell @ South Region MS #2A	Middle School	75	0	%0:0			-	3			;	72	30	41.7%	31.7%
CM	O Schot	CMO Schools Median			46	7	27.6%	8	58.9%	59.5%	7	7	38.5%	37.5%	26	12	41.4%	44.0%

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

BOARD OF EDUCATION REPORT #163-16/17 October 18, 2016

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>.

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," "MSA-1," or "Charter School") charter petition for a term of five years. (Exhibit 1, Petition). The school serves 538 students in grades 6-12 in Board District 6 and Local District Northwest, and is currently located on a private site at 18238 Sherman Way, Reseda, CA 91335.

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.
- 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. <u>ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE</u>

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. <u>Summary</u>

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

The school's 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) results show levels of academic performance that are below the Resident Schools Median in English Language Arts (ELA) and above the Resident Schools Median in Mathematics. Internal assessment data show moderate levels of academic achievement and growth both schoolwide and for the school's numerically significant subgroups. Historically, under the former API system, in the 2013-2014 and 2012-2013 school years, the Charter School earned a Statewide rank of 7 and 8 respectively, and a Similar Schools rank of 10

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.

both years. (Exhibit 2 - Magnolia Science Academy Data Set and Exhibit3 - Magnolia Science Academy SBAC Data).

In 2015-2016, MSA-1's English Learner reclassification rate of 33% was higher than both the Similar and Resident School Median rates. In 2014-2015, Magnolia Science Academy's reclassification rate was 29%. (Exhibit 2, Magnolia Science Academy Data Set).

B. <u>Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math</u>

On the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 43% of MSA-1's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is lower than the Resident Schools Median of 58%. In Math, 31% of MSA-1 students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 20%. On the 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 35% of MSA-1's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is less than the Resident Schools Median of 44%. In Math, 24% of MSA-1's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 16%. (Exhibit 3 - Magnolia Science Academy SBAC Data).

C. <u>Student Subgroup Academic Growth</u>

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-1 with the recognition that this performance is the most important factor when deciding whether to renew the charter. MSA-1 serves the following numerically significant pupil subgroups: 84% Latinos, 91% Students who Qualify for Free and Reduced Meal, 12% English Learners, and 16% Students with Disabilities. (Exhibit 2 - Magnolia Science Academy Data Set).

The Charter School's record of academic performance does indicate that MSA-1's numerically significant student subgroups have achieved growth in academic performance except for the English Learner subgroup. Based on the past two years of CAASPP (SBAC) data, Latino students showed an increase of 5 percentage points in ELA and 6 percentage points in Math. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students showed an increase of 6 percentage points in ELA and 7 percentage points in Math. Students with Disabilities increased 1 percentage point in ELA and 6 percentage points in Math. However, the English Learner subgroup made no gains. That is, in both years, no English Learner students Met and Exceeded Standards in both ELA and Math. (Exhibit 3 - Magnolia Science Academy SBAC Data).

As part of the District's extra consideration of MSA-1's increases in academic achievement, an analysis of MSA-1's 2016 CAASPP (SBAC) subgroup performance compared to subgroup performance of District resident schools ("Resident Schools") has been performed. When comparing the percentage of students who Met or Exceeded the performance standards, the Latino subgroup in ELA is lower than 7 out of 11 Resident Schools; in Math, MSA-1 exceeds 9 out of 11 Resident Schools. For the English Learner subgroup in ELA, MSA-1 is lower than 7

out of 10 Resident Schools; in Math, at 0% of students who Met or Exceeded the performance standards, MSA-1 was equal to 5 Resident Schools and lower than the other 5. It should be noted that one Resident School had less than 10 English learners taking the CAASPP assessment which resulted in a score of an asterisk (*) in the category of English learner. For the Socio-economically Disadvantaged subgroup in ELA, MSA-1 is lower than 7 out of 11 Resident Schools; in Math, the Charter School exceeds 8 out of 11 Resident Schools. Finally, for the Students with Disabilities subgroup in ELA, MSA-1 is lower than 7 out of 11 Resident Schools; in Math, the Charter School exceeds 8 out of 11 Resident Schools. Finally, for the Students with Disabilities subgroup in ELA, MSA-1 is lower than 7 out of 11 Resident Schools; in Math, the Charter School exceeds 8 out of 11 Resident Schools. (Exhibit 4, Magnolia Science Academy SBAC Resident Schools Subgroup Data).

Schoolwide 2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment data confirms that the performance of the Charter School is lower than the performance of the Resident Schools Median in ELA (43% compared to 58%). Conversely, the performance of the Charter School is higher than the performance of Resident Schools Median in Math (31% compared to 20%). (Exhibit 3, Magnolia Science Academy 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 and business operations 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 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. <u>FINDINGS OF FACT FOR DENIAL.</u>

A. MSA-1 is Demonstrably Unlikely to Successfully Implement the Programs Set Forth in the Petition

The District's oversight of MSA-1 has revealed that MSA-1 is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the programs in the petition, for reasons including the following:

1. <u>Failure to Respond To Reasonable Inquiries Interfere with the District's Oversight of</u> <u>the School</u>:

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" interfering with the District's oversight of the school and thereby impeding a full and timely assessment of the organization's fiscal and business operations.

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 <u>2015-16 fiscal year</u>. 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 and business operations 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, <u>over two years after</u> 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.

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.

Although MERF has provided the District with some information, it has declined to provide the back-up documentation such as H-1B visa applications, H-1B visas granted, invoices and receipts for H-1B visa related expenses, and other immigration related applications, which would allow the OIG to determine whether the expenditures were appropriate.

- In its correspondence on August 22, 2016, MERF stated it would only make the following documents and information available for OIG to review at MERF's site (contrary to assertions by MERF related to some, but not all, categories, OIG has never received complete copies of these documents):
 - Lease agreements, discounted notes, contracts
 - Ownership of property leased or used
 - Source documents, e.g., invoices, receipts, etc., for bank records
 - Subsidiary journals for accounts receivable, intercompany loans, and adjusting journal entries, including source documents
 - Loan documents
 - Backup documents, loan agreements, Board approvals for inter-company and intra-company loans
 - List of donations and pledges
 - Grant applications
 - Grant awards and accounting of fund expenditure
 - Recruitment activities
 - Employment contracts
 - List of current vendors, contractors, and subcontractors
 - Current vendor and facility contracts
 - MPS student enrollee data
- On August 5, 2016, State Superintendent Tom Torlakson sent a correspondence to MERF requesting a series of documentation in order to respond to a complaint received by the California Department of Education regarding MERF. In that letter, Superintendent Torlakson noted that it is the CDE's understanding that the OIG has requested a series of documents from each of the MPS charter school's inception to the present date and that it is their understanding that MPS has declined to release these documents. (See Exhibit 13, Letter to Umit Yapanel and Caprice Young from Tom Torlakson, August 5, 2016).

By failing to provide timely documentation originally requested by the OIG back on July 29, 2014, MERF impeded the ability of the District to fully exercise general and fiscal oversight and responsibility in order to monitor the fiscal condition of MERF pursuant to Education Code section 47604.32, and violated the terms of its District authorized charters and the requirement of Education Code section 47604.3 requiring that it "promptly respond to all reasonable inquiries, including, but not limited to, inquiries regarding financial records, from its chartering authority."

2. <u>Inconsistent Adherence to Board Approved Fiscal Policies and Procedures:</u>

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
 - <u>Governance Structure (Element 4)</u> The petition <u>does not</u> 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

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

Government Code section 1090 et seq. and District policies applicable to the Charter School. For instance, the Bylaws in Article XII, section 1 allow for approval of transactions in which a non-director designated employee (e.g., officers and other key decision–making employees) directly or indirectly has a material financial interest as the non-director designated employee files a statement of economic interest with the Corporation in conformance with the Conflict of Interest Code (see Conflict of Interest Policy section II, "Designated Employees" and page 1, 2nd paragraph of the Conflict of Interest Code). However, if an officer or key decision-making employee has a material interest in a contract/transaction entered into by the Board, this would not suffice to avoid violation of Govt. Code 1090 et seq. and District policies applicable to the Charter School.

• The petition and Charter School's corporate board Bylaws (See specifically Article VII, sections 5 and 6) inconsistently specify how corporate Board Directors are selected. Also, although the petition specifies that Magnolia's governance structure provides for staggered terms which is accomplished through the Corporate Bylaws by appointing members of the Board at different times and for staggered terms, the process as described is not reflected in the Bylaws.

• Employee Qualifications (Element 5)

The petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of employee qualifications.

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

• Admission Requirements (Element 8)

The petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the charter school's admission requirements.

- The petition does not include a reasonably comprehensive description of the manner in which the Charter School will implement a public random drawing process in the event that applications for enrollment exceed school capacity. Among other deficiencies, the petition does not describe how preference will be granted in the lottery to the student categories listed in the petition, and unclearly identifies where the lottery will be held.
- The petition does not sufficiently describe the procedures the Charter School will follow to determine waiting list priorities based upon lottery results and to enroll students from the waiting list or the means by which

the Charter School will notify parents/guardians of students who have been offered a seat as a result of the lottery or from the waiting list following a lottery, and the procedures and timelines under which parents/guardians must respond in order to secure admission.

• <u>Suspension and Expulsion Procedures (Element 10)</u>

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. Cleary 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. <u>RECOMMENDATION</u>

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: 84% Latinos, 91% Students who Qualify for Free and Reduced Meal, 12 % English Learners, and 16% Students with Disabilities.

1. The Charter School's record of academic performance does indicate that most of MSA-1's numerically significant student subgroups have achieved growth in academic performance. However, the English learner subgroup made no gains in ELA and Math

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

- Latino students showed an increase of 5 percentage points in ELA and 6 percentage points in Math.
- Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students showed an increase of 6 percentage points in ELA and 7 percentage points in Math.
- Students with Disabilities increased 1 percentage point in ELA and 6 percentage points in Math.

• The English learner subgroup made no gains. That is, in both years, no students Met and Exceeded Standards in both ELA and Math

2. As part of the District's extra consideration of MSA-1's increases in academic achievement, an analysis of MSA-1's 2016 CAASPP (SBAC) subgroup performance compared to subgroup performance of District resident schools ("Resident Schools") had been performed:

- For the Latino subgroup in ELA, MSA-1 exceeds 5 out of 11 Resident Schools; in Math, MSA-1 exceeds 9 out of 11 Resident Schools
- For the English learner subgroup in ELA, MSA-1 is equal to 3 out of 10 Resident Schools; in Math, MSA-1 exceeds 5 out of 10 Resident Schools. (It should be noted that one Resident School had less than 10 English learners taking the CAASPP which resulted in a score of an asterisk (*) in the category of English learner).
- For the Socio-economically Disadvantaged subgroup in ELA, MSA-1 exceeds 4 out of 11 Resident Schools; in Math, MSA-1 exceeds 8 out of 11 Resident Schools.
- For Students with Disabilities subgroup in ELA, MSA-1 exceeds 4 out of 11 Resident Schools; in Math, MSA-1 exceeds 8 out of 11 Resident Schools.

3. Schoolwide 2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment data confirms that the performance of MSA-1 is lower than the performance of the Resident Schools median in ELA (43% compared to 58%). Conversely, the performance of MSA-1 is higher than the performance of Resident Schools median in Math (31% compared to 20%).

And, District further finds:

- 1. <u>As described in the Charter Petition Review Checklist and Staff Report, the Petition does</u> not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions in several essential elements, including:
 - a. <u>The governance structure of the school (Ed. Code, § 47605(b)(5(C));</u>
 - b. A description of the individuals to be employed by the charter school (Ed. Code, $\frac{47605(b)(5)(E)}{2}$; and
 - c. <u>The admissions requirements of the school. (Ed. Code, §47605(b)(5)(H).)</u>
 - d. The suspension and expulsion procedures of the charter school (Ed. Code, \S <u>47605(b)(5)(J)</u>.
- 2. <u>The Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set</u> <u>forth in the Petition, due to the organization's continued and repeated failure to timely</u> 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-1's academic performance has

demonstrated gains in most subgroups, it is noted that there was a lack of academic progress for English Learners, a population targeted for recruitment by Petitioners and comprises 12% of its student population. The cumulative gravity of the Charter School's Charter Management Organization's operational deficiencies and its ongoing pattern of failing to respond adequately to District inquires as noted in these findings of fact nonetheless substantially outweighs the academic growth achieved by some of the Charter School's student subgroups. In 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.

Exhibits 1-18 May be viewed at:

http://laschoolboard.org/sites/default/files /10-18-16BR163Exhibits.pdf

TAB 7



Board of Education Report

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

Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2 October 18, 2016 Charter Schools Division

Action Proposed:

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

Background:

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

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

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

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

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

Statutory Framework

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

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

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

- (1) Attained its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in the prior year or in two of the last three years both school wide and for all groups of pupils served by the charter school; *or*
- (2) Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API in the prior year or in two of the last three years; or
- (3) Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API for a demographically comparable school in the prior year or in two of the last three years; *or*
- (4) (A)The entity that granted the charter determines that the academic performance of the charter school is at least equal to the academic performance of the public schools that the charter school pupils would otherwise have been required to attend, as well as the academic performance of the schools in the school district in which the charter school is located, taking into account the composition of the pupil population that is served at the charter school.
 - (B) The determination made pursuant to this paragraph shall be based upon all of the following:
 - i) Documented and clear and convincing data.
 - ii) Pupil achievement data from assessments, including, but not limited to, the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program established by Article 4 (commencing with Section 60640) for demographically similar pupil populations in the comparison schools.
 - iii) Information submitted by the charter school; or
- (5) Qualified for an alternative accountability system pursuant to subdivision (h) of section 52052.

In addition, section 47607(a)(2) provides that charter school renewals are governed by the standards and criteria set forth in Section 47605, and shall include, but not be limited to, a reasonably comprehensive description of any new requirement of charter schools enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.

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

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

(6) The petition does not contain a declaration of whether or not the charter school shall be deemed the exclusive public employer of the employees of the charter school for purposes of Chapter 10.7 (commencing with Section 3540) of Division 4 of Title 1 of the Government Code."

Pursuant to the requirements of SB 1290, the District "shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to grant a charter renewal." Ed. Code § 47607(a)(3)(A). In addition, state regulations require the District to "consider the past performance of the school's academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement if any." 5 CCR § 11966.4.

Grounds for Denial

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

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

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

SB 1290 Analysis

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

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

Due Diligence

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

A Public Hearing was held on September 20, 2016.

The petition is available for perusal in the Charter Schools Division and online at the District's Board of Education website at the following link: .

Expected Outcomes:

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

Board Options and Consequences:

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

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

Policy Implications:

There are no policy implications at this time.

Budget Impact: There is no budget impact.

Issues and Analysis:

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

Attachments:

Staff Assessment and Recommendation Report Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 2

Informatives:

Not applicable

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

APPROVED & PRESENTED BY:

MICHELLE KING Superintendent JOSÉ COLE-GUTIÉRREZ Director Charter Schools Division

REVIEWED BY:

DAVID HOLMQUIST General Counsel

____ Approved as to form.

REVIEWED BY:

CHERYL SIMPSON Director, Budget Services and Financial Planning

____ Approved as to budget impact statement.

STAFF ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATION REPORT RENEWAL PETITION

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

School Name:	Magnolia Science A	cademy 2		BOARD IS
Type of Charter School:	Start-Up Independe	nt		REQUIRED TO TAKE ACTION
CMO/Network:	Magnolia Public Scl	hools (MERF)		BY:
Location Code:	8461			October 18, 2016
Type of Site(s):	Proposition 39 Co-L High School	ocation with Birmingh	am Co	mmunity Charter
Site Address(es):	17125 Victory Blvd,	Van Nuys, CA 91406		
Board District(s):	3	Local District(s):	North	west
Grade Levels Currently Served:	6-12	Current Enrollment:	460	
Grade Levels Authorized in Current Charter:	6-12	Enrollment Authorized in Current Charter:	425	
STAFF Recommendation:	Denial			
SUMMARY OF Staff Findings	 the school's record of school has not met the Petitioners are a educational proget The petition doe of all required en Please see Findings of Renewal Charter Petition 	ensive review of the rene f performance, staff has on the standards and criteria for the standards and criteria for the standards and criteria for the standards and criteria for gram set forth in the petit s not contain reasonably lements. In the standard standard standards and the standards and standards and standards the staff Review and Asset	determi for rene succes ition. v compr ommen ce Acad	ned that the charter wal. Staff findings: sfully implement the rehensive descriptions dation of Denial of the demy 2 for further
PROPOSED BENCHMARKS:	N/A			

STAFF ASSESSMENT

I. ACTION PROPOSED

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

II. CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL

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

III.GENERAL SCHOOL INFORMATION

	Magnolia Science Academy 2
Initial Authorization	On May 8, 2007, MSA2 was authorized by LAUSD Board of Education to serve 425 students in grades 6-12.
Most Recent Renewal	The charter was renewed on March 13, 2012, to serve up to 425 students in grades 6-12.
Approved Revisions of Current Charter	A settlement agreement was entered between MPS and LAUSD in March of 2015. There was a major change in leadership in the academic school year 2014-2015. All ties with the Accord Institute were severed for all 8 Magnolia Public Schools. Thus, the management organization had to hire a professional staff of its own to support with the services that Accord previously provided.
Board Benchmarks in Current Charter Term	 On March 13, 2012, the Board of Education issued a benchmark to MSA 2. "As a result of Magnolia Science Academy 2's low absolute performance on the Math and Algebra I California Standards Tests, coupled with at predicted three-year Academic Growth Over Time results, the following benchmarks must be met by the end of its five-year term of the renewal: Benchmark #1: "CST Mathematics data for 2010-11 indicates that 20% of Magnolia Science Academy 2's students scored Proficient/Advanced while the Median of Resident Schools Median of students scoring Proficient/Advanced in Mathematics based on the CST

A. <u>School History</u>

	 scores for the term of its charter. The Charter Schools Division will monitor this annually through its ongoing oversight." Update: CST Mathematics data for 2012-2013 indicates that 30% of MSA 2's students scored Proficient/Advanced while the Median of LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE indicates that of 30% of students scored Proficient/Advanced.
	• Benchmark #2: "CST Mathematics data for 2010-11 indicates that 46% of Magnolia Science Academy 2's students scored Below Basic and Far Below Basic while the Median of Resident Schools Median of students scoring Below Basic and Far Below Basic was 32%. Therefore, Magnolia Science Academy 2 will have a lower percentage of students scoring Below Basic and Far Below Basic in Mathematics than the Resident Schools Median based on CST scores for the term of its charter. The Charter Schools Division will monitor this annually through its ongoing oversight."
	<i>Update</i> : CST Mathematics data for 2012-2013 indicates that 40% of MSA 2's students scored Below Basic/Far Below Basic while the Median of LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE indicates that of 44% of students scored Below Basic/Far Below Basic.
Submission of Renewal Petition Application	MSA2 submitted its renewal petition application on August 22, 2016. The 60-day statutory timeline for Board action on the petition runs through October 21, 2016.
Concurrent Request for Material Revision	N/A

B. Educational Program

	Magnolia Science Academy 2
Key Features of Educational Program	 Magnolia Science Academy 2 is a 6-12 span school offers Science Technology Engineering Arts and Mathematics (STEAM) instructional program that includes: Science – MSA has a partnership with Mt. Wilson Observatory where the school's science department works with their team of scientists to design curricular aligned trips. Science is brought to life as example, the school has a "life lab" Student Garden and outdoor classroom where theory meets the real world and students engage in gardening and soil analysis. Technology – is used to personalize learning and integrate all subjects in project-based learning opportunities in a fun and meaningful way. The technology curriculum develops critical thinking skills as students explore a variety of ways to solve problems in various content areas.

	18
	• College Pathways Program - provides students with the emotional and instrumental support students need to graduate college and career ready. By providing students with college awareness starting in middle school and college guidance throughout high school, students are able to see the importance of advancing their education and becoming positive contributors to society.
Program Components to Meet the Needs of English Learners	 Magnolia Science Academy 2 implements its own English Learner Master Plan. Teachers implement Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) to scaffold content area instruction for English learners. The school uses myON and Study Sync to support language acquisition and fluency in the four language domains and also incorporates daily English Language Development classes. Push-in and pull-out services are also provided for either one-on one or small-group instructional support.
Program Components to Meet the Needs of GATE/High Achieving Students	 MSA2 identifies GATE students through teacher and/or administrator recommendations as well as work samples in its identification process. GATE teams, comprised of the GATE coordinator or Special Education Teacher, Academic Dean, and General Education teacher, review all pieces of data and then make a determination of eligibility. MSA2 provides honors and AP classes, enrichment activities (i.e. Academic Decathlon, Robotics, etc.) and the Congressional Award Program (CAP), a voluntary mentorship program designed to help qualified students improve their skills in academic athletics, character education leadership, and voluntary public service.
Special Education SELPA	MSA2 participates in LAUSD SELPA Option 3.

C. <u>Student Population</u>

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

*As of October 2015 Census Day

D. Charter School Operator

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

IV. STAFF REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

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

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

A. <u>Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?</u> *This criterion has not been determined to be a finding.*

B. Are Petitioners Demonstrably Likely To Succeed?

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

1. Student Achievement and Educational Performance

a. Summary

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

b. Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math

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

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

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

c. Minimum Renewal Eligibility Criteria

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

*"Resident Schools" = Public schools that the charter school students would have otherwise attended based on their addresses. "District Similar Schools" are LAUSD schools on the CDE's Similar Schools list for this charter school. **Not available

d. Student Subgroup Academic Growth

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

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

e. English Learner Reclassification Rates

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

MSA's reclassification criteria are the following:

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

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

f. <u>CAHSEE Passage and Graduation Rates [HS only]</u>

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

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

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

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

h. <u>Additional Information</u> None

2. Governance

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

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

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

3. Organizational Management, Programs, and Operations

a. Summary

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

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

*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

				2015-16							2015-16 SUBGROUPS								
				2013-10					AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS				STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY						
School	Susp. Event Rate 2013- 14	Susp. Event Rate 2014- 15	Susp. Event Rate	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Event Rate	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16		Event Rate	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16		
Magnolia Science Academy 2	1.6%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	487	3	12	14	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	82	0	0	0.0%	0.0%		
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	811	5	9	12	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	107	2	4	4.3%	0.9%		
Resident Schools Median	0.0%	1.1%	1.5%	1.3%	1356	21	33	51	3	4	4.9%	4.6%	217	33	35	14.3%	2.7%		

c. Access and Equity

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

*As of October 2015 Census Day

d. Special Education

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

e. <u>Additional Information</u> None

4. Fiscal Operations

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

a. <u>Summary</u>

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

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

2014-2015	2015-2016
1	2
Unsatisfactory	Developing
	1

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

b. Fiscal Condition

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

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

					1	87
Prior Year	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	1
Adjustments						

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

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

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

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

- c. <u>2014-15 Independent Audit Report</u> Audit Opinion: Unmodified Material Weakness: None Reported Deficiency/Finding: None Reported
- d. Other Significant Fiscal Information

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

C. <u>Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?</u>

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

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

Magnolia Science Academy 2

Loc. Code: **8461** CDS Code: **0115212**

CRITERIA SUMMARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 as <i>repor</i>	sterisk (* ted. Th e	*) indicates (ese ranks ar	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.	. Note: The 201	13 state	vide and s	imilar sch	ools ranks are	the final set	of ranks				Š	chool De	emograp	School Demographic Characteristics	acterist	ics			
ΓD	BD	Loc Code	School	2013 Enrolled # on 1st Day of Testing	Conf	2012 2 Base Gr API	2013 2 Growth Si API R	2013 2013 State Similar Rank Rank	.3 Met 2013 ar Sch-wide bls Target k	13 Met 2013 de Subgroup t Targets	% Free/ Reduced Lunch	% Sp Ed	% GATE	% EL	% RFEP %	Latino	% White	% Af. Amer	% % Asian %	% Fili %	% Am % Pacific Indian Island	% Two or More
XR	3	8461 Ma	Magnolia Science Academy 2		6-12	759	756	4 5	No	٩	67	16	0	15	31	71	13	5	4	4	0 1	2
LAU	SD Simi	ilar School.	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																			
S	7	8127 Ale	Alexander Fleming Middle	1557 6-	8	763	771	4 7	Yes	No	71	12	16	6	35	70	9	15	2	5	0 2	 0
Μ	4	8038 Hu	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	883 6-	8	764	764	4 6	No	No	100	13	19	14	51	82	7	6	3	2	0 0	0
XR	4	8004 ICE	ICEF Vista Middle Academy	199 6-	8	779	798	6 10	Yes	Yes	88	14	0	35	37	91	2	4	1	2	0 0	 2
С	S	8066 Lut	Luther Burbank Middle	873 7-	. 8-2	792	786	5 8	No	No	100	11	19	12	40	91	1	2	2	3	1 0	0
XR	7	8464 Ma	Magnolia Science Academy 3	372 6-	6-12	785	748	3 8	No	No	72	10	0	S	19	44	2	51	1	1	0 1	1
XR	. 9	U9 6777	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	308 6-	8	813	821	6 10	Yes	Yes	92	12	5	11	59	98	1	1	0	0	0 0	0
S	7	8104 Ric	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
Е	S	8377 Soi	South Gate Middle	2372 6-	8	724	722	2 2	No	No	85	10	16	16	44	66	1	0	0	0	0 0	0
ш	ъ	8153 Soi	Southeast Middle	1153 6-	∞	683	690	1 1	Yes	No	81	10	15	20	43	66	0	1	0	0	0 0	0
XR	9	8426 PU	8426 PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triumph Charter High	336 6-	∞	828	838	7 10	Yes	Yes	93	13	2	10	60	97	0	2	0	0	1 0	0
XR	2	5984 Vis	Vista Charter Middle	416 6-	8	713	752	3 5	Yes	Yes	91	4	0	10	59	86	1	3	1	8	0 0	 0
LAUS	SD Simi	ilar School	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	873	-	764	764	4 7	1		88	12	15	11	43	91	1	3	1	1	0 0	0
Resid	Resident Schools	chools																				
NW	з	8259 Wi	William Mulholland Middle	1447 6-	. 8-9	713	716	2 2	No	No	80	17	15	19	42	87	5	5	2	1	0 0	 0
ΝW	9	8814 Re:	Reseda Senior High	1344 9-	9-12	752	748	5 9	No	No	64	15	17	16	42	74	12	6	4	3	0 0	0
NE	9	8142 Rol	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1775 6-	6-12	648	657	2 2	Yes	No	73	15	10	26	48	90	2	3	2	3	0 0	 0
XR	ŝ	8557 Bir	Birmingham Community Charter High	2256 9-	9-12	722	734	4 8	Yes	No	86	12	6	14	43	81	7	7	2	2	0 0	 0
NE	3	8434 Va	Van Nuys Middle	1319 6-	. 8-9	751	742	3 5	No	No	64	17	14	20	40	80	6	5	3	3	0 0	 0
ΝM	3	8283 No	Northridge Middle	863 6-	8	769	744	3 9	No	No	100	21	12	20	46	83	5	4	5	2	0 0	 0
ΜN	ŝ	8513 No	Northridge Academy High	794 9-	9-12	744	764	6 8	Yes	Yes	68	14	15	80	36	64	20	5	4	9	1 1	 0
ΝN	3	8590 Gr	Grover Cleveland Charter High	2581 9-	9-12	789	808	8 10	Yes	No	67	11	32	15	37	63	15	5	13	4	0 0	 0
ΝM	3	8898 Val	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	925 9-	9-12	686	724	4 3	Yes	Yes	64	15	19	7	33	63	18	7	5	7	1 0	 0
ΝW	4	8406 Joh	John A. Sutter Middle	1305 6-	. 8-9	735	764	4 8	Yes	No	100	19	14	18	43	83	4	5	9	2	0 0	 0
NE	9	8893 Va	Van Nuys Senior High	2142 9-	9-12	762	767	6 7	Yes	No	100	11	32	16	44	62	11	5	14	8	0 0	0
NW	9	8363 Fra	Francisco Sepulveda Middle	1624 6-	. 8-9	751	731	2 6	No	No	100	13	20	25	46	85	3	4	3	6	0 0	0
Resiv	dent Sc.	Resident Schools Median	lian	1396	1	748	743	4 8	1	I	11	15	15	17	43	81	8	ß	4	e	0	 0

Magnolia Science Academy 2 OCTOBER 2015 CALPADS DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

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

				:					Ī			ľ			
LD	BD	Code	School	Total Enroll #	% F/R 9 Meal 9	% GATE	% EL %	% Latino % White		% Af. Amer.	% Asian	% Fili.	% Am Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	79%	2%	13%	82%	%6	3%	2%	2%	%0	%0	1%
LAUS	SD Sin	nilar Scho	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE												
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	1442	80%	1%	13%	72%	5%	14%	3%	4%	%0	1%	1%
×	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	811	84%	2%	16%	75%	%9	13%	2%	2%	%0	%0	1%
XR	4	8004	ICEF Vista Middle Academy	241	97%	1%	24%	88%	%0	2%	%0	%0	%0	%0	%0
ပ	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	815	88%	2%	11%	%06	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	%0	%0
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	455	81%	1%	5%	49%	2%	44%	1%	%0	1%	1%	3%
XR	9	6777	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	423	77%	%0	19%	100%	%0	%0	%0	%0	%0	%0	%0
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1546	68%	1%	%6	20%	15%	8%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%
ш	5	8377	South Gate Middle	2063	88%	1%	13%	88%	1%	1%	%0	%0	%0	%0	%0
ш	5	8153	Southeast Middle	1113	94%	1%	18%	%66	%0	1%	%0	%0	%0	%0	%0
XR	9	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triumph Charter High	726	80%	%0	11%	67%	1%	1%	%0	%0	%0	%0	%0
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle	407	95%	3%	22%	91%	%0	%0	1%	7%	%0	%0	%0
LAUS	SD Sin	nilar Scho	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	811	84%	1%	13%	91%	1%	2%	1%	%0	%0	%0	%0
Resid	dent S	Resident Schools													
ΝN	, 3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	1162	91%	4%	23%	87%	6%	4%	2%	2%	%0	%0	%0
NN	, 6	8814	Reseda Senior High	1597	79%	7%	19%	77%	10%	4%	4%	3%	%0	%0	%0
NE	9	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1769	91%	7%	24%	88%	2%	3%	2%	3%	%0	%0	%0
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	3278	85%	5%	11%	83%	7%	4%	2%	3%	%0	%0	1%
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle	1159	81%	3%	23%	82%	8%	3%	3%	3%	%0	%0	1%
ΝN	/ 3	8283	Northridge Middle	839	%06	8%	28%	80%	6%	4%	6%	3%	%0	1%	1%
ΝN	, 3	8513	Northridge Academy High	1072	71%	1%	5%	67%	18%	3%	3%	7%	%0	%0	1%
NN	, 3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	3202	65%	5%	11%	60%	17%	5%	13%	4%	%0	%0	1%
ΝN	/ 3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	1201	61%	2%	%9	59%	22%	5%	3%	7%	1%	%0	2%
NN	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	862	91%	4%	26%	83%	4%	4%	%9	2%	%0	%0	1%
NE	9	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	2594	77%	6%	12%	63%	11%	4%	13%	8%	%0	%0	1%
ΝN	, 6	_	8363 Francisco Sepulveda Middle	1511	88%	3%	28%	86%	3%	3%	3%	4%	%0	1%	%0
Resid	dent S	Resident Schools Median	ledian	1356	83%	4%	21%	81%	8%	4%	3%	3%	%0	%0	1%

Magnolia Science Academy 2 RECLASSIFICATION RATES

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

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

Magnolia Science Academy 2 RECLASSIFICATION OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

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

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

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

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

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 (*).

D	BD (Loc Code	School	OCT 2015 Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll %	% High Incidence	% Low Incidence	# AUT	# DB	# DEAF	# ED		# EMD # HOH	H # MR	# HO	10 #	# SLD*	# SLI*	# TBI	IN #
XR	3 8	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	86	18%	91%	%6	2		-	÷	:	1	1	24	1	51	3		
LAUSD	Similar	ar Schoo	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																		
S	7 8	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	1442	153	11%	78%	22%	21		:	2	:	2	1	18	1	101	1		
N	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	811	51	%9	%69	31%	6	ı	4	I	1	2	1	4	:	31	1	I	1
XR	4	8004	ICEF Vista Middle Academy	241	23	10%	91%	%6	2		-	-	:	-	1	5	1	15	1		
U	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	815	82	10%	78%	22%	16		:	-	-	:	1	3	1	60	1		T
XR	7 8	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	455	48	11%	%06	10%	e		:	1	:	1	1	7	1	34	2		
XR	9	<i>9777</i>	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	423	51	12%	88%	12%	5		-	1	:	-	1	14	1	28	3		
S	7 8	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1546	200	13%	81%	20%	24		-	5	-	2	1	28	£	133	-		
Е	5	8377	South Gate Middle	2063	223	11%	74%	26%	42		1	-	-	1	1	14	1	149	3	1	
Е	5	8153	Southeast Middle	1113	128	12%	80%	20%	11		:		:	2	1	15	2	83	4		
XR	9	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triumph Charter High	726	129	18%	85%	15%	15	I	1	I	1	3	1	20	1	90	1	I	-
XR	2	5984	5984 Vista Charter Middle	407	25	%9	%96	4%	I		1	I	ł	ł	1	2	1	21	1		1
AUSD	Similar	ar Schoo.	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	811	82	11%	81%	20%	13		1	2	:	2	1	14	2	60	2	1	1
Resider	Resident Schools	ools																			
ΝM	3	8259	8259 William Mulholland Middle	1162	141	12%	77%	23%	18	-	1	I	-	5	-	19	2	86	4	-	1
ΝM	9	8814	Reseda Senior High	1597	321	20%	55%	45%	50	I	1	30	1	1	1	38	3	138	1	I	-
NE	9	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1769	274	15%	88%	12%	26	I	1	3	1	1	1	31	3	207	2	I	1
XR	ж С	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	3278	400	12%	83%	17%	41	I	1	7	1	4	1	68	1	261	4	I	:
NE	e S	8434	Van Nuys Middle	1159	144	12%	72%	28%	35	I	1	I	1	2	1	25	1	76	з	I	1
ΝM	3	8283	Northridge Middle	839	177	21%	75%	25%	15	I	1	1	1	1	1	14	1	117	2	2	1
ΝM	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	1072	175	16%	80%	20%	30	I	1	I	-	1	1	39	2	101	1	1	1
ΝM	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	3202	313	10%	82%	18%	41	-	1	3	1	1	-	34	-	217	9	1	1
ΝM	3	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	1201	211	18%	72%	28%	20	-	-	3	-	1	1	36	2	113	2	-	10
ΝM	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	862	172	20%	77%	22%	25	ł	1	I	1	1	1	12	1	117	4	I	1
NE	9	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	2594	239	%6	79%	21%	37	-	1	4	1	2	1	35	1	155	1	1	1
NW	9	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle	1511	221	15%	78%	22%	20	I	1	1	1	1	2	33	з	136	з	1	1
Resider	nt Scho	Resident Schools Median	dian	1356	216	15%	78%	27%	28	1	-	m	;	2	-	34	•	177	"		1

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

							2013 CST ELA	T ELA							2013 CST MATH	r math			
ΓD	BD	Loc. Code	School Name	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/FB B	% Prof /Adv	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/FB B	% Prof /Adv
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	352	6%	12%	33%	30%	18%	51%	48%	350	10%	30%	29%	23%	7%	%69	30%
LAUS	SD Simi	ilar Scho	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%
≥	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	812	5%	11%	35%	32%	17%	51%	49%	830	7%	21%	34%	32%	%9	62%	38%
XR	4	8004	ICEF Vista Middle Academy	185	1%	12%	39%	32%	15%	52%	47%	189	1%	19%	34%	28%	18%	54%	46%
ပ	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	810	5%	12%	33%	36%	15%	50%	51%	808	5%	16%	28%	35%	16%	49%	51%
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	372	5%	15%	30%	38%	13%	50%	51%	371	14%	35%	27%	17%	7%	76%	24%
XR	9	6777	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	300	5%	10%	32%	37%	16%	47%	53%	302	3%	13%	27%	39%	18%	43%	57%
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1365	5%	13%	36%	31%	14%	54%	45%	1357	8%	23%	30%	27%	12%	61%	39%
ш	5	8377	South Gate Middle	2294	7%	16%	36%	28%	12%	59%	40%	2289	10%	30%	31%	21%	7%	71%	28%
ш	5	8153	Southeast Middle	1101	11%	20%	35%	26%	8%	%99	34%	1116	12%	31%	26%	23%	7%	%69	30%
XR	9	8426	8426 PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triump	311	2%	11%	37%	37%	13%	50%	50%	318	1%	7%	14%	38%	40%	22%	78%
XR	2		5984 Vista Charter Middle	413	3%	11%	41%	31%	13%	55%	44%	413	5%	30%	38%	21%	7%	73%	28%
LAUS	SD Simi	ilar Scho	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	810	5%	12%	36%	32%	14%	52%	47%	808	7%	22%	30%	27%	12%	61%	39%
Resic	Resident Schools	chools																	
ΝN	3	8259	8259 William Mulholland Middle	1295	6%	16%	37%	28%	13%	59%	41%	1322	11%	34%	28%	19%	8%	73%	27%
ΝN	6	8814	Reseda Senior High	1233	5%	10%	32%	34%	19%	47%	53%	1140	20%	37%	24%	15%	4%	81%	19%
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	1603	12%	19%	37%	22%	9%	68%	31%	1622	21%	36%	25%	15%	3%	82%	18%
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	2060	6%	13%	35%	32%	15%	54%	47%	1994	12%	43%	29%	14%	2%	84%	16%
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle	1143	7%	16%	35%	26%	16%	58%	42%	1182	9%	24%	30%	27%	10%	63%	37%
ΝN	3	8283	Northridge Middle	741	4%	14%	43%	29%	10%	61%	39%	766	3%	23%	32%	30%	11%	58%	41%
ΝN	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	741	2%	8%	32%	40%	18%	42%	58%	739	11%	39%	31%	16%	3%	81%	19%
ΝN	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	2406	5%	10%	24%	29%	32%	39%	61%	2258	7%	23%	25%	29%	16%	55%	45%
ΝN	3	8688	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	845	2%	%9	34%	36%	21%	42%	57%	851	29%	42%	21%	8%	1%	92%	%6
ΝN	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	1197	7%	13%	37%	30%	13%	57%	43%	1208	4%	16%	30%	38%	12%	50%	50%
NE	9	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	2004	8%	11%	23%	25%	32%	42%	57%	1978	16%	31%	20%	22%	11%	67%	33%
ΝN	9	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle	1468	10%	18%	32%	24%	16%	60%	40%	1500	9%	25%	26%	25%	14%	%09	39%
Resic	lent Sc	Resident Schools Median	edian	1264	6%	13%	35%	29%	16%	56%	45%	1265	11%	33%	27%	21%	%6	70%	30%

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

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

Report created on: 08/16/2016

Office of Data and Accountability

					2012-13	2012-13	2013-14	2013-14	2014-15
				2014-15	CAHSEE	CAHSEF	CAHSEE	CAHSEF	Cohort
P	BD	Loc Code	School	Grade Span	Grade 10 % Passed	Grade 10 % Passed ELA	Grade 10 % Passed	Grade 10 % Passed ELA	Graduation Rate
22	(C 40	Math) 0 - 0	Math	1000	10001
ХК	r	8461	Ivlagnolia Science Academy Z	6-12	A/%	81%	83%	83%	100%
LAUS	D Simil.	ar Schools	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE						
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	6-8	:	-	:		1
×	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	6-8	:	-	:		:
XR	4	8004	ICEF Vista Middle Academy	6-8	:	:	:	1	1
ပ	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	7- 8	:	1	:		1
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	6-12	89%	81%	62%	71%	98%
XR	9	6777	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	6-8	:	1	:	1	1
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	6-8	:	:	:		1
ш	5	8377	South Gate Middle	6-8	1	ł	:	1	ł
ш	5	8153	Southeast Middle	6-8	:	ł	:	1	1
XR	9	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triumph Charter High	6-8	:	-	:		:
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle	6-8	:	:	:		1
LAUS	D Simil	ar Schools	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median		89%	81%	62%	71%	88%
Resid	Resident Schools	sloor							
NΝ	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle	6-8	:	-	:		1
ΝN	9	8814	Reseda Senior High	9-12	%06	86%	85%	82%	84%
NE	6	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	6-12	71%	71%	73%	70%	83%
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High	9-12	86%	87%	84%	83%	91%
NE	3	8434	Van Nuys Middle	6-8	:	1	:	-	-
ΝN	3	8283	Northridge Middle	6-8	1	ł	1	ł	ł
ΝN	3	8513	Northridge Academy High	9-12	92%	91%	88%	87%	94%
ΝN	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High	9-12	92%	87%	88%	87%	85%
ΝN	3	8688	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	9-12	86%	%06	89%	92%	91%
ΝN	4	8406	John A. Sutter Middle	6-8	1	I	1	I	1
NE	6	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	9-12	86%	86%	88%	88%	86%
ΝN	6	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle	6-8	1	I	1	I	ł
Resid	ent Sch	Resident Schools Median	ian		86%	87%	88%	87%	86%

Magnolia Science Academy 2 HIGH SCHOOL DATA

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

Magnolia Science Academy 2 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.

						74 7 7 7 7 7 7 7							2015-16 SU	2015-16 SUBGROUPS				
						9T-STU2		1		AFRICAN /	AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS	TUDENTS			STUDEN.	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY	ABILITY	
	School	Susp. Event Susp. Event Rate 2013- Rate 2014- 14 15		Susp. Event Rate	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015- 16	t i	Single Std. Susp % 2015- 16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015- 16	Susp. Event Single Std. Rate 2015- Susp % 2015- 16	Single Std. Susp % 2015- 16
Magnolia Science Academy 2	ce Academy 2	1.6%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	487	æ	12	14	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	82	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
AUSD Similar Schools from CDE																		
Alexander Fleming Middle	ning Middle	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	1442	1	1	195	0	0	%0.0	0.0%	178	1	1	0.6%	0.0%
¹ ubert Howe I	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	0.0%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	811	4	13	109	1	2	%6:0	0.9%	107	13	13	12.1%	0.9%
ICEF Vista Middle Academy	dle Academy	2.8%	0.0%	5.0%	4.6%	241	12	14	ъ	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	25	2	2	8.0%	8.0%
Luther Burbank Middle	k Middle	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	815	1	1	19	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	106	1	4	0.9%	0.0%
1agnolia Scier	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%
UC Nueva Es	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	6.1%	2.6%	0.7%	0.5%	423	e	e	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	49	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
ichard Henry	Richard Henry Dana Middle	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	1546	00	23	124	ю	6	2.4%	1.6%	218	23	23	10.6%	0.9%
South Gate Middle	iddle	0.0%	3.4%	1.6%	1.0%	2063	32	49	12	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	234	49	164	20.9%	2.6%
Southeast Middle	ddle	%0:0	1.0%	0.4%	0.4%	1113	5	9	8	0	0	%0.0	0.0%	126	9	20	4.8%	1.6%
UC Triumph	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triumph Charter High	5.5%	7.8%	1.0%	1.0%	726	7	6	9	0	0	%0.0	0.0%	126	e	4	2.4%	2.4%
Vista Charter Middle	Middle	0.0%	%0.0	1.5%	1.0%	407	9	23	2	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	23	1	2	4.3%	4.3%
AUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	ur en	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	811	S	6	12	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	107	2	4	4.3%	0.9%
Villiam Mulh	William Mulholland Middle	0.0%	1.1%	2.6%	2.1%	1162	30	38	41	3	3	7.3%	4.9%	183	38	139	20.8%	3.3%
Reseda Senior High	r High	0.0%	1.1%	2.1%	1.8%	1597	34	58	69	4	6	5.8%	4.3%	349	58	59	16.6%	2.3%
obert Fulton	Robert Fulton College Preparatory	0.0%	0.6%	1.2%	1.0%	1769	22	33	58	3	4	5.2%	5.2%	269	33	40	12.3%	2.6%
irmingham (Birmingham Community Charter High	5.0%	3.5%	2.7%	2.2%	3278	87	114	145	13	19	9.0%	8.3%	416	35	48	8.4%	6.0%
Van Nuys Middle	ddle	0.0%	3.6%	2.4%	1.8%	1159	28	30	35	1	1	2.9%	2.9%	149	30	37	20.1%	3.4%
Northridge Middle	liddle	0.0%	0.4%	1.5%	1.5%	839	13	32	30	3	7	10.0%	10.0%	177	32	32	18.1%	4.0%
Iorthridge A	Northridge Academy High	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	1072	4	11	37	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	172	11	11	6.4%	0.6%
rover Cleve	Grover Cleveland Charter High	0.0%	3.0%	1.4%	1.1%	3202	44	66	146	4	4	2.7%	2.7%	330	99	77	20.0%	4.2%
'alley Acade	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	0.0%	0.4%	0.7%	0.7%	1201	8	15	64	ŝ	5	4.7%	4.7%	213	15	16	7.0%	0.9%
John A. Sutter Middle	er Middle	1.1%	2.8%	2.3%	2.1%	862	20	24	33	2	е	6.1%	6.1%	176	24	25	13.6%	2.8%
Van Nuys Senior High	nior High	%0:0	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	2594	10	23	110	5	8	4.5%	4.5%	274	23	23	8.4%	0.7%
rancisco Sep	Francisco Sepulveda Middle	2.4%	1.5%	%6.0	0.9%	1511	13	33	43	0	0	%0.0	0.0%	221	33	33	14.9%	1.8%
		0.0%	1.1%	1.5%	1.3%	1356	21	33	51	8	4	4.9%	4.6%	217	33	35	14.3%	2.7%

197

Magnolia Science Academy #2 TITLE III ACCOUNTABILITY DATA

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

													AMAO 2	- Attaining	AMAO 2 - Attaining English Proficiency	oficiency		
						AM	AMAO 1 - Annual Growth	nual Grow	vth			Less tha	Less than 5 years			5 Years or More	or More	
LD	BD	Loc Code	School	School Type	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 I AMAO 1 2013-14	Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level F 2014-15	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14	Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2014-15	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy #2	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	65	0	0.0%		:	56.0%	14	7	50.0%		51	22	43.1%	41.7%
LAUSI	D Simila	ar Schools	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE															
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle School	Middle School	136	136	100.0%	50	36.8%	49.7%	25	5	20.0%		118	29	24.6%	36.6%
8	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle School	Middle School	124	124	100.0%	51	41.1%	58.1%	14	5	35.7%	-	114	35	30.7%	41.5%
XR	0	8004	Inner City Education Foundation Vista Middle Academy	Middle School	63	63	100.0%	43	68.3%	74.4%	5		-	-	59	38	64.4%	60.8%
U	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle School	Middle School	96	96	100.0%	59	61.5%	67.7%	23	9	26.1%	-	77	32	41.6%	47.8%
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy #3	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	29	16	55.2%	-		:	1		-	-	29	12	41.4%	:
XR	9	6777	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	Middle School		-	-	-		:	:		-	-	:			:
s	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle School	Middle School	112	112	100.0%	29	25.9%	50.8%	19	1	5.3%	:	104	19	18.3%	40.5%
ш	5	8377	South Gate Middle School	Middle School	285	285	100.0%	140	49.1%	53.9%	35	00	22.9%	20.8%	259	93	35.9%	37.2%
ш	5	8153	Southeast Middle School	Middle School	198	198	100.0%	86	43.4%	38.5%	32	4	12.5%		169	48	28.4%	23.1%
XR	9	8426	PUC Triumph Academy and High School	Middle School		-	-	-	:		:	-	-	-	:	:		:
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle School	Middle School	72	70	97.2%	40	57.1%		6	2	22.2%		63	30	47.6%	
LAUS	D Simila	ar Schools	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median		112	112	100.0%	51	46.3%	53.9%	19	5	22.2%	20.8%	104	32	35.9%	40.5%
Resid	Resident Schools	sloor																
NN	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle School	Middle School	207	207	100.0%	107	51.7%	51.7%	62	11	17.7%	11.5%	171	64	37.4%	43.8%
MN	9	8814	Reseda Senior High	Senior High School	210	207	98.6%	79	38.2%	50.8%	110	8	7.3%	21.3%	139	34	24.5%	37.0%
NE	9	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory School	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	394	393	99.7%	161	41.0%	44.2%	131	20	15.3%	17.0%	301	80	26.6%	28.6%
XR	3	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High School	Senior High School	336	336	100.0%	173	51.5%	48.9%	146	23	15.8%	13.3%	248	97	39.1%	32.6%
NE	ю	8434	Van Nuys Middle School	Middle School	248	248	100.0%	116	46.8%	51.0%	52	13	25.0%	18.2%	213	65	30.5%	36.6%
MN	3	8283	Northridge Middle School	Middle School	170	170	100.0%	86	50.6%	45.7%	48	6	18.8%	25.0%	142	46	32.4%	32.7%
NN	3	8513	Northridge Academy Senior High	Senior High School	76	76	100.0%	46	60.5%	48.8%	11	8	72.7%	-	65	30	46.2%	32.1%
MN	3	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High School	Senior High School	287	274	95.5%	160	58.4%	57.7%	124	15	12.1%	26.8%	193	84	43.5%	41.8%
MN	3	8688	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	Senior High School	43	41	95.3%	28	68.3%	44.3%	11	7	63.6%	-	32	19	59.4%	32.1%
MN	4	8406	John A Sutter Middle School	Middle School	238	238	100.0%	108	45.4%	52.4%	43	7	16.3%	27.5%	211	61	28.9%	39.2%
NE	9	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	Senior High School	305	303	99.3%	162	53.5%	56.4%	162	25	15.4%	14.4%	181	71	39.2%	45.5%
MN	9	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle School	Middle School	428	428	100.0%	178	41.6%	36.5%	68	16	23.5%	14.0%	377	109	28.9%	23.2%
Resid	lent Sch	Resident Schools Median	ian		243	243	100.0%	112	51.1%	49.9%	65	12	17.0%	17.6%	187	65	34.9%	34.7%

PLOC School Name	Board District	Test	Grade	Subgroup ID	Students with Scores	Percentage Standard Not Met	Percentage Standard Nearly Met	Percentage Standard Met	Percentage Standard Exceeded
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	£	ELA	9	EL	16	94%	6%	%0	%0
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	m	ELA	2	EL	13	85%	15%	%0	%0
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	8	EL	10				
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	11	EL	£				
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	9	EL	16	%88	13%	%0	0%
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	З	MATH	2	EL	13	%58	15%	%0	%0
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	m	MATH	8	EL	10				
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	m	MATH	11	EL	З				
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	m	ELA	9	RFEP	37	30%	38%	30%	3%
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	m	ELA	2	RFEP	55	38%	33%	27%	2%
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	Э	ELA	8	RFEP	26	14%	54%	29%	4%
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	11	RFEP	16	13%	25%	38%	25%
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	9	RFEP	37	35%	43%	16%	5%
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	2	RFEP	55	%67	31%	13%	7%
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	m	MATH	8	RFEP	56	50%	30%	6%	11%
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	с	MATH	11	RFEP	16	%77	25%	19%	13%
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	Э	ELA	9	SPED	12	100%	%0	%0	%0
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	ŝ	ELA	2	SPED	17	76%	24%	%0	%0
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	m	ELA	8	SPED	12	50%	33%	17%	%0
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	ELA	11	SPED	8				
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	m	MATH	9	SPED	12	100%	%0	%0	%0
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	2	SPED	17	%78	89	12%	%0
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	3	MATH	8	SPED	12	75%	25%	%0	0%
8461 Magnolia Sci Acad #2	£	MATH	11	SPED	8				

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

2015-16	5-16					English Language	guage Arts			Mathe	Mathematics	
ΓD	BD	Loc Code	School	Subgroup	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy #2	All Students	34	31	27	8	49	27	14	6
				African American	-		-	1	-	I	-	-
				Latino	37	32	25	9	52	27	13	80
				English Learners	06	7	2	0	86	10	5	0
				Soc-eco Disadvantaged	35	32	26	7	49	28	14	8
				Students with Disabilities	71	22	9	0	84	8	8	0
LAUSD S	Similar St	AUSD Similar Schools from CDE	m CDE									
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle School	All Students	29	30	31	6	39	31	18	12
Μ	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle School	All Students	33	31	31	5	54	28	12	9
XR	4	8004	Inner City Education Foundation Vista Middle Aca	All Students	23	33	35	6	28	39	19	13
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle School	All Students	27	31	33	6	37	29	19	15
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy #3	All Students	23	34	35	8	42	36	16	6
XR	9	7779	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	All Students	36	30	28	9	41	34	17	8
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle School	All Students	39	29	25	9	46	31	13	10
ш	5	8377	South Gate Middle School	All Students	36	31	28	5	52	27	13	7
ш	5	8153	Southeast Middle School	All Students	46	29	22	4	54	32	11	3
XR	9	8426	PUC Triumph Academy and High School	All Students	32	28	32	8	39	34	20	7
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle School	All Students	33	31	27	8	51	32	11	6
LAUSD S	Similar St	chools fror.	AUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	All Students	33	31	31	8	42	32	16	7
Residen	Resident Schools	s										
NW	3	8259	William Mulholland Middle School	All Students	37	28	27	7	52	25	13	6
NN	9	8814	Reseda Senior High	All Students	15	25	36	24	46	24	20	11
NE	9	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory School	All Students	45	31	20	4	64	27	8	2
XR	ε	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High School	All Students	14	22	40	24	44	31	19	7
NE	з	8434	Van Nuys Middle School	All Students	46	30	21	3	60	25	10	4
NW	3	8283	Northridge Middle School	All Students	45	26	23	5	55	24	13	8
NW	3	8513	Northridge Academy Senior High	All Students	16	21	36	27	41	33	21	5
NN	з	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High School	All Students	6	22	38	31	33	28	27	12
NW	з	8898	Valley Academy of Arts and Sciences	All Students	12	20	45	22	54	30	12	4
NW	4	8406	John A Sutter Middle School	All Students	41	33	23	3	57	25	13	5
NE	9	8893	Van Nuys Senior High	All Students	13	21	43	23	35	28	25	13
NW	9	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle School	All Students	53	23	20	4	58	24	11	7
Residen.	it Schools	Resident Schools Median		All Students	27	24	32	15	53	26	13	7

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

2014-15	ŀ-15					English Lan	English Language Arts			Mathe	Mathematics	
ΓD	BD	Loc Code	School	Subgroup	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy #2	All Students	34	36	24	ъ	41	33	16	10
				African American	58	17	17	8	50	42	0	8
				Latino	35	38	23	4	44	32	15	6
				English Learners	86	14	0	0	77	17	3	3
				Soc-eco Disadvantaged	35	37	23	5	43	33	14	6
				Students with Disabilities	20	23	9	0	77	13	9	4
LAUSD Si	imilar Sc	AUSD Similar Schools from CDE	m CDE									
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle School	All Students	36	31	26	7	46	32	15	8
Ν	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle School	All Students	36	32	29	£	54	31	12	4
XR	4	8004	Inner City Education Foundation Vista Middle Aca	All Students	23	39	33	5	23	40	21	16
U	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle School	All Students	30	34	30	9	41	32	18	6
XR	7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy #3	All Students	44	34	19	3	50	37	10	3
XR	9	7779	PUC Nueva Esperanza Charter Academy	All Students	32	40	24	4	42	37	18	4
S	7	8104		All Students	37	31	25	9	48	29	14	9
ш	5	8377	South Gate Middle School	All Students	38	33	26	4	53	29	12	6
ш	5	8153	Southeast Middle School	All Students	41	32	24	3	59	30	8	3
XR	9	8426	PUC Triumph Academy and High School	All Students	45	33	20	2	59	22	14	5
XR	2	5984	Vista Charter Middle School	All Students	29	42	24	5	49	35	11	5
LAUSD SI	Similar Sc	schools fro	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	All Students	36	33	25	4	49	32	14	5
Resident	Resident Schools											
NN	e	8259	8259 William Mulholland Middle School	All Students	44	31	21	3	61	21	12	5
NN	9	8814	8814 Reseda Senior High	All Students	18	29	40	13	61	23	12	4
NE	9	8142	Robert Fulton College Preparatory School	All Students	52	29	16	3	68	23	7	2
XR	e	8557	Birmingham Community Charter High School	All Students	24	34	31	11	67	20	10	з
NE	З	8434	Van Nuys Middle School	All Students	53	29	17	2	60	27	10	3
NN	3	8283	Northridge Middle School	All Students	41	35	21	2	58	29	6	4
NN	З	8513	Northridge Academy Senior High	All Students	15	29	35	20	47	28	21	5
NN	З	8590	Grover Cleveland Charter High School	All Students	12	24	33	30	37	31	22	10
NN	З	8898		All Students	8	24	49	19	51	31	15	3
NN	4	8406		All Students	51	29	18	2	56	29	11	5
NE	9	8893		All Students	18	27	35	20	35	27	23	14
NN	9	8363	Francisco Sepulveda Middle School	All Students	52	27	18	3	58	23	12	7
Resident	t Schools	Resident Schools Median		All Students	33	29	26	7	58	27	12	5

Image: brough out	An a the j	asterisŀ final s €	sk (*) indica [.] set of ranks	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.	2012 Base API (2013 Growth A	or 2013 G I PI data.	irowth API	.Note: The	2013 state	ewide and s	similar school	ls ranks are				S	hool De	School Demographic Characteristics	ic Chara	Icteristic	S				
Image: Manual Amplicatione Academy 432 612 703 70 80 10 81 10 10 50 76 10 1 5 6 0 0 0 Image: Mage: Amplicatione Academy 355 6-12 759 756 4 5 10 10 11 13 5 6 7 10 11 </th <th>ΓD</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>School</th> <th>2013 Enrolled # on 1st Day of Testing</th> <th>Conf</th> <th>2012 Base API</th> <th>2013 Growth API</th> <th></th> <th>2013 Similar Schools Rank</th> <th>Met 2013 Sch-wide Target</th> <th>Met 2013 Subgroup Targets</th> <th>% Free/ Reduced Lunch</th> <th>% Sp Ed</th> <th>% GATE</th> <th>EL</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Two or 1ore</th>	ΓD			School	2013 Enrolled # on 1st Day of Testing	Conf	2012 Base API	2013 Growth API		2013 Similar Schools Rank	Met 2013 Sch-wide Target	Met 2013 Subgroup Targets	% Free/ Reduced Lunch	% Sp Ed	% GATE	EL									Two or 1ore
Image Mage Signe 6-12 759 756 4 5 No No 67 16 0 17 13 5 4 4 0 17 Mage Mage 372 6-12 785 748 3 8 No No No 72 10 2 5 17 13 5 14 10 11 11 10 11	XR				432	6-12	805	797	7	10	No	No	88	12	0	10	50	76	10	1	5	9	0	0	0
Image Mage Mage <t< td=""><td>XR</td><td></td><td></td><td>Magnolia Science Academy 2</td><td>365</td><td>6-12</td><td>759</td><td>756</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>No</td><td>No</td><td>67</td><td>16</td><td>0</td><td>15</td><td>31</td><td>71</td><td>13</td><td>5</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2</td></t<>	XR			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
I Magnolia Science Academy 4 182 6-12 767 761 7 No No No 76 12 0 18 16 2 2 0 1 2 Magnolia Science Academy 4 182 6-12 843 759 4 5 No No 85 9 0 17 48 81 6 3 5 5 0 0 1 Magnolia Science Academy 6 126 6-8 845 7 7 Ves No 48 10 0 14 50 15 3 6 2 2 1 </td <td>XR</td> <td>7</td> <td>8464</td> <td></td> <td>372</td> <td>6-12</td> <td>785</td> <td>748</td> <td>3</td> <td>8</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>72</td> <td>10</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td>19</td> <td>44</td> <td>2</td> <td>51</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td>	XR	7	8464		372	6-12	785	748	3	8	No	No	72	10	0	5	19	44	2	51	1	1	0	1	1
2 Magnolia Science Academy 5 236 6-12 843 759 4 5 No No 85 9 0 17 48 81 6 3 5 5 0 0 0 3 Magnolia Science Academy 6 126 6-8 845 828 7 7 Yes No 48 10 0 3 14 50 3 6 2 1 1 1 Magnolia Science Academy 7 116 K-5 906 904 9 10 Yes 16 1 15 20 61 23 2 5 7 1<	XR			Magnolia Science Academy 4	182	6-12	767	761	5	7	No	No	76	12	0	8	30	60		16	2	2	0	1	1
3 Magnolia Science Academy 6 126 6-8 845 7 7 Yes No 48 10 0 3 14 50 20 15 3 6 2 1 1 1 Magnolia Science Academy 7 116 K-5 906 904 9 10 Yes 73 16 1 15 20 61 23 2 5 0 0 0 10 Na Na Na Na Na 16 1 15 16 17 16 1 1 15 16 1 16 1 16 1 16 1 16 1 16 10 16 1 16 10 15 16 10 10 10 10 16 1 16 17 16 17 16 10 16 10 16 10 16 10 16 10 10 10 10	XR			Magnolia Science Academy 5	236	6-12	843	759	4	5	No	No	85	6	0	17	48	81	6	3	5	5	0	0	0
Image And Mage A model a Science Academy 7 116 K-5 906 904 9 10 Yes Yes 73 16 1 15 20 61 23 2 5 5 0 0 0 5 Magnolia Science Academy Bell 490 6-8 714 753 4 5 Yes Yes 94 7 0 16 47 98 2 0	XR	1	8013		126	6-8	845	828	7	7	Yes	No	48	10	0	3	14	50		15	3	6	2	1	3
5 Magnolia Science Academy Bell 490 6-8 714 763 4 5 Yes Yes 94 7 0 16 47 98 2 0 </td <td>XR</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>116</td> <td>K- 5</td> <td>906</td> <td>904</td> <td>6</td> <td>10</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>73</td> <td>16</td> <td>1</td> <td>15</td> <td>20</td> <td>61</td> <td>23</td> <td>2</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>3</td>	XR				116	K- 5	906	904	6	10	Yes	Yes	73	16	1	15	20	61	23	2	5	5	0	0	3
301 - 795 762 5 7 - · · 75 11 0 13 31 66 12 4 4 5 0 1	XR				490	6-8	714	763	4	5	Yes	Yes	94	7	0	16	47	98	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Sch	ools A	Median		301	I	795	762	5	7	:	:	75	11	0	13	31	66	12	4	4	5	0	1	1

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

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS OCTOBER 2015 CALPADS DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

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

2		Loc	Cobool	Total Enrol	I % F/R	OK GATE	07 EI	0/ 1 ating 0/ 1//bitg	0/1/1/14	% Af.	0/ Acian	07 Eili	% Am	% Pacific	% Two or
3		Code		#	Meal		70 EL		20 VVIIILE	Amer.		70 FIII.	Indian	Island	More
XR	9		8454 Magnolia Science Academy	540	91%	1%	12%	84%	7%	1%	4%	%E	%0	%0	%0
XR	3	8461	8461 Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	79%	2%	13%	82%	%6	3%	2%	2%	%0	%0	1%
XR	7	8464	8464 Magnolia Science Academy 3	455	81%	1%	5%	49%	2%	44%	1%	%0	1%	1%	3%
XR	4	8011	8011 Magnolia Science Academy 4	184	76%	1%	%6	78%	8%	10%	1%	1%	%0	1%	1%
XR	9		8012 Magnolia Science Academy 5	148	89%	4%	28%	82%	8%	5%	1%	%†	%0	%0	1%
XR	1	8013	8013 Magnolia Science Academy 6	165	84%	1%	15%	85%	3%	10%	1%	%0	%0	%0	1%
XR	З	8014	8014 Magnolia Science Academy 7	291	74%	2%	32%	66%	19%	5%	5%	3%	%0	%0	2%
XR	5	5166	5166 Magnolia Science Academy Bell	493	94%	1%	14%	93%	6%	%0	1%	%0	%0	%0	%0
Scho	Schools Median	edian		373	83%	1%	14%	82%	7%	5%	1%	2%	%0	%0	1%

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS RECLASSIFICATION RATES

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. This page displays the number of English learners (ELs) on Census Day, the number of students reclassified since the prior Census Day, beginning in 2013-14, the state moved the collection of official EL and Reclassification counts from Spring Census to Fall Census. The number reclassified by the number of prior year ELs. These data have historically been collected as of Spring Census Day. However, and the reclassification rate for each specified year. The reclassification rate, displayed in percentage, is calculated by dividing the 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.

ΓD	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	9	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	45	26	36%	72	21	29%	64	21	33%
XR	æ	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	56	6	15%	68	12	18%	99	20	30%
XR	7	8464	8464 Magnolia Science Academy 3	18	6	28%	27	0	%0	35	18	51%
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	14	1	5%	25	0	%0	28	3	11%
XR	9	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	41	8	18%	48	10	21%	34	2	6%
XR	1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	8	1	14%	12	3	25%	19	8	42%
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	42	15	40%	96	23	24%	74	0	%0
XR	5	5166	5166 Magnolia Science Academy Bell	76	19	19%	87	16	18%	74	21	28%
Schools Median	Is Me	dian		42	6	19%	58	11	20%	50	13	29%

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS RECLASSIFICATION OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

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

			0T-CT07	
		2015-16 #	Reclassification C	Change from Prior
2015-16	2014-15 # EL	Reclassified	Rate	Year
Schools Median	50	13	0	9.7%
District	164,349	19,952	12.1%	-4.5%

			CT-HT07
		2014-15 #	Reclassification
2014-15	2013-14 # EL	Reclassified	Rate
Schools Median	58	11	19.6%
District	179,322	29,694	16.6%

			+T-CTOZ
		2013-14 #	Reclassification
2013-14	2012-13 # EL	Reclassified	Rate
Schools Median	42	6	18.7%
District	170,797	25,532	13.9%

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

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

IN #	-	1	1	I	1	1	1	1	ł
# TBI	:	:	-	:	:	:	:	:	1
# SLI*	2	3	2	3	2	1	23	4	3
# SLD*	60	51	34	12	20	6	8	37	27
10 #		1						1	1
#HO	6	24	7	9	4	11	3	4	7
		-	-	ł	-	1	1	ł	1
# HOH # MR	2	1	1	-	1	4	-	1	1
# EMD	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	ł	
# ED	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	1
# DEAF	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	ł	
# DB	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	:
# AUT	7	5	З	4	1	2	2	9	4
% Low Incidence	11%	%6	10%	16%	7%	22%	6%	15%	11%
% High Incidence	89%	91%	%06	84%	93%	78%	94%	85%	89%
Sp Ed Enroll %	16%	18%	11%	14%	19%	16%	12%	11%	15%
Sp Ed Enroll #	85	86	48	25	28	27	36	53	42
OCT 2015 Enroll #	540	487	455	184	148	165	291	493	373
School	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	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	
Loc Code	8454	8461	7978	8011	8012	8013	8014	5166	dian
BD	9	3	7	4	9	1	3	5	Schools Median
LD	XR	XR	XR	XR	XR	XR	XR	XR	Schol

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

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

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

MAGNOLIA CHARTER SCHOOLS HIGH SCHOOL DATA

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

<mark>98%</mark>	91%	87%	<mark>%06</mark>	<mark>%68</mark>			lian	Schools Median	School
1		:	:		8-9	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	5166	5	XR
:		-	-		K- 5	Magnolia Science Academy 7	8014	3	XR
:	-	-	-	:	6-8	Magnolia Science Academy 6	8013	1	XR
-	96%	87%	92%	85%	6-12	Magnolia Science Academy 5	8012	9	XR
88%	91%	88%	80%	88%	6-12	Magnolia Science Academy 4	8011	4	XR
98%	71%	62%	81%	%68	6-12	Magnolia Science Academy 3	8464	7	XR
100%	83%	83%	87%	%26	6-12	Magnolia Science Academy 2	8461	3	XR
98%	%56	88%	93%	%56	6-12	Magnolia Science Academy	8454	9	XR
2014-15 Cohort Graduation Rate	2013-14 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed ELA	2013-14 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed Math	2012-13 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed ELA	2012-13 CAHSEE Grade 10 % Passed Math	2014-15 Grade Span	School	Loc Code	BD	ΓD

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.

							201E-16							2015-16 SUBGROUPS	BGROUPS				-
							01-0107				AFRICAN A	AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS	TUDENTS			STUDEN	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY	ABILITY	
LD BD	Loc Code	School	Susp. Event Susp. Rate 2013- Event Rate 14 2014-15		Susp. Event Single Std. Rate Susp. %	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015- 16	Susp. Event Single Std. Rate 2015- Susp % 201 16 16	Susp. Event Single Std. Rate 2015- Susp % 2015- # Enrolled 16 16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015- 16	Susp. Event Single Std. Rate 2015- Susp % 201 16 16	Susp. Event Single Std. Rate 2015- Susp % 2015- 16 16
XR 6	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	540	1	5	е	1		:		84				
XR 3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	1.6%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	487	m	12	14	I	ı	ł	ł	82	ı	1	ł	ł
XR 7	8464	Magnolia Science Academy 3	2.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	455	0	0	198	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	47	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
XR 4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	%6'9	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	184	0	0	19	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	24	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
XR 6	8012	Magnolia Science Academy 5	2.9%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	148	0	0	2	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	28	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
XR 1	8013	Magnolia Science Academy 6	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	165	1	1	17	1	1	5.9%	5.9%	27	-		1	-
XR 3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy 7	%0'0	%0.0	0.0%	0.0%	291	0	0	14	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	34	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%	54	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Schools Median	ut		1.2%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	373	0	0	14	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	41	0	0	0.0%	0.0%

Suspension Events: The number of suspensions issued by the school Suspension Days: The total number of days issued for all suspension events Suspension Event Rate: The rate is calculated by dividing the total number of suspension events for the school or subgroup (events/enrollment) Single Student Suspension %: The percent of students in the school or subgroup by the total enrollment of the school or subgroup (events/enrollment) Single Student Suspension %: The percent of students in the school or subgroup that have been suspended one or more times (students suspended/enrollment)

Report updated on: 6/24/2016 210

MAGNOLIA CMO TITLE III ACCOUNTABILITY DATA

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

													AMAO 2	AMAO 2 - Attaining English Proficiency	English Pro	oficiency		
						AM.	AMAO 1 - Annual Growth	ual Growt	ų			Less than 5 years	5 years			5 Years or More	or More	
LD	BD) Loc Code	e School	School Type	Number of Annual CELDT Takers	Number in with Prior Cohort CELDT Scores	Percent with Prior CELDT Scores	Number Met AMAO 1	Percent Met AMAO 1 / 2014-15 2	Percent Met Nur AMAO 1 C 2013-14	Number in A Cohort P	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2014-15	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14	Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2014-15	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14
XR	9	8454	Magnolia Science Academy	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	63	0	0.0%	:	:	1	7	:	:	1	56	19	33.9%	46.6%
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy #2	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	65	0	%0.0	:	-	56.0%	14	7	50.0%	:	51	22	43.1%	41.7%
XR	2	8464	Magnolia Science Academy #3	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	29	16	55.2%	:		1	1		:	I	29	12	41.4%	:
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy #4	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	16	13	81.3%	8	61.5%	1	2	-	:	I	22	8	36.4%	:
XR	۶ و	8012	Magnolia Science Academy #5	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	27	22	81.5%	4	18.2%	59.5%	12	0	0.0%	:	22	4	18.2%	46.3%
XR	1	. 8013	Magnolia Science Academy #6	Middle School	20	0	%0.0	:	-	1	7		:	I	15	7	46.7%	:
XR	3	8014	Magnolia Science Academy #7	Elementary School	06	06	100.0%	53	58.9%	66.2%	91	35	38.5%	37.5%	5		;	:
XR	2	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell @ South Region MS #2A	Middle School	75	0	%0.0	:	-	1	3	-	:	I	72	30	41.7%	31.7%
CMC	O Schoo	MO Schools Median			46	7	27.6%	8	58.9%	59.5%	7	7	38.5%	37.5%	26	12	41.4%	44.0%

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

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

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>.

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

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW FOR A RENEWAL CHARTER.

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

The Act further provides that renewals and material revisions of charter petitions are governed by the same standards and criteria set forth in Education Code section 47605 "and shall include but not be limited to, a reasonably comprehensive description of any new requirement of charter schools enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed." (Ed. Code § 47607, subd. (a)(2).)

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

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

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

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

- 1) The charter school presents an unsound educational program for the pupils to be enrolled in the charter school.
- 2) The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.
- 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. <u>ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE</u>

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. <u>Summary</u>

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

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

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

² "District Similar Schools" are LAUSD schools on the CDE's Similar Schools list for this Charter School.

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

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

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

B. <u>Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math</u>

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

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

C. <u>Student Subgroup Academic Growth</u>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. STAFF SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION.

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

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

V. <u>FINDINGS OF FACT FOR DENIAL.</u>

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

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

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

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. <u>Failure to Timely Respond to FCMAT's Document Requests</u>:

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. <u>Failure to Timely Respond to OIG's Document/Information Requests</u>: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, <u>over two years after</u> OIG's original request, MERF sent another response that failed to account for and provide the requested records and information. Among other things, MERF failed to provide the following requested items:
 - Corporate documents related to MERF and all affiliates, including, but not limited to, MPM Sherman Way LLC and Magnolia Properties Management Inc.
 - QuickBooks files for all entities, including, but not limited to, MPM Sherman Way LLC
 - Identification of owners, partners, and members of all affiliates, including, but not limited to, MPM Sherman Way LLC and Magnolia Properties Management Inc.
 - Payroll registers, 1099s, and W-2s

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

• <u>Governance Structure (Element 4)</u> The petition <u>does not</u> contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the charter school's governance structure.

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

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

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

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

• <u>Employee Qualifications (Element 5)</u> 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.

• <u>Suspension and Expulsion Procedures (Element 10)</u>

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. Cleary 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. <u>RECOMMENDATION</u>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And, District further finds:

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

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

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

CONCLUSION

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

Exhibits 1-18 May be viewed at:

http://laschoolboard.org/sites/default/files /10-18-16BR164Exhibits.pdf **TAB 8**



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

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

- (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

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

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: .

Expected Outcomes:

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

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 A	BOARD IS					
Type of Charter School:	Start-Up Independe		REQUIRED TO TAKE ACTION				
CMO/Network:	Magnolia Public Sch	100ls (MERF)		BY:			
Location Code:	8464			October 18, 2016			
Type of Site(s):	Proposition 39 Co-L	ocation with Curtiss M	iddle S	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						
STAFF FINDINGS	 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: Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the educational program set forth in the petition. The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all required elements. Please see Findings of Fact in Support of Recommendation of Denial of the Renewal Charter Petition for Magnolia Science Academy 3 for further detail. Please also see "Staff Review and Assessment" section below. 						
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

	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. "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: 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

A. <u>School History</u>

	 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." 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.
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	 MSA3 is a 6-12 span school that offers a Science Technology Engineering Arts and Mathematics (STEAM) instructional program that includes: 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	 MSA3 implements its own English Learner Master Plan. 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

	22
GATE/High Achieving	coordinator or Special Education Teacher, Academic Dean, and
Students	General Education teacher, review all pieces of data and then make a
	determination of eligibility:
	• 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												

*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 <u>not</u> 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. <u>Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?</u> *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 <u>not</u> 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 24%.

2015-16		En	iglish Lan	guage Ar	ts	Mathematics			
School	Cult and up	% Standard	% Standard	% Standard	% Exceeds	% Standard	% Standard	% Standard	% Exceeds
School	Subgroup	Not Met	Nearly Met	Met	Standard	Not Met	Nearly Met	Met	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		En	iglish Lan	guage Ar	ts	Mathematics			
School	<u>Cub ano un</u>	% Standard	% Standard	% Standard	% Exceeds	% Standard	% Standard	% Standard	% Exceeds
School	Subgroup	Not Met	Nearly Met	Met	Standard	Not Met	Nearly Met	Met	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

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

c. Minimum Renewal Eligibility Criteria

Minimum Renewal Criteria	Yes/No
(School must meet at least one of the following criteria (Ed. Code § 47607(b).)	105/110
Has the charter school attained its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in the	N/A**
prior year or in two of the last three years, both schoolwide and for all significant subgroups?	1N/A
Has the charter school ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API in the prior year or in	N/A**
two of the last three years?	\mathbf{N}/\mathbf{A}
Has the charter school ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API for a demographically	N/A**
comparable school in the prior year or in two of the last three years?	IN/A**

Yes

222

*"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 <u>and</u> 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	13-14 EL #	14-15 Reclass	14-15 Reclass	14-15 EL #	15-16 Reclass	15-16 Reclass
	#*	#	Rate		#	Rate		#	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. <u>CAHSEE Passage and Graduation Rates [HS only]</u>

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		2014-15 Cohort Graduation Rate
Magnolia Science Academy 3	6-12	89%	81%	62%	71%	98 %
LAUSD Similar Schools Median		93%	89%	86%	87%	9 4%
Resident Schools Median		79%	75%	79%	74%	85%

g. <u>Annual Oversight Results (Based on Former API System)</u>

	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. <u>Additional Information</u> 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	2	3
Rating in Category of Governance *	Developing	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

				2015-16				2015-16 SUBGROUPS									
				2013-10				AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS					STUDEN	ITS WITH	DISABILITY		
School	Susp. Event Rate 2013- 14	Susp. Event Rate 2014- 15	Susp. Event Rate	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16		Event Rate	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16	#Enrolled	# Events 2015-16		Event Rate	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 %	% High Incidenc e	% Low Inciden ce	# AUT	# DB	# DEAF	# ED	# EMD	# НОН	# 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. <u>Additional Information</u> 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.

225

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report	3	2
Rating in Category of Fiscal Operations	Proficient	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/ <mark>Out</mark>	\$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. <u>2014 2015 Independent Audit Report</u> Audit Opinion: Unmodified Material Weakness: None Reported Deficiency/Finding: None Reported
- d. <u>Other Significant Fiscal Information</u> 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. <u>Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?</u>

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. <u>Does the Petition Contain the Required Affirmations, Assurances, and Declarations?</u> *This criterion has not been determined to be a finding.*

Magnolia Science Academy 3

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	Growth	Growth	Met Target	Growth	Growth	Met	Growth	Growth	Met	
Subgroup Art	Target	Growth	Wiet Target	Target	Growth	Target	Target	Growth	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	А	-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 Com	nparison		
	2011	2012	11-12	2012	2013	12-13
	Base API	Growth API	Growth	Base API	Growth API	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 Lar	nguage Arts	Mathematics				
	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below Basic	Proficient & Advanced	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below Basic	Proficient & Advanced			
Magnolia Science Academy 3	50%	51%	76%	24%			
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	Schools from CDE 51%		61%	39%			
Resident Schools Median	63%	37%	75%	26%			

			AYP Cor	nparison						
		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%	

Loc. Code: 8464

CDS Code: 0115030

Magnolia Science Academy 3 2 BASE API AND 2013 GROWTH API DEMOGRAPHIC INFORM

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 aste	erisk (*) ir.	An asterisk (*) indicates that the school does not have a valid 2012 Base API or 2013 Growth API. Note: The 2013 statewide	th API. Note:	The 2013	statewide	and similar	schools ran	ıks are the f	and similar schools ranks are the final set of ranks	nks					-							
report	ed. These	reported. These ranks are based on the 2013 Growth API data.	ļ	ļ	ľ	ŀ							ŀ	SCD	school Demographic Characteristics	graphic	characti	eristics		-		
ΓD	BD Lo Coi	Loc Code School	2013 Enrolled # on 1st Day of Testing	Conf	2012 Base G API	2013 2 Growth SI API R	2013 20 State Sch Rank Ra	2013 Mei Similar Sch Schools Ta Rank	Met 2013 Me Sch-wide Su Target T	Met 2013 % Subgroup Re Targets L	% Free/ Reduced % Lunch	% Sp Ed %	% GATE %	6 EL %	6 EP % Latino	no %	e Amer	f. % er Asian	% Fili	% Am Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More
XR	7 84	8464 Magnolia Science Academy 3	372	6-12	785	748	3	8	No	No	72	10	0	5 19	9 44	2	51	1	1	0	1	1
LAUSI	D Similar	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																				
S	7 81:	8127 Alexander Fleming Middle	1557	6-8	763	771	4	7	Yes	No	71	12	16	9 35	5 70	9	15	2	5	0	2	0
XR	6 80	8054 Bert Corona Charter	364	6-8	691	734	3	° E	Yes	No	81	14	0	18 47	7 96	2	1	0	1	0	0	1
XR	2 20:	2024 PUC Excel Charter Academy	331	6-8	776	669	1	1	No	No	87	12	5	11 47	66 2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Ν	4 80:	8038 Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	883	6-8	764	764	4	9	No	No	100	13	19	14 51	1 82	7	9	3	2	0	0	0
XR	1 84	8458 KIPP Academy of Opportunity	369	5-8	823	790	5	6	No	No	79	11	0	1 5	10	0	89	0	0	0	0	1
XR	6 82:	8212 PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	350	6-8	855	843	7 2	10	Yes	No	88	13	7	13 52	2 95	2	1	0	1	1	0	0
U	5 80	8066 Luther Burbank Middle	873	7- 8	792	786	5	8	No	No	100	11	19	12 40	0 91	1	2	2	3	1	0	0
XR	3 84	8461 Magnolia Science Academy 2	365	6-12	759	756	4	5	No	No	67	16	0	15 31	1 71	13	5	4	4	0	1	2
XR	4 80	8011 Magnolia Science Academy 4	182	6-12	767	761	5	7	No	No	76	12	0	8 30	09 00	18	16	2	2	0	1	1
XR	5 51	5166 Magnolia Science Academy Bell	490	6-8	714	763	4	5	Yes	Yes	94	7	0	16 47	7 98	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
S	7 81	8104 Richard Henry Dana Middle	1489	6-8	733	753	4	5	Yes	No	71	14	16	8 23	3 73	13	8	1	1	1	1	0
XR	2 80	8018 Synergy Kinetic Academy	466	6-8	804	784	5	8	No	No	95	6	11	20 52	2 96	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
XR	6 84	8426 PUC Triumph Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High	336	6-8	828	838	7	10	Yes	Yes	93	13	7	10 60	0 97	0	2	0	0	1	0	0
XR	1 84	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
LAUSL	D Similar	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	367	-	772	768	5	7	-	:	84	12	9	12 44	4 87	2	5	1	1	0	0	0
Residu	Resident Schools	ols																				
S	7 81	8103 Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle	660	6-8	704	707	2	5	No	No	75	11	15	5 21	1 42	1	56	1	0	0	0	0
S	7 86	8664 Gardena Senior High	1238	9-12	633	641	1	3	Yes	No	68	11	12	16 37	7 70	1	21	4	2	0	1	0
S	7 88	8868 Rancho Dominguez Preparatory	1068	6-12	681	673	2	3	No	No	71	10	12	7 21	1 61	2	27	1	9	1	3	0
S	7 83:	8352 Robert E. Peary Middle	1635	6-8	724	720	2	4	No	No	73	13	16	13 33	3 65	1	26	4	2	1	1	0
S	7 84	8487 Stephen M. White Middle	1808	6-8	764	751	3	3	No	No	65	13	19	9 27	7 64	3	10	2	17	0	4	0
S	7 80	8090 Andrew Carnegie Middle	885	6-8	737	729	2	5	No	No	76	13	14	7 17	7 50	2	22	2	16	0	8	0
XR	7 80	8087 Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	542	9-12	675	681	2	6	Yes	Yes	88	11	0	35 34	4 83	1	15	0	0	0	0	0
S	7 81	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
XR	1 51	5180 Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle	583	6-8	593	629	1	2	Yes	Yes	76	17	0	19 20	0 50	0	47	0	0	0	0	2
XR	1 51	5181 Animo Western Charter Middle	590	6-8	655	694	1	6	Yes	Yes	86	17	0	19 33	3 66	1	31	0	0	1	0	1
S	7 83:	8352 Robert E. Peary Middle	1635	6-8	724	720	2	4	No	No	73	13	16	13 33	3 65	1	26	4	2	1	1	0
S	7 22	2247 Avalon Gardens Elementary	154	K- 6	800	814	6	10	Yes	Yes	66	11	6	12 11	1 35	0	64	1	0	0	0	0
Residu	ent Scho	Resident Schools Median	902	1	693	701	2	4	-	:	76	13	12	13 27	7 64	1	27	1	1	0	1	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.

		Loc		Total Enroll	% F/R					% Af.			% Am	% Pacific	% Two or
LD	BD	Code	School	#	Meal	% GATE	% EL	% Latino	% White		% Asian	% Fili.	Indian	Island	More
XR	7	8464	8464 Magnolia Science Academy 3	455	81%	1%	5%	49%	2%	44%	1%	%0	1%	1%	3%
LAUSI	D Simil	lar Scho	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE												
S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	1442	80%	1%	13%	72%	5%	14%	3%	4%	%0	1%	1%
XR	9	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
M	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	9	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	351	84%	%0	14%	95%	%0	2%	1%	1%	1%	%0	%0
С	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	815	88%	2%	11%	%06	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	%0	%0
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	%6 <i>L</i>	2%	13%	82%	%6	3%	2%	2%	%0	%0	1%
XR	4	8011	Magnolia Science Academy 4	184	76%	1%	%6	78%	8%	10%	1%	1%	%0	1%	1%
XR	5	5166	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%	%6	70%	15%	8%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%
XR	2	8018	Synergy Kinetic Academy	477	%66	%0	19%	97%	%0	3%	%0	%0	%0	%0	%0
XR	9	8426	8426 PUC Triumph Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High	726	80%	%0	11%	97%	1%	1%	%0	%0	%0	%0	%0
XR	1	8460	8460 View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle	424	83%	%0	1%	3%	%0	95%	%0	%0	%0	%0	1%
LAUS	D Simil	lar Schot	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	482	84%	1%	13%	80%	3%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Reside	Resident Schools	hools													
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	2247 Avalon Gardens Elementary	254	84%	%0	24%	44%	1%	53%	%0	%0	%0	%0	1%
Reside	ent Sch	Resident Schools Median	edian	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%
LAUS	D Sim	ilar Scho	ools 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%
С	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%
LAUS	D Sim	ilar Scho	ools from CDE Median	59	20	23%	72	13	18%	65	10	14%
Resid	ent So	chools										
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%
Resid	ent Sc	hools N	ledian	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	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 (*).

	ΓD	BD	Loc Code	School	OCT 2015 Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll %	% High Incidence	% Low Incidence	# AUT	# DB	# DEAF	# ED	# EMD	# HOH #	# MR	# [*] IHO	IO #	# SLD*	+ ۲۱۱۶ #	# TBI	> #
mCDE 1442 ander Fleming Middle 1442 Corona Charter 375 Excel Charter Academy 371 Excel Charter Academy 321 Excel Charter Academy 315 Excel Charter Academy 351 Excel Charter Academy 351 Academy of Opportunity 351 Academy of Opportunity 351 I Lakeview Charter Academy 351 Academy of Opportunity 351 I Lakeview Charter Academy 351 I er Burbank Middle 351 I er Burbank Middle 351 I er Burbank Middle 351 I olia Science Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High 726 I funny D charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High 726 I funny Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High 726 I funny Charter Middle 424 I funny Charter Middle 424 I funny Charter Middle 1332 I funny Charter Middle 557 I funny Charter Middle 557 I funny Charter Middle 557 <td< th=""><th>XR</th><th>7</th><th>8464</th><th></th><th>455</th><th>48</th><th>11%</th><th>90%</th><th>10%</th><th>3</th><th>:</th><th>1</th><th>1</th><th>1</th><th>1</th><th>ı</th><th>7</th><th></th><th>34</th><th>2</th><th>1</th><th>1</th></td<>	XR	7	8464		455	48	11%	90%	10%	3	:	1	1	1	1	ı	7		34	2	1	1
ander Fleming Middle 1442 142 1435 1442 1442 1442 1442 1442 1444 1445 1445	LAUS	D Simil	lar Scho	ols from CDE																		
Corona Charter375375Excel Charter Academy321321Excel Charter Academy321811Ert Howe Bancroft Mildle811357Ert Howe Bancroft Mildle351357Fat dealemy of Opportunity351357Academy of Opportunity351351Iakeview Charter Academy 2815487Iakeview Charter Academy 2487493Iakeview Charter Academy A Bell4931546Iolia Science Academy Bell493726Iolia Science Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High726424Indin Science Academy A PUC Triumph Charter High726726Indin Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High726726Indin Charter Academy A PUC Triumph Charter Middle424726Indin Charter Middle726726726Indin Charter Middle726726726Indin Charter Middle726726726Indin Charter Middle726726726Indin Charter Middle726726726Indin Charter Middle726726726Indin Charter Middle726732732Indin Charter Middle736732732Indin Charter Middle736732732Indin Charter Middle732732732Indir Charter Middle732732732Indir Charter Middle732732732Indir Charter Middle732732732	S	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle	1442	153	11%	78%	22%	21		-	2	-	2	-	18	1	101	1	-	
Excel Charter Academy321Excel Charter Academy811Academy of Opportunity367Academy of Opportunity367Iakeview Charter Academy 2815Iakeview Charter Academy 2815Iakeview Charter Academy 2815Iakeview Charter Academy 2815Iakeview Charter Academy 4815Iakeview Charter Academy 8923Iakeview Charter Academy 8184Iolia Science Academy 8477Iolia Science Academy 8474Iolia Science Academy 8477Iolia Science Academy 8726Iolia Science Academy 8477Interp Charter Middle424Interp Charter Middle536Ion Connegie Middle1332Ion Muhte Middle1610Ion White Middle557Ion Contege Preparatory Academy557Ion Western Charter Middle557Ion Western Charter Middle557Ion Carter Selmentary254Ion Carter Selmentary	XR	9	8054	Bert Corona Charter	375	60	16%	87%	13%	6	1	-	-	1	I	1	8	2	42	2	-	:
ert Howe Bancoft Middle811813Academy of Opportunity367367367Lakeview Charter Academy351351815Lakeview Charter Academy 2815487815er Burbank Middle815487361nolia Science Academy 2487184361nolia Science Academy Bell493477477nolia Science Academy Bell493477477nolia Science Academy Bell479477477nolia Science Academy Bell474477477nolia Science Academy Bell474477477norter Academy Bell474477477norter Middle544546557544norter Middle133216841630557norter Middle1586557554557norter Middle1684557554554norter Middle1332554554554norter Middle1532554554554norter Middle1332554554554norter Middle1332554554555norter Renertary554554555555	XR	2	2024	PUC Excel Charter Academy	321	48	15%	81%	19%	6	1	-	:	:	1	I	7	1	30	2	;	:
Academy of Opportunity367367Lakeview Charter Academy35118Lakeview Charter Academy 235118er Burbank Middle815487nolia Science Academy 2487184nolia Science Academy Bell184184nolia Science Academy Bell15461546ref Henry Dana Middle15461546ref Henry Dana Middle15461546ref Henry Dana Middle477156ref Henry Dana Middle424256ref Henry Dana Middle424256ref Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle2261332ref Refrance138613321332n Mammond Curtiss Middle133213321332n Hammond Curtiss Middle133213321332n CDE Median133213321332n Hammond Curtiss Middle133213321332n CDE Median133213321332n Dominguez Preparatory Academy15861332ert E. Peary Middle13321641663on Orester Charter Middle557557on Western Charter Middle1332547on Carter Sternetary254554554on Carter Sternetary254554554on Carter Sternetary254554554on Carter Sternetary254554554on Carter Sternetary254554554on Carter Sternetary254554554 </td <td>Ν</td> <td>4</td> <td>8038</td> <td>Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle</td> <td>811</td> <td>51</td> <td>%9</td> <td>%69</td> <td>31%</td> <td>6</td> <td></td> <td>4</td> <td>-</td> <td>:</td> <td>2</td> <td>-</td> <td>4</td> <td>:</td> <td>31</td> <td>:</td> <td>-</td> <td>1</td>	Ν	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	811	51	%9	%69	31%	6		4	-	:	2	-	4	:	31	:	-	1
Lakeview Charter Academy3511Lakeview Charter Academy 2815815nolia Science Academy 2487487nolia Science Academy Bell184184nolia Science Academy Bell15461546nolia Science Academy Bell4771546nolia Science Academy Bell4771546nolia Science Academy Bell4771546nolia Science Academy Bell477477riumph Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High7261546Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle4241566Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle15861332Immond Curtiss Middle54415861332In Harmond Curtiss Middle133216101332In Harmond Curtiss Middle133216101332In CDE Media133216101332In CDE Media55416101332In CDE Media5575541610In Conninguez Preparatory Academy5571610In Conninguez Preparatory Academy5571610In Conninguez Preparatory Academy5541610In Conferencies Middle1586557In Conferencies Middle557554In Conferencies Middle554554In Conferencies Middle1332554In Conferencies Conferencies Middle554554In Conferencies Conferencies Conferencies554554In Conferencies Conferencies554554 <t< td=""><td>XR</td><td>1</td><td>8458</td><td>KIPP Academy of Opportunity</td><td>367</td><td>45</td><td>12%</td><td>93%</td><td>7%</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>I</td><td>-</td><td>18</td><td>-</td><td>22</td><td>2</td><td>-</td><td>1</td></t<>	XR	1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	367	45	12%	93%	7%	3	1	-	-	-	I	-	18	-	22	2	-	1
er Burbank Middle 815 els nolia Science Academy 2 487 a 487 nolia Science Academy 4 481 184 nolia Science Academy Bell 481 184 and Henry Dana Middle 432 155 155 Frey Kinetic Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High 726 477 171 Triumph Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High 726 155 Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle 424 155 Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle 424 155 Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle 424 155 Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle 155 Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle 158 158 158 Park Dominguez Preparatory Academy 158 158 158 158 158 158 158 158 158 158	XR	9	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	351	46	13%	%02	30%	10			:	:	1	-	3	:	26	3		1
nolia Science Academy 2 487 887 nolia Science Academy 4 184 184 nolia Science Academy Bell 184 184 nolia Science Academy Bell 433 477 ard Henry Dana Middle 1546 1546 regy Kinetic Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High 726 726 Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle 424 726 Immond Curtiss Middle 544 1586 Immond Curtiss Middle 543 1586 Immond Curtiss Middle 1586 1332 Immond Curtiss Middle 1332 1610 Imm	U	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	815	82	10%	78%	22%	16			:	:	1	-	3	:	60	1		1
nolia Science Academy 4 184 184 nolia Science Academy Bell 493 493 ard Henry Dana Middle 1546 497 rgy Kinetic Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High 726 477 rgy Kinetic Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High 726 726 Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle 424 424 Immond Curtiss Middle 544 1586 726 Immond Curtiss Middle 544 1586 726 Immond Curtiss Middle 1332 1610 726 Immond Curtiss Middle 1332 1610 726 In Hammond Curtiss Middle 1332 1610 726 Immond Curtiss Middle 1332 1610 726 In CDF Median 1332 1610 726 In CDF Median 1332 1610 732 In CDF Median 1332 1610 733 In CDF Median 1332 1610 733 In CDF Locke College Preparatory Academy 924 1610 In Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 1634 1634 In Corke College Preparatory Academy 1332 1610 In Corke College Preparatory Academy 1332 1332 In Leroy Locke College Preparato	XR	ю	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	487	86	18%	91%	%6	5	1	1	1	1	1	ı	24	1	51	е	1	1
nolia Science Academy Bell49393ard Henry Dana Middle15461546rgr Kinetic Academy77776rgr Kinetic Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High726726Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle424424In CDE Median482154154In CDE Median154154154In Ammond Curtis Middle154154154In Ammond Curtis Middle1332154156Cho Dominguez Preparatory9751561332Cho Dominguez Preparatory13321610254Cho Dominguez Preparatory Academy92416101684Cho College Preparatory Academy5571661684Con Concegie Middle15105571661684Con Contragie Middle156168416841684Con Carnegie Middle1565572541665Con Western Charter Middle55760516651665Con Cardens Elementary254254254254Con Cardens Elementary254254254254254Con Cardens Elementary254254254254254Con Cardens Elementary254254254254254Con Cardens Elementary254254254254254Con Cardens Elementary254254254254254Con Cardens Elementary254254254254254	XR	4	8011		184	25	14%	84%	16%	4			-	:	I	-	9	-	12	з		÷
ard Henry Dana Middle 1546 1546 1548 1548 1548 1548 1548 1548 1548 1548	XR	5	5166	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	493	53	11%	85%	15%	9	:	1	1	:	1	ı	4	1	37	4	1	1
rgy Kinetic Academy Frag Kinetic Academy & PUC Triumph Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High 726 726 726 726 720 720 720 720 720 720 720 720 720 720	S	7	8104		1546	200	13%	81%	20%	24	-	-	5	:	2	1	28	3	133	-	-	1
Triumph Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter High 726 Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle 424 In CDE Median 424 Mathematication Accelerated Charter Middle 424 In Hammond Curtiss Middle 534 In Hammond Curtiss Middle 534 In Hammond Curtiss Middle 534 In Dominguez Preparatory 975 Ent E. Peary Middle 1332 In M. White Middle 1332 In M. White Middle 1510 In Corolege Preparatory Academy 557 In Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 557 In Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 605 In Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 605 In Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 657 In Contense Middle 557 In Media 605 In Western Charter Middle 605 In Western Charter Middle 1332 In Media 1332	XR	2	8018		477	64	13%	84%	16%	7	1	1	1	1	1	I	10	1	43	1	1	1
Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle 424 mCDE Median 482 In Hammond Curtiss Middle 544 In Hammond Curtiss Middle 544 In Hammond Curtiss Middle 544 In Barter Senior High 548 In Dominguez Preparatory 975 In Dominguez Preparatory 1586 In Dominguez Preparatory 975 In Contraction 1532 In Muthe Middle 1332 In Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 1684 In Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 557 In Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 605 In Constementary 557 In Model 557 In Constementary 556 In Cardens Elementary 254	XR	6	8426		726	129	18%	85%	15%	15	1	1	1	1	з	I	20	1	90	1	1	1
Im CDE Median 482 In Hammond Curtiss Middle 544 In Hammond Curtiss Middle 544 Iena Senior High 544 Iena Senior High 546 Iena Senior High 1586 Iena Senior High 975 Iena Senior High 975 Iena Senior High 1332 Iena Senior High 1332 Ien M. White Middle 1133 Ieno Locke College Preparatory Academy 1684 Ierov Locke College Preparatory Academy 557 Ierov Locke College Preparatory Academy 605 Io Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle 537 Io Western Charter Middle 636 Io Western Charter Middle 1332 Io Cardens Elementary 254	XR	1	8460	View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle	424	56	13%	86%	14%	5	1	1	-	-	1	-	19	-	27	2	-	1
n Hammond Curtiss Middle 544 54 lena Senior High 544 55 cho Dominguez Preparatory 975 975 ent E. Peary Middle 1332 1333 hen M. White Middle 2924 1684 1684 1684 1684 1684 1684 557 rew Carnegie Middle 557 05 terov Locke College Preparatory Academy 1684 1684 1686 1695 1686 1686 1686 1686 11332 1684 1686 1695 1695 1695 1695 1695 1695 1695 169	LAUS	D Simil	lar Scho	ols from CDE Median	482	58	13%	84%	16%	8	:	4	2	I	1	1	9	1	40	2	1	1
n Hammond Curtiss Middle 544 54 lena Senior High 1586 1586 ho Donninguez Preparatory 755 55 ert E. Peary Middle 1332 1610 hen M. White Middle 2610 2014 1684 hen M. White Middle 2614 1684 1684 ne Carnegie Middle 557 1684 1687 1687 1687 1687 1688 1692 1688 1692 1688 1692 1688 1692 1693 1693 1693 1693 1693 1693 1693 1693	Resid	ent Sch	hools																			
lena Senior High 1586 iho Dominguez Preparatory 975 str. E. Peary Middle 1322 hen M. White Middle 1332 hen M. White Middle 1610 ew Carnegie Middle 924 leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 1684 of Gompers Middle 557 uel Gompers Middle 557 o Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle 557 no Western Charter Middle 605 on Western Charter Middle 1332 on Western Charter Middle 557	S	7	8103	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle	544	39	7%	85%	15%	6	I	1	1	1	1	I	10	1	23	1	1	1
Cho Dominguez Preparatory 975 Ert E. Peary Middle 1332 hen M. White Middle 1332 hen M. White Middle 1610 ew Carnegie Middle 924 iew Carnegie Middle 924 of Edmpers Middle 924 of Edmpers Middle 957 of Gompers Middle 557 of Gompers Middle 557 of Hills Wheatley Charter Middle 557 no Western Charter Middle 605 on Western Charter Middle 526 on Western Charter Middle 1332 on Gardens Elementary 254	S	7	8664	Gardena Senior High	1586	223	14%	70%	30%	34	I	ł	ю	I	5	10	21	с	134	1	1	1
ert E. Peary Middle 1332 hen M. White Middle 1332 hen M. White Middle 1610 1610 iew Carnegie Middle 924 1684 1680 her Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 1684 1680 her College Preparatory Academy 655 on Vestern Charter Middle 605 no Western Charter Middle 1332 hor Western Charter Middle 1332 hor Methods 1332 hor Methods 1332 hor Cardens Elementary 254 hor Cardens Elementary 255 hor Cardens El	S	7	8868	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory	975	119	12%	76%	24%	13	1	1	2	1	1	1	23	1	67	1	1	1
hen M. White Middle 1610 ew Carnegie Middle 924 ew Carnegie Middle 924 n Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 1684 n Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 557 o Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle 557 no Western Charter Middle 605 no Western Charter Middle 626 no Western Charter Middle 1332 no Western Kiddle 1332 on Gardens Elementary 254	S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	1332	183	14%	72%	28%	40	1	1	3	1	1	1	22	1	109	1	1	1
ew Carnegie Middle 924 ever Carnegie Middle 924 1 Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 1684 1684 ever College Preparatory Academy 657 100 Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle 605 100 Western Charter Middle 626 1332 ert E. Peary Middle 1332 00 Gardens Elementary 254 00 Gardens Elementary 050 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	S	7	8487	Stephen M. White Middle	1610	192	12%	73%	27%	30	1	1	1	1	2	I	25	1	111	4	1	1
n Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy 1684 1684 1684 1687 1687 1697 1697 1697 1697 1697 1697 1697 169	S	7	8090		924	143	15%	71%	29%	16	1	7	1	1	9	-	20	-	74	7	1	9
uel Gompers Middle 557 557 on Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle 605 605 io Western Charter Middle 526 at 1.232 at t. Peary Middle 1332 54 547 00 Gardens Elementary 554 554	XR	7	8087	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	1684	284	17%	61%	38%	36	1	1	15	1	з	9	26	3	147	1	2	1
no Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle 605 no Western Charter Middle 626 set E. Peary Middle 1332 ert E. Peary Middle 1332 of Gardens Elementary 254	S	7	8160	Samuel Gompers Middle	557	112	20%	69%	31%	19	1	1	6	1	1	1	19	1	56	2	1	1
no Western Charter Middle 626 1332 1332 1332 1332 1332 1332 1332	XR	1	5180	Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle	605	93	15%	76%	24%	13	1	-	9	1	I	I	16	1	53	2	1	ł
ert E. Peary Middle 1332 on Gardens Elementary 254 on Gardens March 254	XR	1	5181	Animo Western Charter Middle	626	93	15%	71%	29%	2			1	-	ε	-	12	:	52	2	1	1
on Gardens Elementary 254	S	7	8352	Robert E. Peary Middle	1332	183	14%	72%	28%	40	I	1	3	1	1	I	22	1	109	1	1	1
OED OED	S	7	2247	Avalon Gardens Elementary	254	92	36%	22%	78%	8	1	ł	1	1	1	I	2	e	16	2	1	1
0C6	Resid	ent Sch	hools Me	edian	950	131	14%	72%	28%	18	:	4	3	1	3	5	21	1	71	2	1	1

~
-
=
_
<u> </u>
ŝ
23
-
<u> </u>
_
Sol
0
ō
ö
0
~
ч.
$\overline{\mathbf{n}}$
×
<u> </u>
and
~
ata
÷
σ
ä
()
4
0
0
d b
÷
ΠG
. ÷
H
۳
()
\sim

Report created on: 08/16/2016

33

~~~				1	2	201	2	~~~~	2	~~~~				24.22					- 1/2
LAUS	D Sim	ilar Sch	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	9	8054	Bert Corona Charter	323	8%	10%	46%	26%	10%	64%	36%	340	4%	27%	36%	27%	%9	67%	33%
XR	2	2024	PUC Excel Charter Academy	324	11%	19%	40%	21%	9%	20%	30%	326	7%	28%	33%	23%	8%	68%	31%
Ν	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	812	5%	11%	35%	32%	17%	51%	49%	830	7%	21%	34%	32%	%9	62%	38%
XR	1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	344	6%	13%	%67	36%	17%	48%	53%	345	5%	16%	28%	38%	13%	49%	51%
XR	9	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	316	3%	%L	%67	38%	23%	39%	61%	320	2%	%6	20%	36%	34%	31%	70%
U	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	810	5%	12%	%EE	36%	15%	50%	51%	808	5%	16%	28%	35%	16%	49%	51%
XR	3	8461	Magnolia Science Academy 2	352	6%	12%	%EE	30%	18%	51%	48%	350	10%	30%	29%	23%	%L	%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	٢	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle	1365	5%	13%	%9E	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	9	8426	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triump	311	2%	11%	37%	37%	13%	50%	50%	318	1%	%L	14%	38%	40%	22%	78%
XR	1	8460	8460 View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Mid	327	5%	10%	35%	35%	15%	50%	50%	326	7%	22%	26%	32%	13%	55%	45%
LAUS	D Sim	nilar Sch	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	348	5%	11%	%SE	33%	15%	51%	50%	347.5	7%	22%	30%	30%	12%	61%	39%
Resid	lent Sc	<b>Resident Schools</b>																	
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%	%09	40%	1481	11%	27%	26%	26%	%6	64%	35%
S	7	8487	Stephen M. White Middle	1722	7%	13%	33%	32%	15%	53%	47%	1738	8%	23%	29%	29%	11%	%09	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%	%62	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%	%09	40%	1481	11%	27%	26%	26%	%6	64%	35%
S	7	2247	2247 Avalon Gardens Elementary	139	6%	11%	35%	28%	21%	52%	49%	138	4%	12%	26%	32%	25%	42%	57%
Resid	lent Sc	Resident Schools Median	Aedian	822	8%	18%	36%	27%	10%	63%	37%	831	13%	31%	26%	20%	7%	75%	26%
																			23

# 2012-13 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS-TEST (CST) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH RESULTS Magnolia Science Academy 3

% Prof /Adv 24%

B/BB/F

% Adv

% Basic % Prof

Below Basic **35%** 

% Far Below

#

% Prof /Adv **51%** 

B/BB/F

% Basic % Prof % Adv

Below

% Far Below

# Tested

Basic 5%

%

2013 CST ELA

%

BB 50%

13%

38%

30%

Basic 15%

372

8464 Magnolia Science Academy 3

XR 7

School Name

Loc. Code

BD

Ы

Basic 14%

Tested 371

%

2013 CST MATH

%

BB 76%

7%

17%

27%

ccountability
<
and
ata
$\Box$
of
Office

Report created on: 08/16/2016

3	4	

<mark>م</mark> ال	/0%	%c	%6T	24%	97%	18%	741	40%	<u>00%</u>	%7T	%/7	34%	18%	%5	347	vealan	Resident Schools Median	o nua	Can
59%	41%	26%	33%	22%	16%	3%	136	58%	42%	20%	38%	26%	12%	4%	136	2247 Avalon Gardens Elementary	2247	~	S
36%	63%	13%	23%	24%	27%	12%	1697	42%	60%	15%	27%	33%	18%	%6	1683	Robert E. Peary Middle	8352	7	S
23%	76%	5%	18%	23%	33%	20%	476	28%	72%	11%	17%	38%	24%	10%	466	Animo Western Charter Middle	5181	1	XR
16%	85%	2%	14%	26%	38%	21%	418	17%	83%	4%	13%	39%	26%	18%	432	Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle	5180	1	XR
16%	84%	5%	11%	18%	37%	29%	975	19%	80%	4%	15%	29%	27%	24%	978	Samuel Gompers Middle	8160	7	S
18%	82%	3%	15%	22%	33%	27%	453	20%	80%	5%	15%	35%	25%	20%	471	Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	8087	7	XR
40%	61%	11%	29%	28%	27%	6%	919	46%	54%	14%	32%	31%	17%	6%	916	Andrew Carnegie Middle	8090	7	S
42%	58%	12%	30%	30%	21%	7%	1801	50%	50%	19%	31%	30%	13%	7%	1797	Stephen M. White Middle	8487	7	S
36%	63%	13%	23%	24%	27%	12%	1697	42%	60%	15%	27%	33%	18%	%6	1683	Robert E. Peary Middle	8352	7	S
17%	83%	2%	15%	25%	35%	23%	966	40%	59%	12%	28%	35%	16%	8%	1007	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory	8868	7	S
4%	95%	%0	4%	12%	41%	42%	1249	30%	70%	6%	21%	34%	21%	15%	1306	Gardena Senior High	8664	7	S
25%	75%	5%	20%	29%	31%	15%	647	40%	29%	10%	30%	36%	17%	%9	641	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle	8103	7	S
																	Resident Schools	ident S	Resi
41%	61%	13%	29%	29%	23%	7%	354	50%	51%	18%	31%	34%	13%	5%	353	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	nilar Sch	ISD Sin	LAU
41%	%09	11%	30%	32%	23%	%5	358	51%	49%	19%	32%	33%	13%	3%	365	8460 View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Mid	8460	1	XR
75%	26%	34%	41%	17%	%9	3%	316	54%	46%	16%	38%	34%	%2	5%	316	PUC Triumph Charter Academy and PUC Triump	8426	9	XR
43%	57%	11%	32%	32%	22%	3%	459	55%	45%	20%	35%	34%	%6	2%	457	Synergy Kinetic Academy	8018	2	XR
38%	62%	12%	26%	29%	24%	%6	1416	45%	54%	17%	28%	30%	17%	%L	1429	Richard Henry Dana Middle	8104	7	S
26%	75%	8%	18%	28%	33%	14%	473	43%	57%	16%	27%	34%	15%	8%	473	Magnolia Science Academy Bell	5166	5	XR
34%	%99	13%	21%	25%	33%	%8	160	20%	51%	29%	21%	34%	%8	%6	160	Magnolia Science Academy 4	8011	4	XR
25%	75%	5%	20%	24%	35%	16%	307	49%	51%	25%	24%	34%	13%	4%	307	Magnolia Science Academy 2	8461	ŝ	XR
49%	51%	17%	32%	27%	19%	2%	783	54%	46%	17%	37%	32%	10%	4%	782	Luther Burbank Middle	8066	ß	U
76%	24%	39%	37%	16%	%9	2%	320	65%	34%	30%	35%	24%	%9	4%	315	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	8212	9	XR
60%	40%	18%	42%	25%	11%	4%	342	64%	36%	25%	39%	24%	8%	4%	341	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	8458	-	XR
40%	61%	7%	33%	37%	20%	4%	913	47%	52%	17%	30%	32%	14%	%9	886	8038 Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	8038	4	≥
							)			i	ì	)			)				

# 2011-12 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS-TEST (CST) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH RESULTS Magnolia Science Academy 3

% Prof /Adv

B/BB/F

% Adv

% Prof

% Basic

% Below Basic

> Below Basic

# Tested

% Prof /Adv

%

2012 CST ELA

% Basic % Prof % Adv B/BB/F

% Below Basic

% Far Below

# Tested

Basic

% Far

2012 CST MATH

%

BB

29%

72%

%6

20%

31%

32%

%6

270

58%

42%

21%

37%

28%

10%

4%

270

8464 Magnolia Science Academy 3

~

X

School Name

Loc. Code

BD

٦

BB

22% 41%

78% 60%

8%

36% 23%

13%

28%

37%

64%

13%

24% 16%

29% 32% 29%

25%

10% 10% 8%

1561 350 328

49% 37%

51% 62% 52%

20% 14% 17%

29% 23% 31%

34% 37% 32%

12% 16% 14%

5% 9% 6%

1526

340 329

PUC Excel Charter Academy

2024

2

XR

9

XR S

~

8127 Alexander Fleming Middle8054 Bert Corona Charter

LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE

48%

### 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
	7 Simila		Magnolia Science Academy 3 from CDE	6-12	89%	81%	62%	71%	98%
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					
LAUSE	) Simila	ar Schools	from CDE Median		93%	89%	86%	87%	94%
Reside	ent Sch	ools							
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					
Reside	ent Sch	ools Medi	an		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.

L

			I			2015 1.6						5	2015-16 SUBGROUPS	GROUPS				
						01-0107			AFI	<b>AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS</b>	<b>RICAN STUI</b>	DENTS			STUDEN'	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY	<b>BILITY</b>	
LD BD Code	School	Susp. Susp. Event Event Rate 2014- 2013-14 15		Susp. Event Susp. Event	Single Std. 4 Susp. %	# Enrolled #	# Events #	# Days # Enr	# Enrolled 201	# Events # Day 2015-16	Days 2015- Sus 16	Susp. Event Si Rate 2015- Su: 16	Single Std. Susp % 2015 ⁴ 16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015- 16	Susp. Event Rate 2015- 16	Single Std. Susp % 2015 [.] 16
XR 7 8464	8464 Magnolia Science Academy 3	2.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	455	0	0 15	198	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	47	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
LAUSD Similar	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																	
S 7 8127	7 Alexander Fleming Middle	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	1442	1	1 1:	195	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	178	1	1	0.6%	0.0%
XR 6 8054	4 Bert Corona Charter	0.5%	0.8%	2.4%	1.9%	375	6	38	3	0	0	0.0%	%0:0	59	1	4	1.7%	1.7%
XR 2 2024	4 PUC Excel Charter Academy	2.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	321	0	0 0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	47	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
W 4 8038	8 Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	%0.0	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	811	4	13 10	109	1	2	%6.0	%6:0	107	13	13	12.1%	%6.0
XR 1 8458	8 KIPP Academy of Opportunity	8.2%	7.0%	6.8%	5.7%	367	25	38 3(	306	25	38	8.2%	%6.9	45	ŝ	ŝ	6.7%	6.7%
XR 6 8212	2 PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	4.0%	7.4%	0.6%	0.6%	351	2	2	2	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	46	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
C 5 8066	6 Luther Burbank Middle	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	815	1	1	19	0	0	0.0%	%0:0	106	1	4	%6:0	0.0%
XR 3 8461	1 Magnolia Science Academy 2	1.6%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	487	3	12 12	14	-		-	-	82		-		-
XR 4 8011	1 Magnolia Science Academy 4	6.9%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	184	0	0 1	19	0	0	0.0%	%0:0	24	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
XR 5 5166	6 Magnolia Science Academy Bell	0.6%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	493	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	54	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
S 7 8104	4 Richard Henry Dana Middle	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	1546	8	23 12	124	°	6	2.4%	1.6%	218	23	23	10.6%	%6.0
XR 2 8018	8 Synergy Kinetic Academy	4.4%	3.0%	1.9%	1.9%	477	6	12 12	13	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	65	1	4	1.5%	1.5%
XR 6 8426	6 PUC Triumph Charter Academy & PUC Triumph Charter Hig	5.5%	7.8%	1.0%	1.0%	726	7	9 6	9	0	0	0.0%	%0.0	126	3	4	2.4%	2.4%
XR 1 8460	0 View Park Preparatory Accelerated Charter Middle	7.6%	4.3%	10.6%	8.7%	424	45	58 40	404 4	45	58	11.1%	9.2%	57	7	8	12.3%	10.5%
LAUSD Similar	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	1.9%	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	482	4	11 1	17	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	62	1	4	1.5%	0.9%
<b>Resident Schools</b>	SIC																	
S 7 8103	3 Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	544	0	0 28	282	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	54	0	10	0.0%	0.0%
S 7 8664	4 Gardena Senior High	0.0%	3.7%	1.6%	1.6%	1586	26	34 41	410	15	16	3.7%	3.7%	229	34	34	14.8%	3.9%
S 7 8868		0.0%	1.0%	0.3%	0.2%	975	3	15 23	237	3	15	1.3%	0.8%	112	15	16	13.4%	0.9%
S 7 8352	2 Robert E. Peary Middle	0.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	1332	12	24 35	359	7	15	1.9%	1.9%	194	24	25	12.4%	0.0%
S 7 8487	7 Stephen M. White Middle	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	1610	5	14 16	162	2	5	1.2%	0.6%	191	14	14	7.3%	1.0%
S 7 8090	0 Andrew Carnegie Middle	1.2%	0.6%	0.8%	0.8%	924	7	33 22	221	1	3	0.5%	0.5%	140	33	33	23.6%	1.4%
XR 7 8087	7 Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	19.3%	9.5%	6.7%	5.6%	1684	112	274 45	454 8	84 2	228	18.5%	15.0%	315	41	97	13.0%	10.8%
S 7 8160	0 Samuel Gompers Middle	0.0%	8.9%	11.3%	7.7%	557	63	85 15	199 4	47	65	23.6%	14.6%	106	85	298	80.2%	14.2%
XR 1 5180	0 Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle	37.3%	34.5%	24.0%	14.2%	605	145	197 25	250 1	112 1	149	44.8%	26.0%	95	31	46	32.6%	22.1%
XR 1 5181	1 Animo Western Charter Middle	48.6%	33.5%	27.6%	14.2%	626	173	214 14	143 143	102	127	71.3%	34.3%	92	41	50	44.6%	22.8%
S 7 8352	2 Robert E. Peary Middle	0.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	1332	12	24 35	359	7	15	1.9%	1.9%	194	24	25	12.4%	0.0%
S 7 2247	7 Avalon Gardens Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	254	5	5 13	135	5	5	3.7%	3.7%	82	5	5	6.1%	2.4%
<b>Resident Schools Median</b>	vis Median	%0.0	1.1%	1.3%	1.2%	950	12	29 2/	244	7	15	2.8%	2.8%	126	28	29	13.2%	1.9%

Suspension Events: The number of suspensions issued by the school Suspension Days: The Tetral number of days issued for all suspension events Suspension Event Rate: The executed by dividing the total number of suspension events for the school or subgroup (sevents/enrollment) Single Student Suspension %: The percent of students in the school or subgroup that have been suspended one or more times (students suspended) enrollment)

Magnolia 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.

												AMAO	AMAO 2 - Attaining English Proficiency	z English Pro	ficiencv		
					AM	AMAO 1 - Annual Growth	ual Growt	_			Less tha	Less than 5 vears	,		5 Years or More	or More	
9	BD Co	Loc Code	School Type	Number of Annual CELDT Takers	Number in Cohort	Percent with Prior CELDT Scores	Number Met AMAO 1	ercent Met MAO 1 014-15	Percent Met N AMAO 1 2013-14	Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2014-15	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14	Number in Cohort	Number Attain Eng Prof. Level	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2014-15	Percent Attain Eng Prof. Level 2013-14
XR	7 84	8464 Magnolia Science Academy #3	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	29	16	55.2%	,	;	;	1	;	1	:	29	12	41.4%	:
LAUS	D Similar	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE															
S	7 81	8127 Alexander Fleming Middle School	Middle School	136	136	100.0%	50	36.8%	49.7%	25	5	20.0%	-	118	29	24.6%	36.6%
XR	6 80	8054 Bert Corona Charter School	Middle School	63	28	44.4%	1	-	48.6%	2	;	:	-	61	13	21.3%	40.0%
XR	2 20	2024 PUC Excel Academy	Middle School	1	1	1		:	1			:	:	1			
N	4 80	8038 Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle School	Middle School	124	124	100.0%	51	41.1%	58.1%	14	5	35.7%		114	35	30.7%	41.5%
XR	1 84	8458 KIPP Academy of Opportunity	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	6	2	22.2%		:	1	0	:	:	:	6	:	:	:
XR	6 82	8212 PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	Middle School	I	-	I	I	1	1	I	I	1	:	I	-	1	I
U	5 80	8066 Luther Burbank Middle School	Middle School	96	96	100.0%	59	61.5%	67.7%	23	9	26.1%	-	77	32	41.6%	47.8%
XR	3 84	8461 Magnolia Science Academy #2	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	65	0	0.0%	1	:	56.0%	14	7	50.0%	-	51	22	43.1%	41.7%
XR	4 80	8011 Magnolia Science Academy #4	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	16	13	81.3%	8	61.5%		2	;	:	:	22	8	36.4%	;
XR	5 51	5166 Magnolia Science Academy Bell @ South Region MS #2A	Middle School	75	0	0.0%	-	-	-	3	:	:	-	72	30	41.7%	31.7%
S	7 81	8104 Richard Henry Dana Middle School	Middle School	112	112	100.0%	29	25.9%	50.8%	19	1	5.3%	-	104	19	18.3%	40.5%
XR	2 80	8018 Synergy Kinetic Academy	Middle School	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
XR	6 84	8426 PUC Triumph Academy and High School	Middle School	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
XR	1 84	8460 View Park Prep Accelerated Middle School Charter	Middle School	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
LAUS	D Similar	.AUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median		75	28	81.3%	50	41.1%	53.4%	14	5	26.1%	-	72	26	33.6%	40.5%
Reside	Resident Schools	ols															
S	7 81	8103 Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle School	Middle School	24	24	100.0%	10	41.7%	1	3	-	1	I	21	6	28.6%	:
S	7 86	8664 Gardena Senior High	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 88	8868 Rancho Dominguez Preparatory School	Span Schools (Not Magnets)	65	62	95.4%	27	43.5%	60.3%	22	2	9.1%	ł	46	15	32.6%	47.9%
S	7 83	8352 Robert E Peary 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 84	8487 Stephen M White 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 80	8090 Andrew Carnegie 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 80	8087 Alain Leroy Locke College Preparatory Academy	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 81	8160 Samuel Gompers Middle School	Middle School	122	122	100.0%	59	48.4%	63.0%	26	2	7.7%	I	108	38	35.2%	35.5%
XR	1 51	5180 Animo Phillis Wheatley Charter Middle School	Middle School	72	42	58.3%	1	-	51.8%	10	+	1	1	86	23	26.7%	20.9%
XR	1 51	5181 Animo Western Charter Middle School	Middle School	135	84	62.2%	1	-	43.4%	11	2	18.2%	1	136	47	34.6%	17.2%
S	7 83	8352 Robert E Peary 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 22	2247 Avalon Gardens Elementary	Elementary School	66	66	100.0%	18	27.3%	21.7%	45	10	22.2%	10.9%	25	3	12.0%	;
Reside	ent Scho	Resident Schools Median		126	103	100.0%	63	47.0%	48.1%	27	4	12.0%	11.3%	108	35	33.6%	33.2%

201	2015-16					English Lan	English Language Arts			Mathe	Mathematics	
LD	BD	Loc Code	School	Subgroup	% 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	9
				African American	28	35	33	3	50	33	13	4
				Latino	20	33	35	12	34	40	18	7
				English Learners		-	-	I			-	1
				Soc-eco Disadvantaged	24	36	33	7	44	36	15	5
				Students with Disabilities	61	29	7	4	68	25	2	0
LAUSD.	Similar S	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	n CDE									
s	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle School	All Students	29	30	31	6	39	31	18	12
XR	9	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
Ν	4	8038	Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle School	All Students	33	31	31	5	54	28	12	9
XR	1	8458	KIPP Academy of Opportunity	All Students	34	27	28	10	43	33	17	7
XR	9	8212		All Students	36	30	28	5	43	30	16	11
U	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle School	All Students	27	31	33	6	37	29	19	15
XR	з	8461	Magnolia Science Academy #2	All Students	34	31	27	8	49	27	14	6
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 N		32	28	30	10	45	34	15	7
s	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle School	All Students	39	29	25	9	46	31	13	10
XR	2	8018	Synergy Kinetic Academy	All Students	24	31	37	8	34	35	19	11
XR	9	8426			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 S	Schools fron	LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	All Students	34	30	29	8	46	31	15	7
Resider	Resident Schools	ls										
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	9	66	24	8	2
s	7	8868	Rancho Dominguez Preparatory School	All Students	37	30	24	8	46	32	15	9
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	6	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	6	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	9
Residen	nt School.	Resident Schools Median		All Students	42	29	23	5	58	28	11	5

2014-15	ר קר קר					English Lan	English Language Arts			Mathe	Mathematics	
		Loc			% Standard Not	% Standard	00000	% Exceeds	% Standard Not	% Standard		% Exceeds
ΓD	BD	Code	School	Subgroup	Met	Nearly Met	% Standard Met	Standard	Met	Nearly Met	% Standard Met	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	96	35	17	3	54	36	8	2
				Students with Disabilities	87	13	0	0	77	19	æ	0
LAUSD S	imilar Sch	AUSD Similar Schools from CDE	m CDE									
s	7	8127	Alexander Fleming Middle School	All Students	36	31	26	7	46	32	15	∞
XR	9	8054		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
Ν	4	8038		All Students	36	32	29	3	54	31	12	4
XR	1	8458		All Students	38	33	24	5	47	35	14	4
XR	9	8212	PUC Lakeview Charter Academy	All Students	38	33	25	4	41	31	19	9
U	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle School	All Students	30	34	30	9	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 N	All Students	28	34	30	7	44	35	15	6
S	7	8104	Richard Henry Dana Middle School	All Students	37	31	25	9	48	29	14	6
XR	2	8018		All Students	24	33	35	7	40	32	19	6
XR	9	8426		All Students	45	33	20	2	59	22	14	5
XR	1	8460	View Park Prep Accelerated Middle School Charte	All Students	42	37	18	3	64	30	4	1
LAUSD S.	Similar Sch	chools fron	AUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	All Students	36	33	26	5	48	32	14	6
Resident	<b>Resident Schools</b>	S										
S	7	8103	Glenn Hammond Curtiss Middle School	All Students	41	31	25	4	54	30	11	5
S	7	8664		All Students	27	32	31	10	64	18	16	2
S	7	8868		All Students	34	30	30	5	50	29	15	7
S	7	8352		All Students	49	27	20	4	62	23	11	4
S	7	8487		All Students	38	30	26	5	53	28	13	6
S	7	8090		All Students	41	33	22	4	51	32	12	5
XR	7	8087		All Students	54	29	14	Э	75	16	8	1
S	7	8160	Samuel Gompers Middle School	All Students	64	25	6	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	6	1
S	7	8352		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	Resident Schools Median	s Median		All Students	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. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>.

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. <u>ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE</u>

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. <u>Summary</u>

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. <u>Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math</u>

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, 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. <u>Student Subgroup Academic Growth</u>

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. <u>FINDINGS OF FACT FOR DENIAL.</u>

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. <u>Failure to Respond To Reasonable Inquiries interfere the District's Ability to Fully</u> <u>Oversee the School</u>:

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 <u>Timely Respond to OIG's Document/Information Requests</u>: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, <u>over two years after</u> 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. <u>Inconsistent Adherence to Board Approved Fiscal Policies and Procedures:</u>

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

# • <u>Governance Structure (Element 4)</u> The petition <u>does not</u> 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.

#### • <u>Suspension and Expulsion Procedures (Element 10)</u>

# 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 The Handbook defines "Behaving Disrespectfully towards directions." 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. Cleary 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. <u>RECOMMENDATION</u>

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. <u>As described in the Charter Petition Review Checklist and Staff Report, the Petition does</u> not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions in several essential elements, including:
  - a. <u>The governance structure of the school (Ed. Code, § 47605(b)(5(C));</u>
  - b. <u>A description of the individuals to be employed by the charter school (Ed. Code, § 47605(b)(5)(E)); and</u>
  - c. <u>The admissions requirements of the school. (Ed. Code, §47605(b)(5)(H).)</u>
  - d. The suspension and expulsion procedures of the charter school (Ed. Code, § 47605(b)(5)(J).
- 2. <u>The Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set</u> 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.

# Exhibits 1-18 May be viewed at:

http://laschoolboard.org/sites/default/files /10-18-16BR165Exhibits.pdf