



Board of Education Report

File #: Rep-161-16/17, **Version:** 1

Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Dyad Charter School

October 18, 2016

Charter Schools Division

Action Proposed:

Staff recommends denial of the renewal petition for Celerity Dyad Charter School (“Celerity Dyad”), located in Board District 5 and Local District Central, and adoption of the attached *Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Dyad Charter School*.

Background:

Celerity Dyad Charter School was originally approved on August 28, 2007 and was authorized by the LAUSD Board of Education to serve 690 students in grades K-5. The charter was renewed on March 13, 2012, to serve up to 690 students in grades K-8.

Celerity Educational Group (CEG) currently operates six LAUSD-authorized independent charter schools: Celerity Cardinal, Celerity Dyad, Celerity Nascent, Celerity Octavia, Celerity Palmati, and Celerity Troika.

On August 22, 2016, Celerity Dyad submitted a renewal petition application to the Charter Schools Division seeking to renew its independent charter span school to serve 710 students in grades TK-8. The school is serving 695 students in grades TK-8 in Board District 5 and Local District Central.

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

Statutory Framework

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

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

- (1) Attained its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in the prior year or in two of the last three years both school wide and for all groups of pupils served by the charter school; *or*
- (2) Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API in the prior year or in two of the last three years; *or*
- (3) Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API for a demographically comparable school in the prior year or in two of the last three years; *or*
- (4) (A)The entity that granted the charter determines that the academic performance of the

charter school is at least equal to the academic performance of the public schools that the charter school pupils would otherwise have been required to attend, as well as the academic performance of the schools in the school district in which the charter school is located, taking into account the composition of the pupil population that is served at the charter school.

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

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.

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

Expected Outcomes:

Celerity Dyad Charter School 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 Celerity Dyad Charter School*, Celerity Dyad'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 Celerity Dyad Charter School*, Celerity Dyad Charter School 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 Celerity Dyad Charter School*, and instead takes specific action to approve the charter petition, Celerity Dyad Charter School 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 Celerity Dyad Charter School*.

Attachments:

Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Dyad Charter School

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 161– 16/17
October 18, 2016

School Name:	Celerity Dyad Charter			BOARD IS REQUIRED TO TAKE ACTION BY: October 21, 2016
Type of Charter School:	Independent Charter School			
CMO/Network:	Celerity Educational Group			
Location Code:	2116			
Type of Site(s):	(1) Private (2) Private (3) Private			
Site Address(es):	(1) 4501 Wadsworth Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90011 (2) 4607 S. Central Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90011 (3) 4700 S. Central Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90011			
Board District(s):	5	Local District(s):	Central	
Grade Levels Currently Served:	TK-8	Current Enrollment:	695	
Grade Levels Authorized in Current Charter:	TK-8	Enrollment Authorized in Current Charter:	690 (see proposed change in "Action Proposed" below)	
STAFF RECOMMENDATION:	Approval			
SUMMARY OF STAFF FINDINGS	<p>Based on a comprehensive review of the renewal petition application and the school's record of performance, staff has determined that the charter school has not met the standards and criteria for renewal. Staff findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Petitioners are <i>demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the educational program</i> set forth in the petition. ◆ The petition <i>does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions</i> of all required elements. <p>Please see <i>Findings of Fact in Support of Recommendation of Denial of the Renewal Charter Petition for Celerity Dyad Charter</i> for further detail. Please also see "Staff Review and Assessment" section below.</p>			
PROPOSED BENCHMARKS:	N/A			

STAFF ASSESSMENT

I. ACTION PROPOSED

Staff recommends denial of the renewal petition for Celerity Dyad Charter (“Dyad” or “Charter School”), located in Board District 5 and Local District Central, for five (5) years, beginning July 1, 2017, until June 30, 2022, to serve up to 710 students in grades TK-8 in each year of the charter term.

II. CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL

Upon submission, District staff comprehensively reviews each renewal petition application to determine whether the school has not met the requirements for renewal set forth in California Education Code sections 47605 and 47607. Once a charter school is determined to be eligible for renewal under § 47607(b), the school must submit a renewal petition application that, upon review, is determined to be **educationally sound, reasonably comprehensive, and demonstrably likely to be successfully implemented.** (Ed. Code §§ 47607(a) and 47605.) Pursuant to the requirements of SB 1290, the District “shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.” (Ed. Code § 47607(a)(3)(A).) The District “shall consider the past performance of the school’s academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement if any.” (5 CCR § 11966.4.) Please see *Policy for Charter School Authorizing* (LAUSD Board of Education, February 7, 2012) for more information.

III. GENERAL SCHOOL INFORMATION

A. School History

	Celerity Dyad Charter
Initial Authorization	On August 28, 2007, Celerity Dyad Charter was authorized by LAUSD Board of Education to serve 670 students in grades TK-5.
Most Recent Renewal	The charter was renewed on March 13, 2012, to serve up to 690 students in grades TK-8.
Approved Revisions of Current Charter	N/A
Board Benchmarks in Current Charter Term	N/A
Submission of Renewal Petition Application	Celerity Dyad Charter 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

	Celerity Dyad Charter
Key Features of Educational Program	<p>Celerity Dyad Charter offers a TK-8 educational program. The charter school has a positive school culture that reinforces school-wide expectations and ensures that students feel safe and have the capacity to achieve academic success.</p> <p>Three Key Features include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Academic Collaboration - The charter has a structured system of Professional Development. New teachers are invited to a Summer New Teacher Institute to familiarize themselves with Celerity’s guiding principles and practices. ◆ Data Driven Instruction - Every week Curriculum Specialists meet with teachers to analyze and reflect on their weekly data, and plan differentiated lessons for the following week based on that data. After each benchmark, teachers create action plans to reteach and reassess any standards not mastered by students. ◆ Technology - Students take online internal benchmarks which prepare them for Smarter Balanced testing. They complete software and web-based instructional sites. Students participate in project-based learning and performing tasks and conduct online research to create and showcase final products.
Program Components to Meet the Needs of English Learners	<p>Celerity Dyad Charter implements its own English Learner Master Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Teachers who provide EL instruction are appropriately credentialed. ◆ Teachers are recruited who not only hold a valid credential as well as a bilingual or ESL endorsement (state authorization to teach English learners such as BCLAD, CLAD, SB 1969), but who also have training in second language pedagogy and have experience teaching second language learners and sheltered English classes. ◆ The Charter uses Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) and English Language Development (ELD) strategies to provide students access to the core curriculum through a content-based and scaffolded program.
Program Components to Meet the Needs of GATE/High Achieving Students	<p>Celerity Dyad Charter opposes tracking, and therefore, does not identify students as gifted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ High achieving students are identified by scoring in the advanced level on standards-based benchmark assessments and achieving mastery in all core courses with a score of 4 or an A on their report card. ◆ These students are provided with targeted classroom instruction and enrichment opportunities intended to meet their specific learning needs. ◆ Teachers consistently analyze student data and performance to inform their instructional focus and promote appropriate opportunities for individualization. They use this information to

	create learning activities that target the needs of students achieving above grade level.
Special Education SELPA	Celerity Dyad Charter 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
Celerity Dyad Charter	705	97%	0%	62%	98%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

*As of October 2015 Census Day

D. Charter School Operator

Celerity Dyad Charter is operated by Celerity Educational Group (CEG), a California nonprofit public benefit corporation that also operates five other LAUSD-authorized charter schools.

IV. STAFF REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

Based on a comprehensive review of the renewal petition application and the school’s record of performance, staff has determined that the charter school has not met the standards and criteria for renewal. Please see accompanying *Findings of Fact in Support of Recommendation of Denial of the Renewal Charter Petition for Celerity Dyad Charter and Celerity Dyad Charter Data Set*. Please also see staff review below.

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

This criterion has not been determined to be a finding.

B. Are Petitioners Demonstrably Likely To Succeed?

For reasons more fully set forth in the Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Dyad Charter School, petitioners are not demonstrably likely to successfully implement the educational program set forth in the renewal petition.

1. *Student Achievement and Educational Performance*

a. Summary

Celerity Dyad Charter’s comparative performance on the CAASPP (SBAC) from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016 reflects a 16% 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 Mathematics. Celerity Dyad’s CAASPP (SBAC) results show levels of academic performance that are 35% above the Resident Schools Median in ELA and 34% above in Mathematics. Please see attached *Celerity Dyad Charter Data Set*.

b. Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math

On the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 54% of the Dyad students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 19%. In Mathematics, 50% of the Dyad 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, 38% of Dyad’s students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is greater than the Resident Schools Median of 16%. In Mathematics, 41% of Dyad’s

students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 14%.

2014-2015 and 2015-16 Smarter Balanced Assessment Achievement Data

2015-16		English Language Arts				Mathematics			
School	Subgroup	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
Celerity Dyad Charter School	All Students	20	25	34	20	22	28	27	23
	African American	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Latino	20	24	35	21	22	28	27	23
	English Learners	35	32	26	7	35	29	24	12
	Soc-eco Disadvantaged	20	25	34	20	23	28	27	22
	Students with Disabilities	73	20	4	2	78	16	4	2
Similar Schools Median	All Students	52	26	16	4	52	31	15	3
Resident Schools Median	All Students	57	25	14	5	61	26	12	4
2014-15									
School	Subgroup								
Celerity Dyad Charter School	All Students	30	33	27	11	25	34	29	12
	African American	55	27	18	0	64	18	18	0
	Latino	29	33	27	11	23	35	29	12
	English Learners	46	34	17	3	41	37	15	7
	Soc-eco Disadvantaged	29	33	27	10	25	35	29	12
	Students with Disabilities	84	11	3	3	68	32	0	0
Similar Schools Median	All Students	57	25	15	4	56	30	12	3
Resident Schools Median	All Students	58	24	14	2	62	25	11	3

c. Minimum Renewal Eligibility Criteria

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

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

**Not available

d. Student Subgroup Academic Growth

For reasons more fully set forth in the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Dyad Charter*, staff's recommendation is consistent with the requirements of SB 1290. The school's record of academic performance does indicate that Celerity Dyad Charter's numerically significant student subgroups with the exception of Students with Disabilities in ELA (Latino, English Learners, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged) have achieved positive growth in academic performance. Based on the past two years of CAASPP (SBAC) data, the data in

English Language Arts (ELA) reveal that Latino students showed growth of 18 percentage points, English Learners showed growth of 13 percentage points, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged showed growth of 17 percentage points, and Students with Disabilities remained the same from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016. The data in Mathematics reveal that Latino students showed growth of 9 percentage points, English Learners showed growth of 14 percentage points, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged showed growth of 8 percentage points, and Students with Disabilities showed growth of 6 percentage points from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016.

However, while the District recognizes the subgroup academic gains achieved at the school pursuant to Education Code Section 47607(b), the pattern of insufficient responses to inquiries related to Celerity Global Development which is the sole statutory member and a vendor of CEG, or any other related entities of CEG, such as Celerity Development, LLC and Celerity Contracting Services, the lack of transparency, and the potential for significant conflicts of interest posed by its governance structure substantially outweigh the extra consideration accorded to subgroup academic growth by SB 1290 and confirm the organization's persistent and ongoing failure to successfully operate its schools in accordance with applicable law and the terms of its schools' charters. Please see *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Dyad Charter School for further analysis*.

e. English Learner Reclassification Rates

In 2015-2016, Celerity Dyad's English Learner reclassification rate was 14.3%, which is higher than both the Similar and Resident School Median. In 2014-2015, Dyad's reclassification rate was 6.5% due to an office error in recording to CALPADS. Through the CSD oversight, the school has provided evidence that the school has been implementing its English Learner Master Plan with fidelity, and they are working diligently to take the necessary steps to ensure accurate and timely reporting of reclassification data in CALPADS.

Celerity Dyad's reclassification criteria include the following:

- Assessment of language-proficiency using an objective assessment instrument including, but not limited to, the CELDT/ELPAC
- Participation of the pupil's classroom teachers and any other certificated staff with direct responsibility for teaching or placement decisions of the pupil to evaluate the pupil's curriculum mastery
- Parental opinion and consultation
- Comparison of the pupil's performance in basic skills against an empirically established range of performance and basic skills based upon the performance of English proficient pupils of the same age that demonstrate to others that the pupil is sufficiently proficient in English to participate effectively in a curriculum designed for pupils of the same age whose native language is English.
- Celerity's English Language Development Portfolios that measure progress regarding comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar usage

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
Celerity Dyad Charter	371	69	14%	433	28	7%	428	61	14%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	222	31	13%	232	46	18%	211	21	8%
Resident Schools Median	418	65	14%	419	67	16%	392	25	8%

f. CAHSEE Passage and Graduation Rates [HS only]
N/A

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	4 Accomplished	4 Accomplished

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

h. Additional Information
None

2. **Governance**

The school has unresolved issues in this category. Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Dyad Charter School* for further detail.

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report Rating in Category of Governance*	3 Proficient	4 Accomplished

*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**

Celerity Dyad Charter’s record of performance and related information demonstrate that the school is likely to succeed in the area of organizational management, programs, and operations.

a. Summary

Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Dyad Charter* for further detail.

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report Rating in Category of Organizational Management, Programs, and Operations	3 Proficient	4 Accomplished

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

b. School Climate and Student Discipline

School	2015-16							2015-16 SUBGROUPS									
	Susp. Event Rate 2013-14	Susp. Event Rate 2014-15	Susp. Event Rate	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS				STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY					
								# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16
Celerity Dyad Charter	2.7%	2.6%	0.9%	0.9%	705	6	8	10	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	62	2	4	3.2%	3.2%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	563	0	0	69	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	55	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Resident Schools Median	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	786	3	4	44	1	1	0.9%	0.9%	71	4	6	4.6%	0.6%

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
Celerity Dyad Charter	705	97%	0%	62%	98%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	563	94%	1%	45%	83%	1%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Resident Schools Median	786	94%	2%	54%	92%	1%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

*As of October 2015 Census Day

d. Special Education

School	OCT 2015 Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll %	% High Incidence	% Low Incidence	# AUT	# DB	# DEAF	# ED	# EMD	# HOH	# MR	# OHI*	# OI	# SLD*	# SLI*	# TBI	# VI
Celerity Dyad Charter	705	60	9%	85%	15%	3	--	--	2	--	2	--	7	--	30	14	--	2
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	563	58	11%	81%	19%	9	--	--	1	1	1	1	8	1	25	8	--	1
Resident Schools Median	786	78	11%	70%	30%	14	--	--	3	--	2	2	7	2	37	10	--	--

e. Additional Information

None

4. **Fiscal Operations**

Celerity Dyad Charter’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 fiscal operations issues in this category. Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Dyad Charter* for further detail.

a. Summary

Celerity Dyad Charter has received the ratings of Developing and Proficient in this category of Fiscal Operations on its annual oversight evaluation reports for the last two years.

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report Rating in Category of Fiscal 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. Fiscal Condition

According to the 2014-2015 independent audit report, the school had positive net assets of \$4,234,436 and net income of \$446,204. The 2015-2016 Unaudited Actuals project positive net assets and net income.

	2012-2013 (Audited Actuals)	2013-2014 (Audited Actuals)	2014-2015 (Audited Actuals)	2015-2016 (Unaudited Actuals)
Net Assets	\$3,721,108	\$3,788,232	\$4,234,436	\$5,455,079
Net Income/(Loss)	\$738,516	\$67,124	\$446,204	\$1,220,643
Transfers In/(Out)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Prior Year Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

c. 2014-2015 Independent Audit Report

Audit Opinion: Unqualified
 Material Weakness: None
 Deficiency/Finding: None

d. Other Significant Fiscal Information

Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Dyad Charter* for further detail.

C. Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?

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

D. Does the Petition Contain the Required Affirmations, Assurances, and Declarations?

This criterion has not been determined to be a finding.

CRITERIA SUMMARY

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

Schoolwide Academic Performance Index (API)	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Base API	836	883	888
Growth API	884	888	871
Growth Target	A	A	A
Growth	48	5	-17
Met Schoolwide Growth Target	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met All Student Groups Target	Yes	Yes	Yes
Base API State Rank	9	8	8
Base API Similar Schools Rank	10	10	10
2013 Growth API State Rank	--	--	8
2013 Growth API Similar Schools Rank	--	--	10

Subgroup API	2010-11			2011-12			2012-13		
	Growth Target	Growth	Met Target	Growth Target	Growth	Met Target	Growth Target	Growth	Met Target
African American or Black	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
American Indian or Alaska Native	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Filipino	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Latino	A	50	Yes	A	6	Yes	A	-17	Yes
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
White	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Two or More Races	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
English Learners	A	50	Yes	A	7	Yes	A	-27	Yes
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	A	48	Yes	A	5	Yes	A	-17	Yes
Students with Disabilities	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

	API Comparison					
	2011 Base API	2012 Growth API	11-12 Growth	2012 Base API	2013 Growth API	12-13 Growth
Celerity Dyad Charter	883	888	5	888	871	-17
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	734	742	9	742	745	3
Resident Schools Median	703	708	5	709	717	8

	2012-13 CST Comparison			
	English Language Arts		Mathematics	
	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below	Proficient & Advanced	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below	Proficient & Advanced
Celerity Dyad Charter	38%	63%	19%	81%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	62%	39%	46%	54%
Resident Schools Median	66%	34%	56%	44%

	AYP Comparison								
	2012 AYP			2013 AYP			2014 AYP		
	# Criteria	# Met	% Met	# Criteria	# Met	% Met	# Criteria	# Met	% Met
Celerity Dyad Charter	17	13	76%	17	9	53%	--	--	--
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	17	13	69%	17	10	50%	--	--	--
Resident Schools Median	17	9	53%	17	10	53%	--	--	--

Celerity Dyad Charter
2012 BASE API AND 2013 GROWTH API DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

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

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

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	2013 Enrolled # on 1st Day of Testing	2013 Conf	2012 Base API	2013 Growth API	2013 State Rank	2013 Similar Schools Rank	Met 2013 Sch-wide Target	Met 2013 Subgroup Targets	% Free/Reduced Lunch	% Sp Ed	% GATE	School Demographic Characteristics													
															% EL	% REEP	% Latino	% White	% Af. Amer	% Asian	% Fili Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More					
XR	5	2116	Celerity Dyad Charter	484	K-7	888	871	8	10	Yes	Yes	100	9	0	46	40	94	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0			
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																												
E	2	2397	Belvedere Elementary	621	K-5	732	713	1	2	No	No	100	11	4	36	35	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
XR	2	5987	Camino Nuevo Academy #2	410	K-8	855	866	8	10	Yes	Yes	94	13	0	40	42	98	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
XR	1	2925	Celerity Nascent Charter	341	K-8	891	910	9	10	Yes	Yes	99	7	0	13	23	48	0	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
E	2	3699	Evergreen Avenue Elementary	589	K-6	758	749	3	4	No	No	100	11	8	30	42	98	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
S	7	4274	Grape Street Elementary	407	K-5	736	709	1	5	No	No	100	13	8	34	13	69	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
E	5	4562	Holmes Avenue Elementary	228	K-6	709	693	1	2	No	No	100	6	9	32	22	82	0	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
C	1	5113	John W. Mack Elementary	248	K-5	738	721	2	4	No	No	100	14	6	35	20	72	2	25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
C	1	5630	Normandie Avenue Elementary	595	K-5	734	740	2	5	Yes	No	100	13	6	35	16	78	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
S	7	5863	One Hundred Sixteenth Street Elementary	274	K-5	775	752	3	6	No	No	100	14	11	24	22	69	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
C	2	2943	Quincy Jones Elementary	220	K-5	730	781	4	7	Yes	Yes	100	6	7	46	33	99	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
W	1	6808	Sixty-First Street Elementary	380	K-6	766	775	4	9	Yes	Yes	100	13	7	36	32	82	1	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
W	4	6952	Stoner Avenue Elementary	220	K-5	786	810	5	10	Yes	Yes	100	17	10	34	35	93	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
W	1	7123	Tom Bradley Global Awareness Magnet	262	K-5	666	688	1	3	Yes	No	85	11	5	10	3	24	0	74	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	
S	7	6872	Wisdom Elementary	612	K-6	746	737	2	6	No	No	100	9	6	41	22	91	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																												
				361	--	742	745	3	6	--	--	100	12	7	35	23	82	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Resident Schools																												
C	5	2308	Sally Ride Elementary: A SMART Academy	266	K-5	B	740	2	5	--	--	89	10	6	41	32	93	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C	7	3932	Forty-Ninth Street Elementary	566	K-5	709	676	1	1	No	No	84	7	7	42	35	92	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C	5	8094	George Washington Carver Middle	1082	6-8	637	624	1	1	No	No	100	11	9	31	50	93	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C	5	2219	Ascot Avenue Elementary	569	K-5	768	747	2	6	No	No	94	8	9	43	37	96	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C	5	4681	Harmony Elementary	465	K-5	723	725	2	3	No	No	86	10	4	49	28	94	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C	5	4575	Hooper Avenue Elementary	847	1-5	696	675	1	1	No	No	86	12	6	40	39	93	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C	7	8200	Los Angeles Academy Middle	1664	6-8	695	708	2	7	Yes	No	100	10	15	23	54	91	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
C	5	7589	Wadsworth Avenue Elementary	506	K-5	712	727	2	3	Yes	Yes	100	11	8	56	24	97	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
C	2	5173	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of Business and Technology	449	6-8	672	703	2	5	Yes	No	83	11	8	30	54	98	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
C	2	8070	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of Arts and Culture	475	6-8	669	690	1	4	Yes	No	90	13	9	28	52	94	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
C	7	7654	West Vernon Avenue Elementary	463	K-5	731	748	2	7	Yes	Yes	87	10	6	40	41	91	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
C	7	5068	Main Street Elementary	512	K-5	740	744	2	7	No	No	99	12	10	47	33	91	0	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Resident Schools Median																												
				509	--	709	717	2	5	--	--	90	11	8	41	38	93	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Celerity Dyad Charter
OCTOBER 2015 CALPADS DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

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

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	Total Enroll #	% F/R Meal	% GATE	% EL	% Latino	% White	% Af. Amer.	% Asian	% Fili.	% Am Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More
XR	5	2116	Celerity Dyad Charter	705	97%	0%	62%	98%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE															
E	2	2397	Belvedere Elementary	785	94%	1%	49%	99%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
XR	2	5987	Camino Nuevo Academy #2	563	96%	0%	52%	97%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
XR	1	2925	Celerity Nascent Charter	583	92%	1%	41%	69%	0%	29%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
E	2	3699	Evergreen Avenue Elementary	831	96%	1%	37%	96%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
S	7	4274	Grape Street Elementary	623	92%	1%	42%	71%	1%	26%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
E	5	4562	Holmes Avenue Elementary	299	94%	2%	45%	81%	1%	14%	4%	0%	0%	0%	1%
C	1	5113	John W. Mack Elementary	419	93%	1%	48%	79%	2%	18%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	1	5630	Normandie Avenue Elementary	868	93%	2%	44%	78%	1%	19%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
S	7	5863	One Hundred Sixteenth Street Elementary	497	94%	1%	38%	71%	1%	26%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
C	2	2943	Quincy Jones Elementary	377	98%	1%	55%	97%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
W	1	6808	Sixty-First Street Elementary	563	91%	1%	49%	85%	4%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
W	4	6952	Stoner Avenue Elementary	309	96%	2%	48%	93%	2%	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%
W	1	7123	Tom Bradley Global Awareness Magnet	396	90%	1%	8%	24%	1%	74%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
S	7	6872	Wisdom Elementary	935	97%	2%	43%	90%	1%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				563	94%	1%	45%	83%	1%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Resident Schools															
C	5	2308	Sally Ride Elementary: A SMART Academy	562	97%	3%	60%	91%	1%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
C	7	3932	Forty-Ninth Street Elementary	832	94%	2%	53%	92%	1%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	5	8094	George Washington Carver Middle	840	93%	3%	32%	91%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	5	2219	Ascot Avenue Elementary	867	96%	2%	51%	92%	2%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	5	4681	Harmony Elementary	652	93%	1%	55%	92%	2%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	5	4575	Hooper Avenue Elementary	958	91%	2%	57%	93%	1%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	7	8200	Los Angeles Academy Middle	1347	92%	2%	26%	91%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	5	7589	Wadsworth Avenue Elementary	707	91%	2%	62%	94%	2%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	2	5173	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of Business and Technology	502	94%	3%	25%	94%	1%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	2	8070	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of Arts and Culture	502	95%	2%	27%	95%	1%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	7	7654	West Vernon Avenue Elementary	740	95%	1%	63%	92%	1%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	7	5068	Main Street Elementary	862	95%	2%	59%	92%	1%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Resident Schools Median				786	94%	2%	54%	92%	1%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Celerity Dyad Charter
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	5	2116	Celerity Dyad Charter	371	69	14%	433	28	7%	428	61	14%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE												
E	2	2397	Belvedere Elementary	434	67	14%	458	84	18%	412	39	9%
XR	2	5987	Camino Nuevo Academy #2	240	27	14%	220	54	25%	212	43	20%
XR	1	2925	Celerity Nascent Charter	120	40	24%	174	6	3%	195	8	4%
E	2	3699	Evergreen Avenue Elementary	392	95	23%	386	81	21%	358	58	16%
S	7	4274	Grape Street Elementary	245	28	12%	269	23	9%	270	18	7%
E	5	4562	Holmes Avenue Elementary	135	8	6%	143	29	20%	127	10	8%
C	1	5113	John W. Mack Elementary	177	24	13%	193	21	11%	200	13	7%
C	1	5630	Normandie Avenue Elementary	409	48	11%	414	56	14%	378	26	7%
S	7	5863	One Hundred Sixteenth Street Elementary	145	27	17%	174	27	16%	157	1	1%
C	2	2943	Quincy Jones Elementary	203	25	11%	244	53	22%	210	29	14%
W	1	6808	Sixty-First Street Elementary	274	44	15%	313	53	17%	287	24	8%
W	4	6952	Stoner Avenue Elementary	187	33	17%	175	38	22%	160	16	10%
W	1	7123	Tom Bradley Global Awareness Magnet	37	2	5%	46	8	17%	39	2	5%
S	7	6872	Wisdom Elementary	450	48	11%	472	86	18%	435	104	24%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				222	31	13%	232	46	18%	211	21	8%
Resident Schools												
C	5	2308	Sally Ride Elementary: A SMARt Academy	226	29	13%	319	31	10%	319	21	7%
C	7	3932	Forty-Ninth Street Elementary	431	103	21%	420	73	17%	421	32	8%
C	5	8094	George Washington Carver Middle	338	25	7%	319	29	9%	280	22	8%
C	5	2219	Ascot Avenue Elementary	497	106	19%	563	87	16%	491	44	9%
C	5	4681	Harmony Elementary	423	62	15%	418	70	17%	368	22	6%
C	5	4575	Hooper Avenue Elementary	557	128	20%	559	123	22%	531	46	9%
C	7	8200	Los Angeles Academy Middle	389	41	10%	400	65	16%	327	25	8%
C	5	7589	Wadsworth Avenue Elementary	474	68	14%	463	67	15%	416	20	5%
C	2	5173	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of Business and Technology	135	34	21%	139	29	21%	116	25	22%
C	2	8070	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of Arts and Culture	133	18	12%	150	54	36%	110	17	15%
C	7	7654	West Vernon Avenue Elementary	412	69	15%	466	91	20%	461	42	9%
C	7	5068	Main Street Elementary	472	70	14%	504	67	13%	522	69	13%
Resident Schools Median				418	65	14%	419	67	16%	392	25	8%

Celerity Dyad Charter
RECLASSIFICATION OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

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

2015-16	2014-15 # EL	2015-16 # Reclassified	2015-16 Reclassification Rate	Change from Prior Year
Celerity Dyad Charter	428	61	14.3%	7.8%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	211	21	8.1%	-9.7%
Resident Schools Median	392	25	0	-8.2%
District	164,349	19,952	12.1%	-4.5%

2014-15	2013-14 # EL	2014-15 # Reclassified	2014-15 Reclassification Rate
Celerity Dyad Charter	433	28	6.5%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	232	46	17.8%
Resident Schools Median	419	67	16.5%
District	179,322	29,694	16.6%

2013-14	2012-13 # EL	2013-14 # Reclassified	2013-14 Reclassification Rate
Celerity Dyad Charter	371	69	14.2%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	222	31	13.2%
Resident Schools Median	418	65	14.4%
District	170,797	25,532	13.9%

Celerity Dyad Charter
K-12 SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS (DECEMBER 2015 CASEMIS REPORT)

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

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	OCT 2015 Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll %	% High Incidence	% Low Incidence	#AUT	#DB	# DEAF	# ED	# EMD	# HOH	# MR	# OHI*	# OI	# SLD*	# SLI*	# TBI	# VI
XR	5	2116	Celerity Dyad Charter	705	60	9%	85%	15%	3	--	--	2	--	2	--	7	--	30	14	--	2
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																					
E	2	2397	Belvedere Elementary	785	99	13%	70%	30%	9	--	--	--	--	2	--	8	1	45	16	--	1
XR	2	5987	Camino Nuevo Academy #2	563	63	11%	90%	10%	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	9	--	32	16	--	--
XR	1	2925	Celerity Nascent Charter	583	58	10%	86%	14%	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	--	22	23	--	--
E	2	3699	Evergreen Avenue Elementary	831	78	9%	79%	21%	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	8	1	47	7	--	1
S	7	4274	Grape Street Elementary	623	71	11%	82%	18%	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	16	1	28	14	--	--
E	5	4562	Holmes Avenue Elementary	299	31	10%	87%	13%	2	--	--	--	--	1	--	4	1	16	7	--	--
C	1	5113	John W. Mack Elementary	419	50	12%	56%	44%	4	--	--	--	1	--	--	8	--	9	11	--	--
C	1	5630	Normandie Avenue Elementary	868	140	16%	59%	41%	26	--	--	5	--	1	--	22	3	45	16	--	1
S	7	5863	One Hundred Sixteenth Street Elementary	497	57	11%	40%	60%	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	7	--	9	7	--	--
C	2	2943	Quincy Jones Elementary	377	21	6%	100%	0%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	15	5	--	--
W	1	6808	Sixty-First Street Elementary	563	61	11%	62%	38%	11	--	--	1	--	--	1	8	1	21	9	--	1
W	4	6952	Stoner Avenue Elementary	309	57	18%	72%	26%	12	--	--	1	--	--	6	--	30	5	--	--	
W	1	7123	Tom Bradley Global Awareness Magnet	396	32	8%	94%	6%	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	12	6	6	--	--	
S	7	6872	Wisdom Elementary	935	52	6%	83%	17%	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	9	--	28	6	--	--
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																					
Resident Schools																					
C	5	2308	Sally Ride Elementary: A SMART Academy	562	37	7%	86%	14%	2	--	--	--	--	1	--	7	--	22	3	--	--
C	7	3932	Forty-Ninth Street Elementary	832	118	14%	54%	46%	29	--	--	3	--	--	--	9	1	36	19	--	--
C	5	8094	George Washington Carver Middle	840	104	12%	75%	25%	9	--	--	3	--	2	1	7	--	69	2	--	--
C	5	2219	Ascot Avenue Elementary	867	79	9%	65%	35%	13	--	--	--	--	2	--	7	2	30	14	--	--
C	5	4681	Harmony Elementary	652	71	11%	56%	44%	15	--	--	1	--	3	--	10	2	22	8	--	--
C	5	4575	Hooper Avenue Elementary	958	84	9%	62%	38%	22	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	--	36	11	--	--
C	7	8200	Los Angeles Academy Middle	1347	173	13%	82%	18%	14	--	--	3	--	1	2	18	1	122	2	--	--
C	5	7589	Wadsworth Avenue Elementary	707	77	11%	43%	57%	41	--	--	--	--	1	--	7	--	14	12	--	--
C	2	5173	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of Business and Technology	502	70	14%	94%	6%	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	5	2	59	2	--	--
C	2	8070	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of Arts and Culture	502	67	13%	90%	10%	3	--	--	--	--	2	--	5	2	53	2	--	--
C	7	7654	West Vernon Avenue Elementary	740	70	9%	79%	21%	14	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	40	12	--	--
C	7	5068	Main Street Elementary	862	89	10%	60%	40%	8	--	--	--	--	2	3	5	--	37	11	--	--
Resident Schools Median																					
				786	78	11%	70%	30%	14	--	--	3	--	2	2	7	2	37	10	--	--

Celery Dyad Charter
2012-13 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS-TEST (CST) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH RESULTS

LD	BD	Loc. Code	School Name	2013 CST ELA										2013 CST MATH									
				# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/F/BB	% /Adv	% Prof	% %	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/F/BB	% /Adv	% Prof	% %	
XR	5	2116	Celery Dyad Charter	473	2%	10%	26%	34%	29%	38%	63%	477	0%	7%	12%	27%	54%	19%	81%				
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																							
E	2	2397	Belvedere Elementary	590	11%	21%	36%	24%	9%	68%	33%	596	5%	24%	25%	27%	18%	54%	45%				
XR	2	5987	Camino Nuevo Academy #2	376	0%	5%	32%	39%	23%	37%	62%	384	0%	3%	13%	41%	43%	16%	84%				
XR	1	2925	Celery Nascent Charter	334	1%	4%	21%	35%	39%	26%	74%	338	0%	2%	9%	30%	58%	11%	88%				
E	2	3699	Evergreen Avenue Elementary	550	7%	17%	32%	29%	15%	56%	44%	552	3%	22%	23%	26%	26%	48%	52%				
S	7	4274	Grape Street Elementary	381	17%	20%	25%	21%	17%	62%	38%	382	11%	24%	16%	23%	26%	51%	49%				
E	5	4562	Holmes Avenue Elementary	220	13%	20%	33%	27%	6%	66%	33%	220	8%	24%	30%	24%	15%	62%	39%				
C	1	5113	John W. Mack Elementary	221	16%	16%	39%	21%	8%	71%	29%	224	6%	18%	22%	24%	30%	46%	54%				
C	1	5630	Normandie Avenue Elementary	534	14%	17%	30%	27%	12%	61%	39%	533	5%	17%	21%	30%	27%	43%	57%				
S	7	5863	One Hundred Sixteenth Street Elementary	245	10%	16%	36%	27%	11%	62%	38%	245	6%	15%	25%	28%	25%	46%	53%				
C	2	2943	Quincy Jones Elementary	211	4%	17%	36%	29%	13%	57%	42%	213	0%	15%	25%	28%	32%	40%	60%				
W	1	6808	Sixty-First Street Elementary	341	10%	11%	38%	26%	14%	59%	40%	345	3%	16%	21%	27%	33%	40%	60%				
W	4	6952	Stoner Avenue Elementary	195	6%	11%	35%	29%	18%	52%	47%	199	2%	14%	17%	32%	36%	33%	68%				
W	1	7123	Tom Bradley Global Awareness Magnet	236	14%	17%	42%	19%	7%	73%	26%	235	6%	29%	33%	21%	12%	68%	33%				
S	7	6872	Wisdom Elementary	579	10%	19%	34%	26%	12%	63%	38%	583	5%	18%	24%	28%	24%	47%	52%				
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				338	10%	17%	35%	27%	13%	62%	39%	341.5	5%	18%	23%	28%	27%	46%	54%				
Resident Schools																							
C	5	2308	Sally Ride Elementary: A SMART Academy	244	9%	17%	35%	26%	13%	61%	39%	245	5%	20%	28%	24%	24%	53%	48%				
C	7	3932	Forty-Ninth Street Elementary	540	16%	24%	37%	17%	6%	77%	23%	544	9%	27%	22%	25%	17%	58%	42%				
C	5	8094	George Washington Carver Middle	976	20%	24%	32%	20%	4%	76%	24%	994	18%	34%	26%	18%	4%	78%	22%				
C	5	2219	Ascot Avenue Elementary	545	9%	20%	32%	25%	14%	61%	39%	545	4%	23%	20%	26%	26%	47%	52%				
C	5	4681	Harmony Elementary	443	14%	14%	37%	24%	10%	65%	34%	443	6%	17%	24%	30%	23%	47%	53%				
C	5	4575	Hooper Avenue Elementary	763	15%	23%	36%	19%	7%	74%	26%	770	8%	24%	27%	26%	15%	59%	41%				
C	7	8200	Los Angeles Academy Middle	1522	8%	20%	35%	25%	12%	63%	37%	1563	12%	30%	27%	22%	9%	69%	31%				
C	5	7589	Wadsworth Avenue Elementary	469	13%	18%	35%	26%	8%	66%	34%	469	8%	23%	22%	24%	22%	53%	46%				
C	2	5173	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of B	418	11%	16%	43%	23%	7%	70%	30%	424	6%	24%	36%	26%	9%	66%	35%				
C	2	8070	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of A	427	5%	19%	46%	25%	4%	70%	29%	441	7%	34%	32%	22%	5%	73%	27%				
C	7	7654	West Vernon Avenue Elementary	432	9%	14%	38%	28%	11%	61%	39%	432	5%	15%	26%	26%	29%	46%	55%				
C	7	5068	Main Street Elementary	476	10%	18%	38%	23%	11%	66%	34%	481	4%	15%	26%	31%	24%	45%	55%				
Resident Schools Median				473	11%	19%	37%	25%	9%	66%	34%	475	7%	24%	26%	26%	20%	56%	44%				

Celery Dyad Charter
2011-12 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS-TEST (CST) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH RESULTS

LD	BD	Loc. Code	School Name	2012 CST ELA							2012 CST MATH								
				# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/F BB	% /Adv	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/F BB	% /Adv
XR	5	2116	Celery Dyad Charter	477	2%	5%	26%	37%	29%	33%	66%	478	1%	3%	8%	29%	59%	12%	88%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																			
E	2	2397	Belvedere Elementary	609	11%	18%	34%	26%	11%	63%	37%	616	5%	22%	28%	27%	18%	55%	45%
XR	2	5987	Camino Nuevo Academy #2	376	2%	7%	24%	38%	29%	33%	67%	385	1%	5%	11%	35%	48%	17%	83%
XR	1	2925	Celery Nascent Charter	373	2%	5%	23%	37%	33%	30%	70%	375	0%	5%	12%	29%	54%	17%	83%
E	2	3699	Evergreen Avenue Elementary	557	8%	15%	36%	26%	15%	59%	41%	564	4%	20%	23%	29%	24%	47%	53%
S	7	4274	Grape Street Elementary	367	17%	16%	22%	28%	18%	55%	46%	367	13%	16%	20%	23%	29%	49%	52%
E	5	4562	Holmes Avenue Elementary	253	12%	20%	35%	25%	8%	67%	33%	254	8%	20%	28%	24%	20%	56%	44%
C	1	5113	John W. Mack Elementary	234	12%	18%	29%	26%	13%	59%	39%	236	5%	16%	23%	24%	32%	44%	56%
C	1	5630	Normandie Avenue Elementary	583	12%	16%	34%	26%	11%	62%	37%	592	4%	23%	22%	29%	23%	49%	52%
S	7	5863	One Hundred Sixteenth Street Elementary	264	8%	16%	34%	26%	17%	58%	43%	264	4%	11%	22%	27%	36%	37%	63%
C	2	2943	Quincy Jones Elementary	194	7%	19%	39%	26%	9%	65%	35%	197	4%	19%	30%	24%	23%	53%	47%
W	1	6808	Sixty-First Street Elementary	343	10%	17%	31%	26%	16%	58%	42%	349	3%	17%	19%	30%	31%	39%	61%
W	4	6952	Stoner Avenue Elementary	199	8%	13%	31%	32%	17%	52%	49%	208	1%	15%	22%	34%	27%	38%	61%
W	1	7123	Tom Bradley Global Awareness Magnet	252	13%	24%	31%	23%	10%	68%	33%	252	15%	27%	26%	20%	12%	68%	32%
S	7	6872	Wisdom Elementary	560	11%	17%	33%	23%	15%	61%	38%	565	6%	17%	23%	26%	29%	46%	55%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																			
				355	11%	17%	32%	26%	15%	59%	40%	358	4%	17%	23%	27%	28%	47%	54%
Resident Schools																			
C	5	2308	Sally Ride Elementary: A SMART Academy	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
C	7	3932	Forty-Ninth Street Elementary	599	16%	19%	32%	25%	8%	67%	33%	604	8%	23%	19%	28%	22%	50%	50%
C	5	8094	George Washington Carver Middle	1060	21%	24%	34%	16%	5%	79%	21%	1059	18%	36%	25%	16%	5%	79%	21%
C	5	2219	Ascot Avenue Elementary	610	8%	16%	31%	27%	18%	55%	45%	610	6%	16%	22%	24%	32%	44%	56%
C	5	4681	Harmony Elementary	494	13%	17%	30%	26%	15%	60%	41%	496	6%	22%	25%	26%	20%	53%	46%
C	5	4575	Hooper Avenue Elementary	887	14%	22%	34%	22%	7%	70%	29%	893	7%	21%	28%	25%	18%	56%	43%
C	7	8200	Los Angeles Academy Middle	1589	11%	21%	31%	24%	14%	63%	38%	1633	15%	29%	29%	19%	8%	73%	27%
C	5	7589	Wadsworth Avenue Elementary	462	13%	20%	32%	26%	8%	65%	34%	465	7%	27%	24%	23%	18%	58%	41%
C	2	5173	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of B	359	11%	24%	39%	20%	5%	74%	25%	366	8%	26%	32%	25%	8%	66%	33%
C	2	8070	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of A	360	9%	17%	45%	23%	6%	71%	29%	369	11%	33%	36%	19%	2%	80%	21%
C	7	7654	West Vernon Avenue Elementary	609	14%	17%	31%	24%	13%	62%	37%	607	6%	17%	24%	26%	27%	47%	53%
C	7	5068	Main Street Elementary	502	9%	20%	33%	27%	11%	62%	38%	505	4%	19%	23%	28%	26%	46%	54%
Resident Schools Median																			
				599	13%	20%	32%	24%	8%	65%	34%	604	7%	23%	25%	25%	18%	56%	43%

**Celerity Dyad Charter
OUT-OF-SCHOOL SUSPENSION EVENTS**

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

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	2015-16										2015-16 SUBGROUPS														
				2013-14					2014-15					2015-16					AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS					STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY				
				Susp. Event Rate 2013-14	Susp. Event Rate 2014-15	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp. % 2015-16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp. % 2015-16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp. % 2015-16			
XR	5	2116	Celerity Dyad Charter	2.7%	2.6%	0.9%	0.9%	705	6	8	10	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	62	2	4	3.2%	3.2%	16	3.2%				
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																												
E	2	2397	Belvedere Elementary	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	785	1	1	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	93	1	1	1.1%	1.1%	1	1.1%					
XR	2	5987	Camino Nuevo Academy #2	1.2%	0.6%	2.1%	2.0%	563	12	41	6	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55	1	1	1.8%	1.8%	1	1.8%					
XR	1	2925	Celerity Nascent Charter	8.6%	6.0%	4.1%	3.1%	583	24	30	170	17	22	10.0%	7.1%	7.1%	59	8	12	13.6%	8.5%	8	8.5%					
E	2	3699	Evergreen Avenue Elementary	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	831	0	0	4	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	67	0	1	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
S	7	4274	Grape Street Elementary	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	623	0	0	164	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	71	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
E	5	4562	Holmes Avenue Elementary	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	299	0	0	41	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
C	1	5113	John W. Mack Elementary	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	419	0	0	76	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	45	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
C	1	5630	Normandie Avenue Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	868	0	0	189	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	115	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
S	7	5863	One Hundred Sixteenth Street Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	497	0	0	129	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	57	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
C	2	2943	Quincy Jones Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	377	0	0	8	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
W	1	6808	Sixty-First Street Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	563	0	1	7	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	48	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
W	4	6952	Stoner Avenue Elementary	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	309	1	1	7	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55	1	5	1.8%	1.8%	1	1.8%					
W	1	7123	Tom Bradley Global Awareness Magnet	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	396	3	4	293	2	3	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	28	4	16	14.3%	7.1%	16	14.3%					
S	7	6872	Wisdom Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	935	0	0	76	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	51	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																												
Resident Schools				0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	563	0	0	69	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
C	5	2308	Sally Ride Elementary: A SMART Academy	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	562	0	0	39	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
C	7	3932	Forty-Ninth Street Elementary	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	832	2	3	54	1	1	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	66	3	4	4.5%	4.5%	4	4.5%					
C	5	8094	George Washington Carver Middle	0.0%	3.9%	2.7%	2.4%	840	23	51	71	6	11	8.5%	7.0%	7.0%	101	51	54	50.5%	5.9%	54	50.5%					
C	5	2219	Ascot Avenue Elementary	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	867	0	0	46	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	73	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
C	5	4681	Harmony Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	652	0	0	40	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	68	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
C	5	4575	Hooper Avenue Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	958	3	3	60	2	2	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	82	3	3	3.7%	3.7%	3	3.7%					
C	7	8200	Los Angeles Academy Middle	0.0%	3.4%	3.9%	2.6%	1347	52	77	112	20	33	17.9%	13.4%	13.4%	175	77	132	44.0%	9.7%	77	44.0%					
C	5	7589	Wadsworth Avenue Elementary	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.3%	707	2	7	27	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7	7	7	10.1%	10.1%	7	10.1%					
C	2	5173	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of Business and Technology	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%	3.4%	502	38	68	25	10	24	40.0%	20.0%	20.0%	73	68	69	93.2%	6.8%	69	93.2%					
C	2	8070	Dr. Julian Nava Learning Academies-School of Arts and Culture	0.0%	1.9%	3.6%	2.6%	502	18	28	19	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	67	28	30	41.8%	4.5%	30	41.8%					
C	7	7654	West Vernon Avenue Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	740	0	0	41	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	69	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%					
C	7	5068	Main Street Elementary	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	862	3	4	47	1	1	2.1%	2.1%	2.1%	85	4	7	4.7%	4.7%	7	4.7%					
Resident Schools Median																												
				0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	786	3	4	44	1	1	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	71	4	6	4.6%	4.6%	4	4.6%					

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 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)

**Celerity Dyad Charter School
2014-15 and 2015-16 Smarter Balanced Assessment Achievement Data**

2015-16		Loc Code	School	Subgroup	English Language Arts				Mathematics			
LD	BD				% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
XR	5	2116	Celerity Dyad Charter School	All Students	20	25	34	20	22	28	27	23
				African American	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
				Latino	20	24	35	21	22	28	27	23
				English Learners	35	32	26	7	35	29	24	12
				Soc-eco Disadvantaged	20	25	34	20	23	28	27	22
				Students with Disabilities	73	20	4	2	78	16	4	2
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE												
E	2	2397	Belvedere Elementary	All Students	56	28	12	4	53	29	16	2
XR	2	5987	Camino Nuevo Charter Academy #2	All Students	18	28	37	17	21	34	29	16
XR	1	2925	Celerity Nascant Charter School	All Students	31	23	32	14	22	32	28	18
E	2	3699	Evergreen Avenue Elementary	All Students	50	29	17	4	55	29	14	3
S	7	4274	Grape Street Elementary	All Students	68	19	9	4	68	22	7	3
E	5	4562	Holmes Avenue Elementary	All Students	63	21	13	3	61	30	7	3
C	1	5113	John W Mack Elementary	All Students	68	20	9	2	58	30	11	0
C	1	5630	Normandie Avenue Elementary	All Students	56	22	14	7	53	28	14	4
S	7	5863	116th Street Elementary	All Students	49	32	14	4	37	40	19	4
C	2	2943	Quincy Jones Elementary	All Students	48	26	20	6	41	34	18	6
W	1	6808	61st Street Elementary	All Students	53	26	17	3	51	33	14	2
W	4	6952	Stoner Avenue Elementary	All Students	35	31	22	13	34	45	18	4
W	1	7123	Thomas Bradley Global Awareness Magnet	All Students	77	12	7	3	72	21	5	2
S	7	6872	Wisdom Elementary	All Students	44	26	24	6	46	33	18	3
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median					52	26	16	4	52	31	15	3
Resident Schools												
C	5	2308	Sally Ride Elementary: A Smart Academy	All Students	56	25	14	6	62	26	9	3
C	7	3932	49th Street Elementary	All Students	64	22	11	3	61	25	12	1
C	5	8094	George Washington Carver Middle School	All Students	57	28	13	2	68	20	9	3
C	5	2219	Ascot Avenue Elementary	All Students	48	21	20	11	42	32	20	7
C	5	4681	Harmony Elementary School	All Students	60	23	11	6	59	27	12	2
C	5	4575	Hooper Avenue Elementary	All Students	67	17	11	5	61	24	12	4
C	7	8200	Los Angeles Academy Middle School	All Students	46	27	23	5	63	23	11	4
C	5	7589	Wadsworth Avenue Elementary	All Students	60	25	10	5	59	27	12	2
C	2	5173	Dr Julian Nava Learning Academy - School of Business	All Students	47	29	21	3	58	28	8	5
C	2	8070	Dr Julian Nava Learning Academy - School of Arts & Sciences	All Students	50	29	19	2	66	24	7	2
C	7	7654	West Vernon Avenue Elementary	All Students	43	24	21	12	40	28	15	17
C	7	5068	Main Street Elementary	All Students	61	20	13	6	61	24	11	4
Resident Schools Median					57	25	14	5	61	26	12	4

2014-15

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	Subgroup	English Language Arts				Mathematics			
					% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
XR	5	2116	Celerity Dyad Charter School	All Students	30	33	27	11	25	34	29	12
				African American	55	27	18	0	64	18	18	0
				Latino	29	33	27	11	23	35	29	12
				English Learners	46	34	17	3	41	37	15	7
				Soc-eco Disadvantaged	29	33	27	10	25	35	29	12
				Students with Disabilities	84	11	3	3	68	32	0	0
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE												
E	2	2397	Belvedere Elementary	All Students	55	25	15	5	56	32	10	3
XR	2	5987	Camino Nuevo Charter Academy #2	All Students	21	31	37	12	23	35	29	13
XR	1	2925	Celerity Nascent Charter School	All Students	34	32	22	12	26	35	23	16
E	2	3699	Evergreen Avenue Elementary	All Students	56	28	13	3	54	30	13	3
S	7	4274	Grape Street Elementary	All Students	63	22	10	4	66	21	11	2
E	5	4562	Holmes Avenue Elementary	All Students	64	23	12	1	58	30	12	0
C	1	5113	John W Mack Elementary	All Students	68	20	10	2	66	22	8	4
C	1	5630	Normandie Avenue Elementary	All Students	66	19	13	3	64	26	9	1
S	7	5863	116th Street Elementary	All Students	60	22	16	3	50	35	12	3
C	2	2943	Quincy Jones Elementary	All Students	45	28	21	5	40	31	24	5
W	1	6808	61st Street Elementary	All Students	57	26	14	3	61	25	13	1
W	4	6952	Stoner Avenue Elementary	All Students	56	23	15	6	56	29	12	3
W	1	7123	Thomas Bradley Global Awareness Magnet	All Students	60	25	13	2	72	20	6	2
S	7	6872	Wisdom Elementary	All Students	47	29	18	6	51	28	16	5
				All Students	57	25	15	4	56	30	12	3
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median												
Resident Schools												
C	5	2308	Sally Ride Elementary: A Smart Academy	All Students	51	27	12	10	54	27	12	7
C	7	3932	49th Street Elementary	All Students	75	17	7	1	71	23	6	0
C	5	8094	George Washington Carver Middle School	All Students	61	24	13	1	68	22	7	3
C	5	2219	Ascot Avenue Elementary	All Students	54	22	17	6	58	24	13	5
C	5	4681	Harmony Elementary School	All Students	62	19	15	5	62	25	11	2
C	5	4575	Hooper Avenue Elementary	All Students	71	19	9	1	69	19	10	2
C	7	8200	Los Angeles Academy Middle School	All Students	47	28	21	4	62	22	10	5
C	5	7589	Wadsworth Avenue Elementary	All Students	68	19	12	1	62	27	9	2
C	2	5173	Dr Julian Nava Learning Academy - School of Busin	All Students	49	30	19	2	60	25	12	4
C	2	8070	Dr Julian Nava Learning Academy - School of Arts	All Students	53	29	16	2	64	25	10	2
C	7	7654	West Vernon Avenue Elementary	All Students	54	27	17	2	45	32	16	7
C	7	5068	Main Street Elementary	All Students	61	24	12	3	56	28	12	3
				All Students	58	24	14	2	62	25	11	3
Resident Schools Median												

**Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the
Renewal Charter Petition for
Celerity Dyad Charter School
By the Los Angeles Unified School District**

BOARD OF EDUCATION REPORT 161-16/17
October 18, 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

On August 22, 2016, the Los Angeles Unified School District (“District”) received a charter petition (“Petition”) from Celerity Educational Group (“CEG”), a California nonprofit public benefit corporation, requesting that the District’s Board of Education renew the Celerity Dyad Charter School’s (“Charter School” or “Petitioner”) charter for a term of five years. Petitioner seeks authorization to operate a school in Board District 5 and Local District Central serving, at full capacity, 710 students in grades TK-8. (Exhibit 1, Petition).¹ The Charter School is located on three private sites located at: 4501 Wadsworth Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90011; 4607 S. Central Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90011; and 4700 S. Central Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90011.

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

¹ Please note that all page references to the Celerity Dyad Charter School renewal petition in this Findings of Fact are to the version with revisions from Petitioner.

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 (“5 CCR”), section 11966.4, subdivision (a).)

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

In addition, state regulations require the District to “consider the past performance of the school’s academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement if any.” (5 CCR § 11966.4.)

III. ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

As discussed above, charter schools that have operated for at least four years must first meet one of the minimum academic performance criteria listed in Education Code section 47607, subdivision (b) or Education Code sections 52052(e)(2)(F) and 52052(e)(4)(C) before the renewal request is analyzed further. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11966.4; Ed. Code, § 47607, subd. (b).) Petitioner states that Celerity Dyad School “has met not just one but all of the minimum criteria for renewal set forth in Education Code Section 476067(b), and has also met the new criteria for renewal under Section 52052(e)(4)(C).” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 1.)

A. Summary

District staff has concluded that Celerity Dyad 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 Schools² and District Similar Schools.³

² “Resident Schools” are the public schools that the Charter School’s students would have otherwise attended based on their addresses.

³ “District Similar Schools” are LAUSD schools on the CDE’s Similar Schools list for this Charter School.

Celerity Dyad’s 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) results show levels of academic performance that are above the District average in English Language Arts (ELA) and above the District average 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 8 and a Similar Schools rank of 10. (Exhibit 2, Celerity Dyad AMAO Data, and Exhibit 4, Celerity Dyad SBAC Data.)

In 2015-2016, Celerity Dyad’s English Learner reclassification rate was 14%, which is higher than both the Similar and Resident School Median rates of 8%. However, in 2014-2015, Dyad’s reclassification rate was 7%, which was lower than the Similar and Resident School Median rates of 18% and 16%, respectively. (Exhibit 3, Celerity Dyad Data Set.)

B. Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math

On the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts (“ELA”), 54% of the Dyad students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 19%. In Mathematics, 50% of the Dyad 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 ELA, 38% of Dyad’s students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is greater than the Resident Schools Median of 16%. In Mathematics, 41% of Dyad’s students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 14%. This means that in 2015-2016, Dyad students performed 35 percentage points higher in ELA and 34 percentage points higher in Math than the Resident Schools Median. In 2014-2015, the Dyad students performed 22 percentage points higher in ELA and 27 percentage points higher in Math than the Resident Schools Median. (Exhibit 4, Celerity Dyad SBAC Data.)

C. Student Subgroup Academic Growth

Pursuant to the requirements of SB 1290, the District “shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.” (Ed. Code § 47607(a) (3) (A).) The Charter School’s record of academic performance indicates that most of Celerity Dyad’s numerically significant student subgroups (Latino, English Learners, and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and, with the exception of Students with Disabilities, have achieved positive growth in academic performance. Due to a decrease in the number of African American students between 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 to fewer than 10 students, there were no comparative data for that subgroup. CAASPP (SBAC) data revealed that in ELA, Latino students showed growth of 18 percentage points; English Learners showed growth of 13 percentage points; Socioeconomically Disadvantaged showed growth of 17 percentage points; and Students with Disabilities showed no change from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016. The data in Mathematics reveal that Latino students showed growth of 9 percentage points; English Learners showed growth of 14 percentage points; Socioeconomically Disadvantaged showed growth of 8 percentage points; and Students with

Disabilities showed growth of 6 percentage points from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016. Petitioner concedes that the academic performance of Students with Disabilities and English Learners enrolled in the Charter School lags behind the academic performance of the Charter School's pupils school-wide. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 1, Exhibit 4, Celerity Dyad SBAC Data).

However, while the District recognizes the above-referenced academic gains achieved at the school for most subgroups except for Students with Disabilities, the pattern of insufficient responses to inquiries, lack of transparency, and the potential for significant conflicts of interest posed by the Charter School's governance structure, substantially outweigh the extra consideration accorded to the school's academic growth and confirm the Petitioner's persistent and ongoing failure to successfully operate its schools in accordance with applicable law and the terms of its schools' charters. These specific concerns are further articulated below in this Report.

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 Celerity Dyad Charter Renewal based on the following grounds:

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

V. FINDINGS OF FACT FOR DENIAL

Please note that while these findings of fact have been grouped for convenience, certain findings of fact may support more than one ground for denial.

A. The Petitioner is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Petition for Renewal of the Celerity Dyad Charter School (Ed. Code § 47605(b)(2).)

1. Petitioner Intentionally Limits Transparency and Seeks to Subvert Oversight

In reviewing the past history of a charter school's operations, it is appropriate to look to the record of performance of the petitioner that will operate the charter school. An essential part of operating a successful educational program is compliance and performance in all areas, including academic achievement, governance, operations, and finance. While staff acknowledges an overall positive record of achievement outcomes in the area of academics, staff has noted serious concerns about the organization's financial, operational, and governance practices. The concerns include, but are not limited to, whether Celerity Educational Group ("CEG") operates within the

intent and spirit of California's Charter School Act and whether CEG acts to subvert LAUSD's oversight of its charter schools.

Under the Charter Schools Act, the District is responsible for monitoring the Charter School for compliance with the law and its own charter. The District is also obligated to monitor the fiscal conditions of the school. Petitioner has operated in the District for several years, and is familiar with District protocols.

Staff is concerned because Petitioner's lack of transparency attempts to impinge on the District's ability to provide oversight. In the summer of 2016, District staff requested financial and governance documents in order to evaluate Petitioner's fiscal solvency, and to clarify Petitioner's relationship with entities that perform essential charter school functions. Petitioner's response was either partial, or inadequate. (Exhibits 6 & 8.) The lack of transparency is rooted, in large part, in the corporate structure of Petitioner, along with those of Celerity Development, LLC and Celerity Global Development ("Global").

Shortly after the January 2012 incorporation of Global, Petitioner changed its corporate bylaws ("Bylaws") to make Global the Sole Statutory Member of Petitioner's corporation, making the powers of the CEG Board subject to the powers of Global. (Exhibit 5, CEG's Amended Bylaws April 1, 2012, Art. VI, § 3.)

In a letter dated September 23, 2016, Petitioner's CEO, Dr. Grace Canada, confirmed that Global remains the sole statutory member of CEG. (Exhibit 6.) According to CEG's Bylaws, Global has: the power to elect and remove the members of Petitioner's governing board; the power to dispose of Petitioner's assets; the power to merge Petitioner with other corporations; and the power to dissolve Petitioner. (Exhibit 5, CEG's Amended Bylaws April 1, 2012, Art. VI, § 3.) The Charter Schools Division (CSD) requested information regarding Global's and other related entities' governance structure and service contracts, to which CEG provided partial or insufficient responses. (Exhibit 6.) The CSD issued a Notice to Cure on September 22, 2016 to the governing board of CEG to address CSD's concerns regarding their inadequate responses. (Exhibit 7.) Petitioner's responses to these concerns, in a letter dated September 23, 2016, continue to be inadequate, and are designed to reduce, or eliminate, transparency. (Exhibit 6.)

While the Petition downplays impacts of transparency and conflicts of interest, CEG's corporate structure and interaction with its affiliated entities present significant issues identified throughout this Report.

These April 2012, amendments to Petitioner's Bylaws were also a unilateral material amendment to Dyad's charter. As discussed below, the foundation of how Dyad and Petitioner would be governed, as contemplated in Dyad's current charter petition, was materially amended. CEG failed to petition the District's governing board prior to making that material amendment to its charter as required under California's Charter Schools Act, specifically, Education Code section 47607.

In 2012, CEG and Global entered into an "Affiliation Agreement" that makes the day-to-day management and long term operations of CEG's charter schools Global's responsibility. The Affiliation Agreement recognized that Global and CEG "will each maintain their respective

separate corporate existences.” (Exhibit 8.) In fact, in the above-mentioned “Affiliation Agreement” between CEG and Global, it is specifically recognized that Global does not comply with California’s Charter Schools Act. (Exhibit 8, Prov. II.) Further, as part of a Master Personnel Agreement between Global and CEG, it was recognized that only CEG, not Global, had to comply with the Public Records Act. (Exhibit 9.)

Pursuant to the Affiliation Agreement, Global provides management services to CEG. This includes providing CEG’s respective charter schools “with day-to-day management, programmatic support services, staff development and supervisory oversight.” Further, Global would hold and license CEG’s curriculum and other intellectual property. It was also agreed that CEG would transfer significant assets to Global. The stated intent of the transfer was to provide “the assets necessary for CGD [Global] to be capitalized and to carry out the purposes described” in the agreement. (Exhibit 8.)

In carrying out the terms of the Affiliation Agreement, on or about April 1, 2012, CEG’s Board of Directors passed a resolution to transfer to Global:

1. Cash reserves held in a Citibank Account (valued at one time at \$823,857.01) and California Credit Union account (valued at one time at \$1,480,477.18); and
2. Intellectual property, including CEG’s service marks and trade name, curriculum, advertising materials, trade dress in aspects of school design, curriculum implementation guides, pedagogy, facility designs, forms and document designs, business practices, and other protectable written, auditory or visual materials, trade secrets and related information associated with the operation of CEG’s schools and programs. (Exhibit 8.)

Moreover, per the Affiliation Agreement, Global “will provide certain teacher, administrative, personnel and staff resources to CEG” and “CEG will provide certain teacher, administrative personnel and staff resources to” Global. Global “will make offers of employment to certain CEG administrators and staff who are not enrolled in STRS. . .” In other words, certain CEG employees would become Global employees. Those individuals would continue to provide the same services to CEG, however, they would now be doing it as Global employees, provided to CEG by contract. Likewise, CEG would provide Global with CEG employees to serve as “certain executives and staff.” (Exhibit 8.) The specifics of which employees were to be exchanged, and the scope of those employees’ services, were to be specified in a later agreement, which, to District staff’s understanding, has never been provided to the District. Therefore, it is not clear which staff at CEG and at its individual schools are employees of CEG and which are employees of Global.

As a result of these changes to Petitioner’s Bylaws, Global is the organization that actually manages the Charter School. Petitioner and its Board have significantly limited their own governance and operations. CEG’s ceding of its control to Global should have been brought to the District’s Board as a material amendment of the charter. The District, as the charter authorizer, was never informed, and never approved, this substantial change in governance

structure. CEG failed to notify the Charter Schools Division (CSD) that the Bylaws were changed in April 2012.⁴

When Petitioner refuses to provide basic information about their respective charter schools that is possessed by an affiliated entity, it interferes with the District's oversight. When the District made inquiries regarding CEG's finances, an entity by the name of Charter School Management Corporation, Inc. ("CMSC") responded. (Exhibit 10.) However, CEG does not have a contract with CSMC. When the District asked for contracts between CSMC and Global, CEG refused to provide them. (Exhibits 6 & 8.)

District staff has requested other specific documentation and information from CEG, but has received only partial or insufficient responses. Specifically, in a number of emails to Grace Canada between June 29, 2016 and August 26, 2016, District staff repeatedly requested copies of all contracts between CEG, Global, Celerity Development, LLC, and CSMC. (Exhibit 11.) In response, Ms. Canada replied: "As I shared, CEG does not have a contract with CSMC, and CEG does not possess copies of other entity contracts with CSMC." (Exhibit 12, Email to Sharon Jennings, dated 7/19/16.) In a later email, Ms. Canada stated, "These are separate entities from CEG and we don't have their corporate books and records." Ms. Canada further stated, "CEG doesn't possess copies of Global's contracts—Global is a separate entity." (Exhibit 13, Email to Sharon Jennings, dated 9/7/16.)

Further, as part of ongoing oversight, District staff reviewed CEG's check register from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016, and identified checks issued by CEG to Global, Celerity Development, LLC, and Celerity Contracting Services, Inc. that total \$5,021,339.47, \$334,926.00, and \$321,943.23, respectively. (Exhibit 14.) Provided that these are separate, but affiliated, legal entities of CEG, and do business with CEG, CEG should have provided the District with the aforementioned requested items and financial information for Global. This insufficient response to the District's reasonable inquiry—given Global is the sole statutory member of CEG and has the power to exercise various actions for CEG—interferes with the District's assessment of the fiscal condition of CEG and its schools without understanding the fiscal condition of its sole statutory member, including identifying and managing risks to prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse..

Concerns over financial transactions also persist, and both the District and the Los Angeles County Office of Education ("LACOE"), have independently raised concerns regarding loans Petitioner provide to Celerity Development, LLC. On or about October 19, 2011, Petitioner executed a loan with Celerity Development, LLC, in the amount of approximately \$2.5 million⁵. Then on or about June 30, 2013, Petitioner loaned Celerity Development, LLC, approximately \$1.7 million⁶, for a total approximate loan amount of \$4.2 million. These loans are to be paid back over time. Despite requests for information, Petitioner has not disclosed sufficient details

⁴ When CEG submitted their petitions for the renewal of Celerity Cardinal and Celerity Palmati in September 2015, the Bylaws were dated February 5, 2012 and there was no reference to Celerity Global Development. In fact, the Bylaws dated February 5, 2012 stated that CEG is a corporation without members.

⁵ Specifically, the amount was \$2,447,687.65.

⁶ Specifically, the amount was \$1,746,325.98.

regarding these loans to demonstrate Petitioner's fiscal solvency. The District does not know, and Petitioner will not disclose, whether Celerity Development will be able to pay back this loan and what Celerity Development is doing with the loaned funds, other than for the generic acquisition of facilities.

2. *There Are Potential Conflicts of Interests*

The Charter Schools Division (CSD) has identified potential conflicts of interests and the commingling of financial transactions between CEG and the prior mentioned separate, but affiliated, legal entities.

It has been long settled by the Fair Political Practices Commission, the agency charged with interpreting the Political Reform Act ("PRA"), that charter schools, their governing boards, and their employees are subject to the PRA. (See Walsh Advice Letter, No. A-98-234; Fadely Advice Letter, No. A-02-223; and Eisenberg Advice Letter, No. I-11-027.) In addition to being legally required to follow the PRA, Petitioner has voluntarily committed to comply with the terms of the PRA. (Conflict of Interest Code of the Celerity Charter Schools, effective 10/15/14.) By agreeing to follow the PRA in its charters, employees of CEG are treated as "public officials" for the purposes of the PRA and ultimately for determining whether conflicts of interest exist. (Gov. Code § 82048, subdivision (a), defining "public official" to mean every member, officer, employee or consultant of a [charter school].) A violation of the PRA by Petitioner's employees in conducting business with CEG, would constitute both a violation of the Charter, and a violation of law.

The PRA disqualifies a public official from (1) making, (2) participating in making, or (3) using his position with the charter school to influence a charter school decision if it is reasonably foreseeable the decision will have a material effect on the public official's financial interests. (See Gov. Code, §§ 87100, 87103.) Voting on or approving a matter is considered "making" a decision. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 18702.1.) "Participating" in a decision includes actions such as negotiating, studying, making recommendations, providing advice, or other actions that involve the exercise of judgment. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 18702.2.) "Influencing" a charter school decision could include acts such as contacting the charter school or appearing before it. (Cal. Code. Regs., tit. 2, § 18702.3.) Practically speaking, CEG employees may never make or participate in the making of a decision that will have a material financial effect on themselves.

Documents dating back to 2011 state that Vielka McFarlane held the following positions and conducted financial transactions between each of the following entities:

- **President and CEO of Celerity Educational Group**
(Email from CEG President/CEO Vielka McFarlane, dated 09/12/13 (Exhibit 15.)
- **CEO of Celerity Global Development**
(Agreement for Management Services between Celerity Global Development and Celerity Educational Group, date July 2013 (Exhibit 16); and
- **CEO of Celerity Development, LLC.**

(\$2.4 million Promissory Note executed between Celerity Development, LLC. and Celerity Educational Group, date October 2011 (Exhibit 17.)

Ms. McFarlane has subsequently removed herself from positions within CEG, however, checks were identified with her as an authorized signatory which suggests that she continues to be involved with the fiscal operations of the Celerity schools. In addition, it is unclear if conflicts of interest continue because Petitioner will not provide the information to identify the officers and Directors in the other affiliated Celerity entities. However, such potential conflicts are not limited to Ms. McFarlane.

In a recent review of Celerity's operations and governance, when considering the renewal of its own Celerity-run charter school (Sirius), the Los Angeles County Office of Education noted:

A review of [CEG] Board audio recordings and minutes demonstrates the Board member who sits on both the CEG and Global Boards, has not properly recused himself when contracts for Global and its affiliate companies are presented to the CEG Board for approval, creating a possible conflict of interest. He has participated in the presentation of contracts and spoken in favor of their approval. These include contracts with Global for Management Services and Miscellaneous Service, contracts with Attenture, LLC and other companies associated with Global. On at least three (3) occasions (April 2012, August 2014 and December 2015) he voted to approve contracts or agreements with Global.

(Staff Findings on the Renewal Petition for Celerity Sirius Charter School (Grades K-8) Pursuant to Education Code Sections 47607 and 47605, Los Angeles County Office of Education, Charter School Office, February 2, 2016.)

When Petitioner refuses to provide basic information about the affiliated entity, it precludes a full assessment of whether conflicts of interests exist and calls into serious question the practices of the organizations, albeit the conditions described cause a clear appearance of conflict. For example, when Petitioner refuses to provide information about who sits on the Board of Directors for Global, it prevents examination of the transactions between Petitioner and Global. Petitioner has refused to provide that information. (See Exhibits 6 & 8.) While Petitioner promises to comply with Government Code section 1090 *et al.*, in regard to conflicts of interest, Global does not.

3. Petitioner's Use of "Internal Loans" Raises Concerns

Petitioner operates multiple charter schools within, and outside of, California. The District authorizes some, but not all, of Petitioner's charter schools. Petitioner "loans" funds between these charter schools without appropriate documentation or adequate explanation. This practice raises several concerns.

For example, when Petitioner develops the educational program for a particular charter school, the charter school's budget is the financial plan that outlines how Petitioner intends to deliver that educational program. If Petitioner is "loaning" money from one charter school to another,

then it must provide the terms and conditions regarding these loans, such as repayment schedules, interest, purpose for the loan and plans in the event of a default. Loans may also have a direct impact on the school that is providing the cash. When funds are “loaned”, the charter school loaning the money has less access to cash on hand, which in turn affects whether the charter school can still deliver the educational program as originally promised in its Charter.

However, if Petitioner is not facilitating loans, but rather is making “receivable and payable transactions” between charter schools, as it states in its response to the District regarding these issues, then Petitioner must explain the benefits and impacts on the originating school and the purposes for the transfer involved in these transactions. (Exhibit 18, CEG Response to the District’s October 5, 2015, Request for Documentation.) Regarding the question of whether they are facilitating “internal loans,” Petitioner had the following response:

There are no debt instruments between CEG, Celerity Schools and Celerity Global, and there is no board-adopted policy in that regard for the use of such loans per se. Among the Celerity Schools, you may be referring to receivable and payable transactions, sometimes referred to as intracompany “loans”. That terminology may have caused confusion. There is no debt associated with those types of transactions, and there is no specific policy in that regard. Such uses of funds are board approved, in keeping with applicable statutory requirements. In light of your inquiry, Celerity will consider some clarifying policy regarding the description of such transactions so as to avoid any further confusion. (Exhibit 18, CEG Response to the District’s October 5, 2015, Request for Documentation.)

Based on CEG’s independent audit reports from fiscal year 2011-2012 to fiscal year 2014-2015, the following is a depiction of the intercompany receivables and intercompany payables that have occurred. For example, amounts listed below in BLACK, without parenthesis, indicate funds that were taken from the respective charter school in order to supplement Celerity operations elsewhere. Amounts listed below in RED, within parenthesis, indicate funds that were given to the respected charter school due to deficits experienced at that specific charter school. In other words, each red number below shows instances where a Celerity charter school needed funds, from other Celerity charter schools, in order to pay their obligations.

Intercompany Transactions											
Intercompany Receivables / (Intercompany Payables)											
Fiscal Year	Celerity Nascent	Celerity Dyad	Celerity Troika	Celerity Octavia	Celerity Palmati	Celerity Cardinal	Celerity Sirius ¹	Celerity Exa ²	CEG (Home Office)	Celerity Development, LLC	Celerity Global Development
2011-2012	\$3,833,339	\$580,699	(\$1,035,521)	(\$830,163)	(\$330,766)	(\$253,668)	(\$1,469,742)	(\$12,525)	\$73,412	(\$573,533)	\$18,468
2012-2013	\$3,367,424	\$763,928	(\$1,164,679)	(\$548,249)	(\$372,906)	(\$537,563)	(\$1,415,397)	(\$1,031,669)	\$939,111	N/A ³	N/A ³
2013-2014	\$4,175,692	\$1,729,054	(\$450,177)	(\$178,837)	(\$27,545)	(\$614,324)	(\$1,493,449)	(\$1,002,774)	(\$2,137,640)	N/A ³	N/A ³
2014-2015	\$4,442,139	\$2,265,896	(\$1,226,664)	\$81,708	\$601,506	\$3,147	(\$965,324)	(\$742,959)	(\$4,459,449)	N/A ³	N/A ³
Outstanding Balance as of June 30, 2015	\$4,442,139	\$2,265,896	(\$1,226,664)	\$81,708	\$601,506	\$3,147	(\$965,324)	(\$742,959)	(\$4,459,449)	N/A³	N/A³

¹ The Los Angeles County Office of Education denied Celerity Sirius' renewal petition and the school closed on June 30, 2016.

² The Pasadena Fire Department inspected Celerity Exa and found that the school did not meet several fire and life-safety codes. The school closed on September 3, 2014.

³ Celerity Educational Group no longer disclosed the financials for Celerity Development, LLC and Celerity Global Development in their audited financial statements.

At best, Petitioner's response is that its use of the phrase "internal loans" is misapplied, and that Petitioner intends to clarify the description of these transactions. However, staff's concerns regarding these transactions go beyond their label, and Petitioner must provide adequate documentation to address their concerns regarding these transactions. Whether these transactions are loans or payables, Petitioner has not provided adequate explanations of these transactions. Assuming that Petitioner will continue with this practice, Petitioner must comply with requests for information from District staff so that staff can determine whether funds are being used appropriately.

B. The Petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements. (Ed. Code § 47605(b)(5).)

The Petition serves as Petitioner's proposal for the Charter School's establishment and operation. As such, the Petition must provide reasonably comprehensive descriptions of certain elements in its program and operations as required in Education Code section 47605, subdivisions (b)(5)(A-O). The following elements do not meet this standard due to incomplete or inadequate information, which in some instances contradict the requirements of the law:

- i. Educational Program (Element 1): *The Petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the Charter School's educational program.*

(1) Promotion/Retention of Students

Petitioner provides too brief a description of its proposed policies for the promotion and retention of students. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Elements 2 & 3.) Specifically, Petitioner provides that "Students identified for retention must participate in a remediation program (i.e. after-school, tutoring, summer-school)." (*Id.*) As a preliminary matter, the District is concerned that the process for retention and promotion requires certain students to participate in academic instruction outside of the regular school day and class schedule.

Moreover, though Petitioner mentions this mandatory summer school instruction, it fails to detail this proposed summer program. Petitioner fails to discuss any of the following essential elements of a summer school program: (1) curriculum for each grade level; (2) staffing required for the program; or (3) the number of students expected to enroll.

As an additional concern, the Petition does not include any discussion of the qualifications of the staff who provide tutoring during the after-school program or the training such staff will receive. The reader is told only that “teachers communicate with the after-school tutoring staff to specifically target the supplemental instruction to meet each student’s needs.” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 1.) It is unclear how tutoring from non-credentialed staff will be sufficient to address the needs of students who are at risk of retention.

(2) Intervention Programs

Petitioner provides only a general description of its tiered intervention programs. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 1.) Under the proposed programs, students receive Tier 1 or Tier 2 interventions through the Charter School’s “pre-referral procedures.” (*Id.*) However, these procedures are not clearly described and the Petition fails to include a reasonably comprehensive description of the intervention strategies used in each tier, the thresholds for assigning tiers to students, and the threshold for evaluating student success through these tiered levels. (*Id.*) The Petition states that the Charter School’s after-school Expanded Learning Program is also offered “as intervention and enrichment,” but it does not explain how students receiving tiered interventions can receive “the same level of supports and services from after-school tutors as are provided in the classroom setting by credentialed teachers and other appropriately trained staff. Moreover, Parents are encouraged to sign a Family Agreement that provides, in part, that parents will agree to enroll their child “in academic enrichment programs (After School Institutes, Saturday classes, etc.) if the school deems it necessary.” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 4.) The Petition does not include any description of these additional classes and does not specify whether they are provided at no charge, or whether families are expected to shoulder the cost.

ii. Governance (Element 4): The Petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of Charter School’s governance structure.

As originally submitted, the Petition allows the CEG Board to delegate any or all of its powers or duties to “an employee of the School.” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 4.) The Board’s duties are governed by policies and procedures, such as those provided in the Brown Act, to ensure public participation and Board transparency. District staff have serious concerns about a policy that allows the Charter School to bypass these policies and procedures by delegating the Board’s broad powers to a single employee. District staff requested that Petitioner clarify those powers that should not be delegated by the Board, but Petitioner chose instead to add only a single clause stating that “the Board shall not delegate duties of the Board that should be retained.” (*Id.*) The Petition should clearly list which responsibilities the Board should retain, such as approval of the Charter School’s budget, and hiring and evaluation of the CEO.

iii. Employee Qualifications (Element 5): The Petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the individuals to be employed by the Charter School.

Pursuant to Education Code section 47605 subdivision (b)(5)(E), a charter petition must include “the qualifications to be met by individuals to be employed by the school.”

The job descriptions for the various positions set out in the Petition are not clearly defined and in several instances, overlap. For example, the CEO is charged with supervising and evaluating the performance of employees. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 5.) However, the Principal is responsible for “supervision of the Office Manager and other support staff as assigned,” and the Curriculum Specialist/Administrator in Training supervises “classified staff under the direction of the Principal.” This conflicts with the Petition’s description of the selection and evaluation process for “Other Classified Staff” which states that “All classified staff report to and are evaluated by the Principal . . .” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 5.) In addition, the Principal evaluates the Curriculum Specialist/Administrator in Training on the basis of a number of criteria, including “professional development implementation,” “level of support provided to classroom teachers,” developmentally appropriate teaching practices” and “subject matter competency,” yet these criteria for evaluation are not reflected in the list of job duties assigned to the Curriculum Specialist/Administrator in Training. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 5.)

The Petition also charges the Office Clerk with responsibility for “minor disciplinary issues” without clarifying what “minor disciplinary issues” include, or any description of the qualifications and/or training regarding student discipline that will be provided to the Office Clerk.

Of particular concern, the Curriculum Specialist is responsible for, among other things, “diagnosing reading difficulties and planning appropriate intervention and accommodation strategies for all students.” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 5.) However the required skills and experience for this position do not specify any particular expertise, qualifications or training for these specialized and critically important responsibilities.

The Petition also makes references to the obligation of the Director of School Services to develop budgets and prepare and submit various District, state and federal compliance documents “in conjunction with the CFO,” however, the Petition does not include a description of the duties and obligations of a “CFO.” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 5.)

In sum, the employee qualifications set forth in the Petition are not reasonably comprehensive.

- iv. *Suspension and Expulsion Procedures (Element 10): The Petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the Charter School’s student suspension and expulsion procedures.*

Pursuant to Education Code section 47605, subdivision (b)(5)(J), a charter petition must include “the procedures by which pupils can be suspended or expelled.” The Petition fails to adequately differentiate between the standard for suspending students and the standard for expelling students. For example, the Petition provides a list of twenty-two offenses that are grounds for *both* the discretionary suspension and the discretionary expulsion of a student. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 10..) However, the Petition fails to provide guidance detailing how the Board will differentiate between a suspendable offense and an expellable offense. For example, if the

Board determines that a student “caused, attempted to cause, or threatened to cause physical injury to another person,” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 10), how will the Board determine whether suspension of the student or expulsion of the student is the proper result? This raises due process concerns for students.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing, Staff recommends that the 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).

As stated in the comments 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 review of the Charter School’s 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.

In regard to increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school:

1. Celerity Dyad is generally out-performing the schools that their students would have attended if they were not enrolled in this charter school. Its 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) results show levels of academic performance that are above the District average in English Language Arts (ELA) and above the District average in Math.
2. Internal assessment data show moderate levels of academic achievement and growth both schoolwide and for the school’s numerically significant subgroups.
3. In 2015-2016, Celerity Dyad’s English Learner reclassification rate was 14%, which is higher than both the Similar and Resident School Median rates. In 2014-2015, Dyad’s reclassification rate was 7%, which the school attributes to an office error in recording to CALPADS.
4. On the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) in English Language Arts (“ELA”), 54% of the Dyad students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 19%. In Math, 50% of Dyad students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 16%.
5. On the 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in ELA, 38% of Dyad’s students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is greater than the Resident Schools Median

of 16%. In Math, 41% of Dyad's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 14%.

6. The school's record of academic performance indicates that most of Celerity Dyad's numerically significant student subgroups (Latino, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, English Learners and Students with Disabilities), with the exception of Students with Disabilities, have achieved positive growth in academic performance. Due to a decrease in the number of African American students between 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 to fewer than 10 students, there were no comparative data for that subgroup. CAASPP (SBAC) data revealed that in ELA, Latino students showed growth of 18 percentage points; English Learners showed growth of 13 percentage points; Socioeconomically Disadvantaged showed growth of 17 percentage points; and Students with Disabilities showed no change from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016. The data in Mathematics reveal that Latino students showed growth of 9 percentage points; English Learners showed growth of 14 percentage points; Socioeconomically Disadvantaged showed growth of 8 percentage points; and Students with Disabilities showed growth of 6 percentage points from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016.

And, District staff further finds that:

1. As described in the Charter Petition Review Checklist and Staff Report, the Petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions in several essential elements, including:
 - a. The charter school's educational program (Ed. Code, § 47605(b)(5)(A));
 - b. The governance structure of the school (Ed. Code, § 47605(b)(5)(C));
 - c. A description of the individuals to be employed by the charter school (Ed Code, § 47605(b)(5)(E)); and
 - d. The suspension and expulsion procedures of the charter school (Ed. Code, § 47605(b)(5)(J).
2. The Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Petition, due, in part to Petitioner's lack of transparency which seems to purposefully impinge on the District's oversight of the Charter School, including monitoring Petitioner's fiscal stability. The fact that some of CEG's schools, as well as CEG itself, seem to be dependent on loans from other CEG schools in order to operate gives great weight to this concern. Thus, providing a five year renewal of its charter at this time raises serious concerns.

District staff gives the greater single weight to the consideration of the academic metrics and increases for the school and its subgroups. It is noted that there was a lack of academic progress for Students with Disabilities. Staff's concerns

regarding the lack of transparency from Celerity, and its impact on the District's oversight, is so egregious that the cumulative concerns outweigh the academic increases.

District staff finds that the increases in academic achievement for the Charter School, as a whole, and for its student subgroups, are outweighed by the finding that Petitioner is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement its program, and the lack of comprehensive descriptions of all required elements provided in its Petition.

VII. 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/10-18-16BR161Exhibits.pdf>

TAB 5



Board of Education Report

File #: Rep-162-16/17, **Version:** 1

Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Troika Charter School

October 18, 2016

Charter Schools Division

Action Proposed:

Staff recommends denial of the renewal petition for Celerity Troika Charter School, located in Board District 5 and Local District Central, and adoption of the attached *Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Troika Charter School*.

Background:

Celerity Troika was originally approved on February 9, 2004, under the name Celerity Troika Charter School, and was authorized by the LAUSD Board of Education to serve up to 690 students in grades K-8. The charter was renewed on January 10, 2012, to serve up to 690 students in grades K-8.

Celerity Educational Group (CEG) currently operates six LAUSD-authorized independent charter schools: Celerity Cardinal, Celerity Dyad, Celerity Nascent, Celerity Octavia, Celerity Palmati, and Celerity Troika.

On August 22, 2016, Celerity Troika Charter School submitted a renewal petition application to the Charter Schools Division seeking to renew its independent charter span school to serve up to 690 students in grades TK-8. The school is currently serving 528 students in grades TK-8 in Board District 5 and Local District Central, and is located on one private site and two-co-located sites through Proposition 39 on the campus of Luther Burbank Middle School 6460 N. Figueroa Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90042 and on the campus of Garvanza Elementary School 317 N. Avenue 62, Los Angeles, CA 90042.

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

Statutory Framework

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

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

- (1) Attained its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in the prior year or in two of the last three years both school wide and for all groups of pupils served by the charter school; *or*
- (2) Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API in the prior year or in two of the last three years; *or*
- (3) Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API for a demographically comparable school in the prior

year or in two of the last three years; *or*

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

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

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

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

Pursuant to the requirements of SB 1290, the District "shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to

grant a charter renewal.” Ed. Code § 47607(a)(3)(A). In addition, state regulations require the District to “consider the past performance of the school’s academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement if any.” 5 CCR § 11966.4.

Grounds for Denial

Staff of the Charter Schools Division and the Office of the General Counsel reviewed the renewal petition application for Celerity Troika Charter School. 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 Celerity Troika*, 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 *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Troika Charter*, staff’s recommendation is consistent with the requirements of SB 1290. The school’s record of academic performance does indicate that Celerity Troika Charter’s numerically significant student subgroups, with the exception of English Learners (African American, Latino, English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities), have achieved positive growth in academic performance. The data reveal that African American students showed growth of 10 percentage points, Latino students showed growth of 1 percentage points, English Learners showed a decrease of 8 percentage points, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged showed growth of 4 percentage points, and Students with Disabilities showed growth of 7 percentage points from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016. The data in Mathematics reveal that African American students showed growth of 37 percentage points, Latino students showed growth of 8 percentage points, English Learners showed a decrease of 14 percentage points, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged showed growth of 11 percentage points, and Students with Disabilities showed growth of 21 percentage points from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016.

However, while the District recognizes the subgroup academic gains achieved at the school pursuant to Education Code Section 47607(b), the pattern of insufficient responses to inquiries related to Celerity Global Development which is the sole statutory member and a vendor of CEG, or any other related entities of CEG, such as Celerity Development, LLC and Celerity Contracting Services, the lack of transparency, and the potential for significant conflicts of interest posed by its governance structure substantially outweigh the extra consideration accorded to subgroup academic growth by SB 1290 and confirm the organization’s persistent and ongoing failure to successfully operate its schools in accordance with applicable law and the terms of its schools’ charters. Please see *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Troika Charter School 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 Celerity Educational Group governing board members completed

questionnaires regarding conflicts of interest.

A Public Hearing was held on September 20, 2016.

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

Expected Outcomes:

Celerity Troika Charter School 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 Celerity Troika Charter School*, Celerity Troika'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 Celerity Troika Charter School*, Celerity Troika Charter School 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 Celerity Troika Charter School*, and instead takes specific action to approve the charter petition, Celerity Troika Charter School 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 Celerity Troika Charter School*

Attachments:

Staff Assessment and Recommendation Report

Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Troika Charter School

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 162– 16/17
October 18, 2016

School Name:	Celerity Troika Charter		BOARD IS REQUIRED TO TAKE ACTION BY: October 21, 2016
Type of Charter School:	Independent Charter School		
CMO/Network:	Celerity Educational Group		
Location Code:	2118		
Type of Site(s):	(1) Private (2) Proposition 39 Co-Location (3) Proposition 39 Co-Location		
Site Address(es):	(1) 1495 Colorado Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90041 (2) 6460 N. Figueroa Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90042 (3) 317 N. Avenue 62, Los Angeles, CA 90042		
Board District(s):	5	Local District(s):	Central
Grade Levels Currently Served:	TK-8	Current Enrollment:	528
Grade Levels Authorized in Current Charter:	TK-8	Enrollment Authorized in Current Charter:	690 (no proposed change)
STAFF RECOMMENDATION:	Denial		
SUMMARY OF STAFF FINDINGS	<p>Based on a comprehensive review of the renewal petition application and the school's record of performance, staff has determined that the charter school has not met the standards and criteria for renewal. Staff findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Petitioners are <i>demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the educational program</i> set forth in the petition. ♦ The petition <i>does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions</i> of all required elements. <p>Please see <i>Findings of Fact in Support of Recommendation of Denial of the Renewal Charter Petition for Celerity Troika Charter</i> for further detail. Please also see "Staff Review and Assessment" section below.</p>		
PROPOSED BENCHMARKS:	N/A		

STAFF ASSESSMENT

I. ACTION PROPOSED

Staff recommends denial of the renewal petition for Celerity Troika Charter (“Troika” or “Charter School”), located in Board District 5 and Local District Central, for five (5) years, beginning July 1, 2017, until June 30, 2022, to serve up to 690 students in grades TK-8 in each year of the charter term.

II. CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL

Upon submission, District staff comprehensively reviews each renewal petition application to determine whether the school has not met the requirements for renewal set forth in California Education Code sections 47605 and 47607. Once a charter school is determined to be eligible for renewal under § 47607(b), the school must submit a renewal petition application that, upon review, is determined to be **educationally sound, reasonably comprehensive, and demonstrably likely to be successfully implemented.** (Ed. Code §§ 47607(a) and 47605.) Pursuant to the requirements of SB 1290, the District “shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.” (Ed. Code § 47607(a)(3)(A).) The District “shall consider the past performance of the school’s academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement if any.” (5 CCR § 11966.4.) Please see *Policy for Charter School Authorizing* (LAUSD Board of Education, February 7, 2012) for more information.

III. GENERAL SCHOOL INFORMATION

A. School History

	Celerity Troika Charter
Initial Authorization	On August 28, 2007, Celerity Troika Charter was authorized by LAUSD Board of Education to serve up to 670 students in grades TK-5.
Most Recent Renewal	The charter was renewed on March 13, 2012, to serve up to 690 students in grades TK-8.
Approved Revisions of Current Charter	N/A
Board Benchmarks in Current Charter Term	N/A
Submission of Renewal Petition Application	Celerity Troika Charter 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

	Celerity Troika Charter
Key Features of Educational Program	<p>Celerity Troika Charter offers a TK-8 educational program. The charter school has a positive school culture that reinforces school-wide expectations and ensures that students feel safe and have the capacity to achieve academic success.</p> <p>Three Key Features include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Academic Collaboration - The charter has a structured system of Professional Development. New teachers are invited to a Summer New Teacher Institute to familiarize themselves with Celerity’s guiding principles and practices. Veteran teachers ◆ Data Driven Instruction - Every week Curriculum Specialists meet with teachers to analyze and reflect on their weekly data, and plan differentiated lessons for the following week based on that data. After each benchmark, teachers create action plans to reteach and reassess any standards not mastered by students. ◆ Project Based Learning - Teachers create a set of rigorous, multi-step, cross-curricular assignments based on real world situations in expectation of strong academic performance from the students. The assignments are engaging, culturally relevant, and in line with the charter’s principles of learning.
Program Components to Meet the Needs of English Learners	<p>Celerity Troika Charter implements its own English Learner Master Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Teachers who provide EL instruction are appropriately credentialed. ◆ Teachers are recruited who not only hold a valid credential as well as a bilingual or ESL endorsement (state authorization to teach English learners such as BCLAD, CLAD, SB 1969), but who also have training in second language pedagogy and have experience teaching second language learners and sheltered English classes. ◆ The Charter uses Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) and English Language Development (ELD) strategies to provide students access to the core curriculum through a content-based and scaffolded program.
Program Components to Meet the Needs of GATE/High Achieving Students	<p>Celerity Troika Charter opposes tracking, and therefore, does not identify students as gifted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ High achieving students are identified by scoring in the advanced level on standards- based benchmark assessments and achieving mastery in all core courses with a score of 4 or an A on their report card. ◆ These students are provided with targeted classroom instruction and enrichment opportunities intended to meet their specific learning needs. ◆ Teachers consistently analyze student data and performance to inform their instructional focus and promote appropriate opportunities for individualization. They use this information to create learning activities that target the needs of students

	achieving above grade level. Teachers consistently analyze student data and performance to inform their instructional focus and promote appropriate opportunities for individualization. They use this information to create learning activities that target the needs of students achieving above grade level.
Special Education SELPA	Celerity Troika Charter 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
Celerity Troika Charter	609	68%	1%	24%	77%	2%	4%	1%	11%	0%	0%	4%

*As of October 2015 Census Day

D. Charter School Operator

Celerity Troika Charter is operated by Celerity Educational Group (CEG), a California nonprofit public benefit corporation that also operates five other LAUSD-authorized charter schools.

IV. STAFF REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

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

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

This criterion has not been determined to be a finding.

B. Are Petitioners Demonstrably Likely To Succeed?

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

1. *Student Achievement and Educational Performance*

a. Summary

Celerity Troika Charter's comparative performance on the CAASPP (SBAC) from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016 reflects a 2% 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 Mathematics. Celerity Troika's CAASPP (SBAC) results show levels of academic performance that are 30% above the Resident Schools Median in ELA and 39% above in Mathematics. Please see attached *Celerity Troika Charter Data Set*.

b. Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math

On the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 68% of the Troika students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 38%. In Mathematics, 67% of the Troika students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools

Median of 28%. On the 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 66% of Troika’s students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is greater than the Resident Schools Median of 33%. In Mathematics, 58% of Troika’s students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 24%.

2014-2015 and 2015-16 Smarter Balanced Assessment Achievement Data

2015-16		English Language Arts				Mathematics			
School	Subgroup	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
Celerity Troika Charter School	All Students	12	21	31	37	13	20	27	40
	African American	8	23	38	31	15	23	38	23
	Latino	14	23	32	31	15	23	28	35
	English Learners	42	42	16	0	40	49	4	7
	Soc-eco Disadvantaged	15	22	32	31	13	24	27	35
	Students with Disabilities	37	20	31	11	40	26	14	20
Similar Schools Median	All Students	28	26	25	20	27	32	23	15
Resident Schools Median	All Students	30	29	25	13	40	30	20	8
2014-15		English Language Arts				Mathematics			
School	Subgroup	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard
Celerity Troika Charter School	All Students	12	22	32	34	11	31	28	30
	African American	6	35	35	24	24	53	12	12
	Latino	14	24	32	30	12	33	29	26
	English Learners	41	36	20	4	21	54	20	5
	Soc-eco Disadvantaged	14	27	34	25	13	36	29	22
	Students with Disabilities	48	17	28	7	41	45	3	10
Similar Schools Median	All Students	36	26	23	14	33	32	21	12
Resident Schools Median	All Students	39	29	23	10	44	32	17	7

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 *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Troika Charter*, staff’s recommendation is consistent

with the requirements of SB 1290. The school's record of academic performance does indicate that Celerity Troika Charter's numerically significant student subgroups, with the exception of English Learners (African American, Latino, English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities), have achieved positive growth in academic performance. The data reveal that African American students showed growth of 10 percentage points, Latino students showed growth of 1 percentage points, English Learners showed a decrease of 8 percentage points, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged showed growth of 4 percentage points, and Students with Disabilities showed growth of 7 percentage points from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016. The data in Mathematics reveal that African American students showed growth of 37 percentage points, Latino students showed growth of 8 percentage points, English Learners showed a decrease of 14 percentage points, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged showed growth of 11 percentage points, and Students with Disabilities showed growth of 21 percentage points from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016.

However, while the District recognizes the subgroup academic gains achieved at the school pursuant to Education Code Section 47607(b), the pattern of insufficient responses to inquiries related to Celerity Global Development which is the sole statutory member and a vendor of CEG, or any other related entities of CEG, such as Celerity Development, LLC and Celerity Contracting Services, the lack of transparency, and the potential for significant conflicts of interest posed by its governance structure substantially outweigh the extra consideration accorded to subgroup academic growth by SB 1290 and confirm the organization's persistent and ongoing 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 Celerity Troika Charter* for further analysis.

e. English Learner Reclassification Rates

In 2015-2016, Celerity Troika's English Learner reclassification rate was 18.6%, which is higher than both the Similar and Resident School Medians. In 2014-2015, Troika's reclassification rate was 6% due to an office error in recording to CALPADS. Through the CSD oversight, the school has provided evidence that the school has been implementing its English Learner Master Plan with fidelity, and they are working diligently to take the necessary steps to ensure accurate and timely reporting of reclassification data in CALPADS.

Celerity Troika's reclassification criteria include the following:

- Assessment of language-proficiency using an objective assessment instrument including, but not limited to, the CELDT/ELPAC
- Participation of the pupil's classroom teachers and any other certificated staff with direct responsibility for teaching or placement decisions of the pupil to evaluate the pupil's curriculum mastery
- Parental opinion and consultation
- Comparison of the pupil's performance in basic skills against an empirically established range of performance and basic skills based upon the performance of English proficient pupils of the same age that demonstrate to others that the pupil is sufficiently proficient in English to participate effectively in a curriculum designed for pupils of the same age whose native language is English.

- Celerity's English Language Development Portfolios that measure progress regarding comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar usage

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
Celerity Troika Charter	79	49	42%	137	8	6%	188	35	19%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	189	22	14%	189	32	16%	155	24	11%
Resident Schools Median	115	21	19%	114	22	21%	111	16	15%

f. CAHSEE Passage and Graduation Rates [HS only]
N/A

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	4 Accomplished	4 Accomplished

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

h. Additional Information
None

2. **Governance**

The school has unresolved issues in this category. Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Troika Charter* for further detail.

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report Rating in Category of Governance	3 Proficient	4 Accomplished

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**

Celerity Troika Charter's record of performance and related information demonstrate that the school is likely to succeed in the area of organizational management, programs, and operations.

a. Summary

Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Troika Charter* for further detail.

	2014-2015	2015-2016

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

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

b. School Climate and Student Discipline

School	2015-16							2015-16 SUBGROUPS												
	Susp. Event Rate 2013-14	Susp. Event Rate 2014-15	Susp. Event Rate	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS			STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY			Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16
								# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16							
Celerity Troika Charter	3.7%	2.9%	2.3%	2.0%	609	14	24	23	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	66	3	8	4.5%	4.5%			
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	480	0	0	22	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	50	0	0	0.0%	0.0%			
Resident Schools Median	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	397	0	0	4	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	39	0	1	0.0%	0.0%			

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
Celerity Troika Charter	609	68%	1%	24%	77%	2%	4%	1%	11%	0%	0%	4%
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	480	79%	4%	26%	58%	7%	4%	5%	4%	0%	0%	1%
Resident Schools Median	397	86%	2%	22%	89%	3%	1%	2%	3%	1%	0%	1%

*As of October 2015 Census Day

d. Special Education

School	OCT 2015 Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll %	% High Incidence	% Low Incidence	# AUT	# DB	# DEAF	# ED	# EMD	# HOH	# MR	# OHI*	# OI	# SLD*	# SLI*	# TBI	# VI
Celerity Troika Charter	609	65	11%	89%	11%	3	--	--	1	--	2	--	5	1	21	32	--	--
LAUSD Similar Schools Median	480	50	9%	80%	20%	10	--	--	1	--	2	--	6	1	23	7	--	--
Resident Schools Median	397	49	11%	73%	27%	9	--	--	5	--	2	--	5	1	20	9	--	1

e. Additional Information

None

4. **Fiscal Operations**

Celerity Troika Charter's record of performance and related information demonstrate that the school has had negative net assets and net income for 2014-2015 and positive net assets and net income for 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. The school has unresolved fiscal operations issues in this category. Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Troika Charter* for further detail.

a. Summary

Celerity Troika Charter has received the rating of Developing in the category of Fiscal Operations on its annual oversight evaluation reports for the last two years.

	2014-2015	2015-2016
Annual Oversight Evaluation Report Rating in Category of Fiscal Operations	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.

b. Fiscal Condition

According to the 2014-2015 independent audit report, the school had negative net assets of **(\$110,428)** and a net loss of **(\$406,994)**. The 2015-2016 Unaudited Actuals indicate positive net assets and net income.

The CMO stated that the school’s 2014-2015 negative net assets were due to absorbing students and a majority of the staff of Celerity Exa Charter School (authorized by Pasadena Unified School District) which closed during the 2014-2015 school year.

	2012-2013 (Audited Actuals)	2013-2014 (Audited Actuals)	2014-2015 (Audited Actuals)	2015-2016 (Unaudited Actuals)
Net Assets	\$238,381	\$296,566	(\$110,428)	\$257,164
Net Income/ (Loss)	\$119,885	\$58,185	(\$406,994)	\$367,592
Transfers In/ (Out)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Prior Year Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

c. 2014-2015 Independent Audit Report

Audit Opinion: Unqualified

Material Weakness: None

Deficiency/Finding: None

d. Other Significant Fiscal Information

Please see the *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Petition for Celerity Troika Charter* for further detail.

C. Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?

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

D. Does the Petition Contain the Required Affirmations, Assurances, and Declarations?

This criterion has not been determined to be a finding.

CRITERIA SUMMARY

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

Schoolwide Academic Performance Index (API)	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Base API	932	970	966
Growth API	970	966	947
Growth Target	A	A	A
Growth	38	-4	-19
Met Schoolwide Growth Target	Yes	Yes	Yes
Met All Student Groups Target	Yes	Yes	Yes
Base API State Rank	10	10	10
Base API Similar Schools Rank	10	10	10
2013 Growth API State Rank	--	--	10
2013 Growth API Similar Schools Rank	--	--	10

Subgroup API	2010-11			2011-12			2012-13		
	Growth Target	Growth	Met Target	Growth Target	Growth	Met Target	Growth Target	Growth	Met Target
African American or Black	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
American Indian or Alaska Native	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Filipino	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Latino	A	36	Yes	A	3	Yes	A	-28	Yes
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
White	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Two or More Races	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
English Learners	--	--	--	--	--	--	A	-32	Yes
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	A	36	Yes	A	-3	Yes	A	-27	Yes
Students with Disabilities	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

	API Comparison					
	2011 Base API	2012 Growth API	11-12 Growth	2012 Base API	2013 Growth API	12-13 Growth
Celerity Troika Charter	970	966	-4	966	947	-19
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	835	834	-2	834	840	6
Resident Schools Median	784	799	15	797	789	-8

	2012-13 CST Comparison			
	English Language Arts		Mathematics	
	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below	Proficient & Advanced	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below	Proficient & Advanced
Celerity Troika Charter	15%	84%	8%	92%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	40%	60%	33%	68%
Resident Schools Median	50%	51%	45%	56%

	AYP Comparison								
	2012 AYP			2013 AYP			2014 AYP		
	# Criteria	# Met	% Met	# Criteria	# Met	% Met	# Criteria	# Met	% Met
Celerity Troika Charter	17	17	100%	17	13	76%	--	--	--
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	21	14	74%	21	14	69%	--	--	--
Resident Schools Median	17	14	79%	17	10	56%	--	--	--

Celerity Troika Charter
2012 BASE API AND 2013 GROWTH API DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

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

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

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	2013 Enrolled # on 1st Day of Testing	2013 Conf	2012 Base API	2013 Growth API	2013 State Rank	2013 Similar Schools Rank	Met 2013 Sch-wide Target	Met 2013 Subgroup Targets	% Free/Reduced Lunch	School Demographic Characteristics													
													% SpEd	% GATE	% EL	% RFP	% Latino	% White	% Af. Amer	% Asian	% Fili	% Am Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More		
XR	5	2118	Celerity Troika Charter	300	K-8	966	947	10	10	Yes	Yes	76	6	0	8	26	74	3	4	2	15	0	1	1		
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																										
C	5	2068	Allesandro Elementary	292	K-5	831	840	7	9	Yes	Yes	100	13	18	19	16	87	3	2	2	5	1	1	1	0	
W	4	2507	Brentwood Science	969	K-5	850	839	7	6	Yes	Yes	79	6	15	21	53	10	22	11	2	1	1	1	0		
C	2	2699	Cahuenga Elementary	551	K-5	873	858	8	8	Yes	No	100	10	18	41	35	54	1	3	36	6	0	0	0		
NW	3	3589	Emelita Academy Charter	281	K-5	827	825	6	5	Yes	No	63	17	11	24	15	51	34	9	4	2	0	0	0		
C	5	4164	Glenfeliz Boulevard Elementary	280	K-6	834	814	6	4	Yes	No	79	8	13	13	15	82	7	0	2	7	1	0	0		
W	2	2619	Wilshire Park Elementary	352	K-5	833	841	7	4	Yes	Yes	76	9	16	38	27	57	2	3	35	2	0	0	0		
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				322	--	834	840	7	6	--	--	79	10	16	23	19	56	5	3	8	4	1	0	0		
Resident Schools																										
C	5	4082	Gavanza Elementary	317	K-6	835	803	5	7	Yes	No	100	7	16	21	35	90	1	2	3	3	0	0	0		
C	5	7178	Toland Way Elementary	234	K-6	801	791	4	3	No	No	99	11	11	13	24	76	3	2	5	14	0	0	0		
C	5	6493	San Pascual Elementary Sci Tech Eng Arts Math (STEAM) Magnet	169	K-6	785	751	3	2	No	No	80	12	19	20	21	85	2	2	4	6	2	0	0		
C	5	3507	Eagle Rock Elementary	671	K-6	875	887	9	4	Yes	Yes	57	13	35	10	14	50	17	2	11	19	1	0	0		
C	5	7959	Yorkdale Elementary	250	K-6	813	798	5	6	No	No	85	15	10	20	25	90	2	0	1	4	0	2	0		
C	5	2671	Bushnell Way Elementary	275	K-6	706	738	2	3	Yes	Yes	75	20	9	30	17	92	2	4	1	1	0	1	0		
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	873	7-8	792	786	5	8	No	No	100	11	19	12	40	91	1	2	2	3	1	0	0		
E	5	3562	El Sereno Elementary	311	K-6	810	832	6	8	Yes	Yes	100	9	10	25	21	98	0	0	2	0	0	0	0		
C	5	2603	Buchanan Street Elementary	374	K-6	781	758	3	2	No	No	100	17	13	22	17	88	3	1	2	5	1	0	0		
C	5	5384	Monte Vista Street Elementary	502	2-6	752	748	2	5	No	No	100	14	12	36	30	96	1	1	1	1	0	0	0		
C	5	3329	Dahlia Heights Elementary	283	K-6	859	849	7	2	Yes	No	51	13	25	8	7	58	18	0	6	14	2	0	1		
C	5	2027	Aldama Elementary	448	K-6	760	773	4	5	Yes	No	100	11	12	40	24	92	3	0	2	2	1	0	0		
Resident Schools Median				314	--	797	789	5	5	--	--	100	13	13	21	23	90	2	2	2	4	1	0	0		

Celerity Troika Charter
OCTOBER 2015 CALPADS DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

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

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	Total Enroll #	% F/R Meal	% GATE	% EL	% Latino	% White	% Af. Amer.	% Asian	% Fili.	% Am Indian	% Pacific Island	% Two or More
XR	5	2118	Celerity Troika Charter	609	68%	1%	24%	77%	2%	4%	1%	11%	0%	0%	4%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE															
C	5	2068	Allesandro Elementary	440	87%	2%	24%	87%	4%	2%	3%	4%	0%	0%	1%
W	4	2507	Brentwood Science	897	80%	2%	20%	54%	10%	27%	6%	1%	0%	0%	1%
C	2	2699	Cahuenga Elementary	537	80%	9%	60%	52%	1%	3%	37%	5%	0%	0%	1%
NW	3	3589	Emelita Academy Charter	401	66%	7%	29%	47%	34%	9%	4%	1%	0%	0%	4%
C	5	4164	Glenteliz Boulevard Elementary	313	69%	2%	19%	78%	11%	2%	2%	6%	0%	0%	2%
W	2	2619	Wilshire Park Elementary	520	78%	7%	50%	63%	4%	6%	23%	3%	0%	0%	2%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				480	79%	4%	26%	58%	7%	4%	5%	4%	0%	0%	1%
Resident Schools															
C	5	4082	Garvanza Elementary	375	88%	2%	27%	91%	2%	1%	2%	3%	1%	1%	0%
C	5	7178	Toland Way Elementary	353	85%	3%	21%	76%	3%	1%	6%	12%	0%	1%	1%
C	5	6493	San Pascual Elementary Sci Tech Eng Arts Math (STEAM) Magnet	270	80%	3%	20%	87%	3%	2%	3%	3%	1%	0%	1%
C	5	3507	Eagle Rock Elementary	782	53%	3%	13%	51%	17%	1%	11%	15%	1%	0%	3%
C	5	7959	Yorkdale Elementary	296	89%	3%	17%	91%	4%	0%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%
C	5	2671	Bushnell Way Elementary	310	86%	3%	32%	87%	2%	2%	5%	0%	1%	1%	1%
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	815	88%	2%	11%	90%	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	0%	0%
E	5	3562	El Sereno Elementary	418	88%	0%	28%	96%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	5	2603	Buchanan Street Elementary	487	79%	2%	23%	93%	1%	0%	1%	3%	0%	0%	0%
C	5	5384	Monte Vista Street Elementary	440	94%	2%	38%	93%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
C	5	3329	Dahlia Heights Elementary	374	38%	1%	5%	44%	30%	1%	6%	13%	1%	0%	5%
C	5	2027	Aldama Elementary	564	74%	2%	36%	88%	9%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Resident Schools Median				397	86%	2%	22%	89%	3%	1%	2%	3%	1%	0%	1%

**Celerity Troika Charter
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	5	2118	Celerity Troika Charter	79	49	42%	137	8	6%	188	35	19%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE												
C	5	2068	Allesandro Elementary	115	10	9%	112	17	15%	95	7	7%
W	4	2507	Brentwood Science	272	62	22%	251	79	32%	195	47	24%
C	2	2699	Cahuenga Elementary	444	85	17%	336	47	14%	330	45	14%
NW	3	3589	Emelita Academy Charter	116	12	10%	126	17	14%	114	8	7%
C	5	4164	Glenfeliz Boulevard Elementary	60	15	21%	73	13	18%	57	3	5%
W	2	2619	Wilshire Park Elementary	261	29	11%	279	49	18%	279	40	14%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				189	22	14%	189	32	16%	155	24	11%
Resident Schools												
C	5	4082	Garvanza Elementary	118	29	21%	110	19	17%	111	16	14%
C	5	7178	Toland Way Elementary	88	21	23%	81	9	11%	82	17	21%
C	5	6493	San Pascual Elementary Sci Tech Eng Arts Math (STEAM) Magnet	62	10	14%	55	11	20%	53	13	25%
C	5	3507	Eagle Rock Elementary	112	21	18%	109	24	22%	111	17	15%
C	5	7959	Yorkdale Elementary	74	16	20%	80	16	20%	62	7	11%
C	5	2671	Bushnell Way Elementary	131	15	11%	117	8	7%	127	9	7%
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	107	26	21%	139	48	35%	98	28	29%
E	5	3562	El Sereno Elementary	125	19	14%	140	32	23%	131	13	10%
C	5	2603	Buchanan Street Elementary	148	30	19%	145	28	19%	130	16	12%
C	5	5384	Monte Vista Street Elementary	191	44	20%	196	46	24%	161	35	22%
C	5	3329	Dahlia Heights Elementary	30	8	22%	21	5	24%	18	3	17%
C	5	2027	Aldama Elementary	290	41	14%	266	64	24%	205	21	10%
Resident Schools Median				115	21	19%	114	22	21%	111	16	15%

Celerity Troika Charter
RECLASSIFICATION OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

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

2015-16	2014-15 # EL	2015-16 # Reclassified	2015-16 Reclassification Rate	Change from Prior Year
Celerity Troika Charter	188	35	18.6%	12.8%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	155	24	10.5%	-5.9%
Resident Schools Median	111	16	0	-6.1%
District	164,349	19,952	12.1%	-4.5%

2014-15	2013-14 # EL	2014-15 # Reclassified	2014-15 Reclassification Rate
Celerity Troika Charter	137	8	5.8%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	189	32	16.4%
Resident Schools Median	114	22	21.0%
District	179,322	29,694	16.6%

2013-14	2012-13 # EL	2013-14 # Reclassified	2013-14 Reclassification Rate
Celerity Troika Charter	79	49	41.9%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median	189	22	13.8%
Resident Schools Median	115	21	19.4%
District	170,797	25,532	13.9%

Celerity Troika Charter
K-12 SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS (DECEMBER 2015 CASEMIS REPORT)

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

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	OCT 2015 Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll #	Sp Ed Enroll %	% High Incidence	% Low Incidence	# AUT	# DB	# DEAF	# ED	# EMD	# HOH	# MR	# OHI*	# OI	# SLD*	# SLI*	# TBI	# VI
XR	5	2118	Celerity Troika Charter	609	65	11%	89%	11%	3	--	--	1	--	2	--	5	1	21	32	--	--
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																					
C	5	2068	Allesandro Elementary	440	40	9%	88%	13%	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	7	--	26	2	--	--
W	4	2507	Brentwood Science	897	63	7%	81%	19%	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	14	--	23	14	--	--
C	2	2699	Cahuenga Elementary	537	55	10%	78%	22%	7	--	--	--	--	1	--	5	--	22	16	--	--
NW	3	3589	Emelita Academy Charter	401	61	15%	64%	36%	14	--	--	1	--	2	--	11	1	23	5	--	--
C	5	4164	Glenfelig Boulevard Elementary	313	29	9%	90%	10%	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	--	13	8	--	--
W	2	2619	Wilshire Park Elementary	520	44	8%	39%	61%	22	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	13	2	--	--	
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median																					
				480	50	9%	80%	20%	10	--	--	1	--	2	--	6	1	23	7	--	--
Resident Schools																					
C	5	4082	Garvanza Elementary	375	53	14%	70%	30%	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	2	18	14	--	--
C	5	7178	Toland Way Elementary	353	44	12%	57%	43%	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	--	9	12	--	--
C	5	6493	San Pascual Elementary Sci Tech Eng Arts Math (STEAM) Magnet	270	25	9%	92%	8%	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	--	11	8	--	--
C	5	3507	Eagle Rock Elementary	782	109	14%	56%	44%	15	--	--	9	--	--	--	9	--	46	6	--	--
C	5	7959	Yorkdale Elementary	296	30	10%	70%	30%	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	8	--	10	3	--	--
C	5	2671	Bushnell Way Elementary	310	44	14%	75%	25%	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	17	14	--	1
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	815	82	10%	78%	22%	16	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	60	1	--	1
E	5	3562	El Sereno Elementary	418	44	11%	73%	27%	8	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	21	9	--	--
C	5	2603	Buchanan Street Elementary	487	53	11%	75%	25%	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	7	1	24	9	--	--
C	5	5384	Monte Vista Street Elementary	440	73	17%	74%	26%	12	--	--	1	--	2	--	8	1	36	10	--	--
C	5	3329	Dahlia Heights Elementary	374	32	9%	56%	44%	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	--	9	5	--	--
C	5	2027	Aldama Elementary	564	58	10%	84%	16%	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	--	30	13	--	--
Resident Schools Median																					
				397	49	11%	73%	27%	9	--	--	5	--	2	--	5	1	20	9	--	1

Celerity Troika Charter
2012-13 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS-TEST (CST) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH RESULTS

LD	BD	Loc. Code	School Name	2013 CST ELA							2013 CST MATH								
				# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	B/BB/F BB	% Prof /Adv	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	B/BB/F BB	% Prof /Adv
XR	5	2118	Celerity Troika Charter	300	1%	3%	11%	31%	53%	15%	84%	300	0%	1%	7%	20%	72%	8%	92%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																			
C	5	2068	Allesandro Elementary	275	1%	6%	32%	36%	24%	39%	60%	276	1%	7%	20%	32%	39%	28%	71%
W	4	2507	Brentwood Science	945	2%	8%	31%	30%	29%	41%	59%	944	2%	11%	21%	27%	39%	34%	66%
C	2	2699	Cahuenga Elementary	524	3%	11%	22%	27%	37%	36%	64%	525	2%	9%	13%	21%	55%	24%	76%
NW	3	3589	Emelita Academy Charter	257	6%	7%	31%	25%	30%	44%	55%	256	4%	13%	19%	26%	39%	36%	65%
C	5	4164	Glenfeliz Boulevard Elementary	276	3%	11%	29%	36%	21%	43%	57%	277	3%	15%	23%	34%	26%	41%	60%
W	2	2619	Wilshire Park Elementary	337	4%	8%	25%	33%	31%	37%	64%	343	4%	10%	17%	25%	44%	31%	69%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				307	3%	8%	30%	32%	30%	40%	60%	310	3%	11%	20%	27%	39%	33%	68%
Resident Schools																			
C	5	4082	Garvanza Elementary	301	4%	10%	30%	34%	22%	44%	56%	302	5%	12%	18%	36%	29%	35%	65%
C	5	7178	Toland Way Elementary	219	6%	8%	33%	35%	19%	47%	54%	219	4%	16%	25%	32%	24%	45%	56%
C	5	6493	San Pascual Elementary Science Technology Eng	161	10%	12%	35%	30%	12%	57%	42%	162	5%	16%	31%	30%	19%	52%	49%
C	5	3507	Eagle Rock Elementary	619	2%	4%	17%	29%	48%	23%	77%	620	1%	6%	16%	25%	52%	23%	77%
C	5	7959	Yorkdale Elementary	226	4%	12%	34%	29%	21%	50%	50%	227	3%	14%	26%	28%	29%	43%	57%
C	5	2671	Bushnell Way Elementary	256	9%	15%	37%	24%	15%	61%	39%	255	5%	24%	26%	26%	20%	55%	46%
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	810	5%	12%	33%	36%	15%	50%	51%	808	5%	16%	28%	35%	16%	49%	51%
E	5	3562	El Sereno Elementary	308	4%	10%	32%	35%	19%	46%	54%	308	2%	7%	23%	31%	36%	32%	67%
C	5	2603	Buchanan Street Elementary	343	8%	13%	29%	29%	21%	50%	50%	344	6%	20%	21%	25%	28%	47%	53%
C	5	5384	Monte Vista Street Elementary	456	8%	15%	36%	26%	15%	59%	41%	461	6%	18%	21%	32%	23%	45%	55%
C	5	3329	Dahlia Heights Elementary	256	4%	6%	23%	31%	36%	33%	67%	257	1%	10%	17%	30%	42%	28%	72%
C	5	2027	Aldama Elementary	411	8%	15%	33%	28%	16%	56%	44%	415	4%	16%	25%	29%	26%	45%	55%
Resident Schools Median				305	6%	12%	33%	30%	19%	50%	51%	305	5%	16%	24%	30%	27%	45%	56%

Celerity Troika Charter
2011-12 CALIFORNIA STANDARDS-TEST (CST) ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH RESULTS

LD	BD	Loc. Code	School Name	2012 CST ELA							2012 CST MATH								
				# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof /Adv	% Adv	% B/BB/F BB	% Prof /Adv	# Tested	% Far Below Basic	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Prof	% Adv	% B/BB/F BB	% Prof /Adv
XR	5	2118	Celerity Troika Charter	239	0%	2%	9%	31%	58%	11%	89%	239	0%	0%	3%	21%	75%	3%	96%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																			
C	5	2068	Allesandro Elementary	296	4%	8%	25%	35%	27%	37%	62%	296	3%	9%	23%	33%	33%	35%	66%
W	4	2507	Brentwood Science	1027	3%	8%	24%	31%	34%	35%	65%	1028	3%	11%	21%	28%	38%	35%	66%
C	2	2699	Cahuenga Elementary	537	4%	6%	20%	30%	39%	30%	69%	542	1%	6%	14%	23%	56%	21%	79%
NW	3	3589	Emelita Academy Charter	239	5%	5%	23%	35%	32%	33%	67%	240	3%	13%	20%	23%	41%	36%	64%
C	5	4164	Glenfeliz Boulevard Elementary	315	2%	10%	25%	35%	28%	37%	63%	313	1%	13%	24%	29%	33%	38%	62%
W	2	2619	Wilshire Park Elementary	316	6%	9%	22%	36%	28%	37%	64%	317	4%	10%	19%	31%	35%	33%	66%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				316	4%	8%	24%	35%	30%	36%	65%	315	3%	11%	21%	29%	37%	35%	66%
Resident Schools																			
C	5	4082	Garvanza Elementary	331	5%	8%	27%	32%	27%	40%	59%	330	2%	13%	19%	26%	39%	34%	65%
C	5	7178	Toland Way Elementary	244	4%	10%	32%	30%	24%	46%	54%	244	5%	13%	23%	30%	29%	41%	59%
C	5	6493	San Pascual Elementary Science Technology Eng	176	7%	15%	27%	33%	19%	49%	52%	176	3%	15%	23%	37%	21%	41%	58%
C	5	3507	Eagle Rock Elementary	683	4%	4%	17%	29%	46%	25%	75%	688	3%	11%	16%	22%	49%	30%	71%
C	5	7959	Yorkdale Elementary	244	4%	7%	36%	36%	17%	47%	53%	248	0%	15%	20%	34%	30%	35%	64%
C	5	2671	Bushnell Way Elementary	295	11%	18%	33%	26%	12%	62%	38%	295	11%	24%	29%	23%	13%	64%	36%
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	782	4%	10%	32%	37%	17%	46%	54%	783	5%	19%	27%	32%	17%	51%	49%
E	5	3562	El Sereno Elementary	308	5%	12%	28%	36%	18%	45%	54%	308	2%	13%	21%	31%	33%	36%	64%
C	5	2603	Buchanan Street Elementary	337	5%	14%	31%	32%	19%	50%	51%	339	5%	18%	24%	27%	26%	47%	53%
C	5	5384	Monte Vista Street Elementary	511	10%	14%	33%	28%	15%	57%	43%	513	5%	17%	25%	26%	27%	47%	53%
C	5	3329	Dahlia Heights Elementary	247	2%	8%	22%	32%	36%	32%	68%	246	2%	5%	18%	32%	42%	25%	74%
C	5	2027	Aldama Elementary	426	12%	17%	30%	24%	18%	59%	42%	431	5%	20%	20%	27%	29%	45%	56%
Resident Schools Median				320	5%	11%	31%	32%	19%	47%	54%	319	4%	15%	22%	29%	29%	41%	59%

**Celerity Troika Charter
OUT-OF-SCHOOL SUSPENSION EVENTS**

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

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	2015-16				2015-16 SUBGROUPS				STUDENTS WITH DISABILITY							
				Susp. Event Rate 2013-14	Susp. Event Rate 2014-15	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp. %	# Enrolled	# Events	# Days	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16	Single Std. Susp % 2015-16	# Enrolled	# Events 2015-16	# Days 2015-16	Susp. Event Rate 2015-16
XR	5	2118	Celerity Troika Charter	3.7%	2.9%	2.3%	2.0%	609	14	24	23	0	0	0.0%	66	3	8	4.5%	4.5%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE																			
C	5	2068	Alessandro Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	440	0	0	7	0	0	0.0%	43	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
W	4	2507	Brentwood Science	0.0%	0.5%	3.2%	2.2%	897	29	36	240	19	26	7.9%	64	36	42	56.3%	4.7%
C	2	2699	Cahuenga Elementary	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	537	0	0	15	0	0	0.0%	54	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
NW	3	3589	Emelita Academy Charter	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	401	0	0	35	0	0	0.0%	61	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
C	5	4164	Glenfritz Boulevard Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	313	1	1	5	0	0	0.0%	29	1	1	3.4%	0.0%
W	2	2619	Wiltshire Park Elementary	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	520	0	0	29	0	0	0.0%	45	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median				0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	480	0	0	22	0	0	0.0%	50	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Resident Schools																			
C	5	4082	Garvanza Elementary	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	375	0	0	5	0	0	0.0%	39	0	1	0.0%	0.0%
C	5	7178	Toland Way Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	353	0	0	3	0	0	0.0%	33	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
C	5	6493	San Pascual Elementary Sci Tech Eng Arts Math	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	270	0	0	5	0	0	0.0%	25	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
C	5	3507	Eagle Rock Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	782	0	0	9	0	0	0.0%	98	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
C	5	7959	Yorkdale Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	296	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	32	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
C	5	2671	Bushnell Way Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	310	1	1	7	0	0	0.0%	39	1	3	2.6%	0.0%
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	815	1	1	19	0	0	0.0%	106	1	4	0.9%	0.0%
E	5	3562	El Sereno Elementary	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	418	0	0	2	0	0	0.0%	37	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
C	5	2603	Buchanan Street Elementary	0.0%	1.0%	0.4%	0.4%	487	2	2	0	0	0	0.0%	55	2	2	3.6%	1.8%
C	5	5384	Monte Vista Street Elementary	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	440	2	3	5	0	0	0.0%	67	3	3	4.5%	1.5%
C	5	3329	Dahlia Heights Elementary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	374	0	0	2	0	0	0.0%	28	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
C	5	2027	Aldama Elementary	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	564	3	5	2	0	0	0.0%	54	5	5	9.3%	1.9%
Resident Schools Median				0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	397	0	0	4	0	0	0.0%	39	0	1	0.0%	0.0%

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

**Celerity Troika Charter School
2014-15 and 2015-16 Smarter Balanced Assessment Achievement Data**

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	Subgroup	English Language Arts				Mathematics					
					% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Not Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard		
XR	5	2118	Celerity Troika Charter School	All Students	12	21	31	37	13	20	27	40		
				African American	8	23	38	31	15	23	38	23		
				Latino	14	23	32	31	15	23	28	35		
				English Learners	42	42	16	0	40	49	4	7		
				Soc-eco Disadvantaged	15	22	32	31	13	24	27	35		
				Students with Disabilities	37	20	31	11	40	26	14	20		
2015-16														
<i>LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE</i>														
C	5	2068	Allesandro Elementary	All Students	18	26	27	30	15	32	29	24		
W	4	2507	Brentwood Elementary Science Magnet	All Students	33	25	24	18	34	31	20	14		
C	2	2699	Cahuenga Elementary	All Students	26	24	23	27	23	27	20	30		
NW	3	3589	Emmelita Academy Charter	All Students	30	23	26	21	27	34	26	13		
C	5	4164	Glentelz Boulevard Elementary	All Students	50	27	16	7	50	31	15	4		
W	2	2619	Wilshire Park Elementary School	All Students	26	27	30	17	26	33	26	15		
				All Students	28	26	25	20	27	32	23	15		
<i>LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median</i>														
Resident Schools														
C	5	4082	Garvanza Elementary	All Students	33	28	25	14	42	26	25	7		
C	5	7178	Toland Way Elementary	All Students	39	32	20	9	41	30	23	6		
C	5	6493	San Pascual Avenue Elementary	All Students	25	29	32	14	39	36	19	7		
C	5	3507	Eagle Rock Elementary	All Students	19	20	25	37	21	25	21	34		
C	5	7959	Yorkdale Elementary	All Students	27	23	32	19	30	30	22	18		
C	5	2671	Bushnell Way Elementary	All Students	44	29	21	6	48	30	15	8		
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle School	All Students	27	31	33	9	37	29	19	15		
E	5	3562	Ej Sereno Elementary	All Students	18	37	30	15	34	36	22	8		
C	5	2603	Buchanan Street Elementary	All Students	40	25	24	11	48	31	14	8		
C	5	5384	Monte Vista Street Elementary	All Students	40	29	25	6	44	35	17	4		
C	5	3329	Dahlia Heights Elementary	All Students	20	15	37	28	23	27	26	25		
C	5	2027	Aldama Elementary	All Students	53	20	17	10	47	31	15	7		
				All Students	30	29	25	13	40	30	20	8		
<i>Resident Schools Median</i>														

2014-15

LD	BD	Loc Code	School	Subgroup	English Language Arts				Mathematics				
					% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	% Standard Met	% Standard Nearly Met	% Standard Met	% Exceeds Standard	
XR	5	2118	Celery Troika Charter School	All Students	12	22	32	34	11	31	28	30	
				African American	6	35	35	24	24	53	12	12	
				Latino	14	24	32	30	12	33	29	26	
				English Learners	41	36	20	4	21	54	20	5	
				Soc-eco Disadvantaged Students with Disabilities	14	27	34	25	13	36	29	22	
					48	17	28	7	41	45	3	10	
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE													
C	5	2068	Allesandro Elementary	All Students	31	23	31	14	28	31	28	13	
W	4	2507	Brentwood Elementary Science Magnet	All Students	37	27	21	15	34	33	21	12	
C	2	2699	Cahuenga Elementary	All Students	32	20	24	24	27	22	25	26	
NW	3	3589	Emelita Academy Charter	All Students	35	26	25	14	31	43	20	6	
C	5	4164	Glentelz Boulevard Elementary	All Students	44	33	19	4	46	39	10	6	
W	2	2619	Wilshire Park Elementary School	All Students	40	25	22	13	42	31	16	11	
LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE Median					36	26	23	14	33	32	21	12	
Resident Schools													
C	5	4082	Garvanza Elementary	All Students	35	30	23	12	39	29	23	9	
C	5	7178	Toland Way Elementary	All Students	42	31	19	8	45	33	16	7	
C	5	6493	San Pascual Avenue Elementary	All Students	49	29	15	7	50	32	14	4	
C	5	3507	Eagle Rock Elementary	All Students	23	17	27	33	26	23	24	28	
C	5	7959	Yorkdale Elementary	All Students	33	29	23	15	37	35	16	12	
C	5	2671	Bushnell Way Elementary	All Students	45	25	24	5	51	25	19	5	
C	5	8066	Luther Burbank Middle School	All Students	30	34	30	6	41	32	18	9	
E	5	3562	El Sereno Elementary	All Students	32	34	22	12	43	34	18	5	
C	5	2603	Buchanan Street Elementary	All Students	50	27	14	9	58	27	13	3	
C	5	5384	Monte Vista Street Elementary	All Students	51	31	13	5	57	30	11	2	
C	5	3329	Dahlia Heights Elementary	All Students	24	27	30	19	28	32	26	14	
C	5	2027	Aldama Elementary	All Students	46	29	16	10	47	33	14	6	
Resident Schools Median					39	29	23	10	44	32	17	7	

**Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the
Renewal Charter Petition for
Celerity Troika Charter School
By the Los Angeles Unified School District**

BOARD OF EDUCATION REPORT 162-16/17
October 18, 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

On August 22, 2016, the Los Angeles Unified School District (“District”) received a charter petition (“Petition”) from Celerity Educational Group (“CEG”), a California nonprofit public benefit corporation, requesting that the District’s Board of Education renew the Celerity Troika Charter School’s (“Charter School,” “Petitioner,” or “Celerity Troika”) charter for a term of five years. Petitioner seeks authorization to operate a school in Board District 5 and Local District Central serving, at full capacity, 690 students in grades TK-8. (Exhibit 1, Petition.)¹ The Charter School is located on one private site located at 1495 Colorado Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90041, and currently on two co-located sites through Proposition 39 on the campus of Luther Burbank Middle School at 6460 N. Figueroa Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90042 and on the campus of Garvanza Elementary School at 317 N. Avenue 62, Los Angeles, CA, 90042.

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 Please note that all page references to the Celerity Troika Charter School renewal petition in this Findings of Fact are to the version with revisions from Petitioner.

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 (“5 CCR”), section 11966.4, subdivision (a).)

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

In addition, state regulations require the District to “consider the past performance of the school’s academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement if any.” (5 CCR § 11966.4.)

III. ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

As discussed above, charter schools that have operated for at least four years must first meet one of the minimum academic performance criteria listed in Education Code section 47607, subdivision (b) or Education Code sections 52052(e)(2)(F) and 52052(e)(4)(C) before the renewal request is analyzed further. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11966.4; Ed. Code, § 47607, subd. (b).) Petitioner states that Celerity Troika School “has met not just one but all of the minimum criteria for renewal set forth in Education Code Section 47607(b), and has also met the new criteria for renewal under Section 52052(e)(4)(C).” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 1.)

A. Summary

District staff has concluded that Celerity Troika 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 Schools² and District Similar Schools.³

² “Resident Schools” are the public schools that the Charter School’s students would have otherwise attended based on their addresses.

³ “District Similar Schools” are LAUSD schools on the CDE’s Similar Schools list for this Charter School.

Celerity Troika’s 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) results show levels of academic performance that are above the District average in English Language Arts (ELA) and above the District average 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 10 and a Similar Schools rank of 10. (Exhibit 2, Celerity Troika AMAO Data, and Exhibit 4, Celerity Troika SBAC Data.)

In 2015-2016, Celerity Troika’s English Learner reclassification rate was 18.6%, which is higher than both the Similar and Resident School Median rates. In 2014-2015, Troika’s reclassification rate was 6% due to an office error in recording to CALPADS. (Exhibit 3, Celerity Troika Data Set.)

B. Student Academic Performance in ELA and Math

On the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 68% of Celerity Troika students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 38%. In Math, 67% of Celerity Troika students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 28%. On the 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 66% of Celerity Troika’s students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is greater than the Resident Schools Median of 33%. In Math, 58% of Celerity Troika’s students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 14%. (Exhibit 4, Celerity Troika SBAC Data.)

C. Student Subgroup Academic Growth

Pursuant to the requirements of SB 1290, the District “shall consider increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school as the most important factor in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.” (Ed. Code § 47607(a) (3) (A).) The Charter School’s record of academic performance indicates that most of Celerity Troika’s numerically significant student subgroups (African American, Latino, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities), with the exception of English Learners, have achieved positive growth in academic performance. CAASPP (SBAC) data revealed that in ELA, African American students showed growth of 10 percentage points; Latino students showed growth of 1 percentage points; Socioeconomically Disadvantaged showed growth of 4 percentage points; and Students with Disabilities showed growth of 7 percentage points, while English Learners showed a decrease of 8% from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016. The data in Mathematics reveal that African American students showed growth of 37 percentage points; Latino students showed growth of 8 percentage points; Socioeconomically Disadvantaged showed growth of 11 percentage points; and Students with Disabilities showed growth of 21 percentage points, while English Learners showed a decrease of 14% from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016. Petitioner concedes that the academic performance of Students with Disabilities and English Learners enrolled in the Charter School lags behind the academic performance of the Charter School’s pupils school-wide. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 1, Exhibit 4, Celerity Troika SBAC Data).

The 8% decline in percentage scores for English Learners in ELA and 14% decrease in Math for English Learners are cause of concern. However, while the District recognizes the above-referenced academic gains achieved at the school for all other significant subgroups, the pattern of insufficient responses to inquiries, lack of transparency, and the potential for significant conflicts of interest posed by the Charter School's governance structure, substantially outweigh the extra consideration accorded to the school's academic growth and confirm the Petitioner's persistent and ongoing failure to successfully operate its schools in accordance with applicable law and the terms of its schools' charters. These specific concerns are further articulated below in this Report.

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 Celerity Troika Charter Renewal based on the following grounds:

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

V. FINDINGS OF FACT FOR DENIAL

Please note that while these findings of fact have been grouped for convenience, certain findings of fact may support more than one ground for denial.

A. The Petitioner is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Petition for Renewal of the Celerity Troika Charter School (Ed. Code § 47605(b)(2).)

1. Petitioner Intentionally Limits Transparency and Seeks to Subvert Oversight

In reviewing the past history of a charter school's operations, it is appropriate to look to the record of performance of the petitioner that will operate the charter school. An essential part of operating a successful educational program is compliance and performance in all areas, including academic achievement, governance, operations, and finance. While staff acknowledges a moderate to strong overall record of achievement outcomes in the area of academics, staff has noted serious concerns about the organization's financial, operational, and governance practices. The concerns include, but are not limited to, whether Celerity Educational Group ("CEG") operates within the intent and spirit of California's Charter School Act and whether CEG acts to subvert LAUSD's oversight of its charter schools.

Under the Charter Schools Act, the District is responsible for monitoring the Charter School for compliance with the law and its own charter. The District is also obligated to monitor the fiscal conditions of the school. Petitioner has operated in the District for several years, and is familiar with District protocols.

Staff is concerned because Petitioner's lack of transparency attempts to impinge on the District's ability to provide oversight. In the summer of 2016, District staff requested financial and governance documents in order to evaluate Petitioner's fiscal solvency, and to clarify Petitioner's relationship with entities that perform essential charter school functions. Petitioner's response was either partial, or inadequate. (Exhibits 6 & 8.) The lack of transparency is rooted, in large part, in the corporate structure of Petitioner, along with those of Celerity Development, LLC and Celerity Global Development ("Global").

Shortly after the January 2012 incorporation of Global, Petitioner changed its corporate bylaws to make Global the Sole Statutory Member of Petitioner's corporation, making the powers of the CEG Board subject to the powers of Global. (Exhibit 5, CEG's Amended Bylaws April 1, 2012, Art. VI, § 3.)

In a letter dated September 23, 2016, Petitioner's CEO, Dr. Grace Canada, confirmed that Global remains the sole statutory member of CEG. (Exhibit 6) According to CEG's Bylaws, Global has: the power to elect and remove the members of Petitioner's governing board; the power to dispose of Petitioner's assets; the power to merge Petitioner with other corporations; and the power to dissolve Petitioner. (Exhibit 5 CEG's Amended Bylaws April 1, 2012, Art. VI, § 3.) The Charter Schools Division (CSD) requested information regarding Global's and other related entities' governance structure and service contracts, to which CEG provided partial or insufficient responses. (Exhibit 6) The CSD issued a Notice to Cure on September 22, 2016 to the governing board of CEG to address CSD's concerns regarding their inadequate responses. (Exhibit 7) Petitioner's responses to these concerns, in a letter dated September 23, 2016, continue to be inadequate, and are designed to reduce, or eliminate, transparency. (Exhibit 6)

While the Petition downplays impacts of transparency and conflicts of interest, CEG's corporate structure and interaction with its affiliated entities present significant issues identified throughout this Report.

These April 2012, amendments to Petitioner's Bylaws were also a unilateral material amendment to Troika's charter. As discussed below, the foundation of how Troika and Petitioner would be governed, as contemplated in Troika's current charter petition, was materially amended. CEG failed to petition the District's governing board prior to making that material amendment to its charter as required under California's Charter Schools Act, specifically, Education Code section 47607.

In 2012, CEG and Global entered into an "Affiliation Agreement" that makes the day to day management and long term operations of CEG's charter schools Global's responsibility. The Affiliation Agreement recognized that Global and CEG "will each maintain their respective separate corporate existences." (Exhibit 8.) In fact, in the above-mentioned "Affiliation Agreement" between CEG and Global, it is specifically recognized that Global does not comply with California's Charter Schools Act. (Exhibit 8, Prov. II.) Further, as part of a Master Personnel Agreement between Global and CEG, it was recognized that only CEG, not Global, had to comply with the Public Records Act. (Exhibit 9.)

Pursuant to the Affiliation Agreement, Global provides management services to CEG. This includes providing CEG's respective charter schools "with day-to-day management, programmatic support services, staff development and supervisory oversight." Further, Global would hold and license CEG's curriculum and other intellectual property. It was also agreed that CEG would transfer significant assets to Global. The stated intent of the transfer was to provide "the assets necessary for CGD [Global] to be capitalized and to carry out the purposes described" in the agreement. (Exhibit 8.)

In carrying out the terms of the Affiliation Agreement, on or about April 1, 2012, CEG's Board of Directors passed a resolution to transfer to Global:

1. Cash reserves held in a Citibank Account (valued at one time at \$823,857.01) and California Credit Union account (valued at one time at \$1,480,477.18); and
2. Intellectual property, including CEG's service marks and trade name, curriculum, advertising materials, trade dress in aspects of school design, curriculum implementation guides, pedagogy, facility designs, forms and document designs, business practices, and other protectable written, auditory or visual materials, trade secrets and related information associated with the operation of CEG's schools and programs. (Exhibit 8.)

Moreover, per the Affiliation Agreement, Global "will provide certain teacher, administrative, personnel and staff resources to CEG" and "CEG will provide certain teacher, administrative personnel and staff resources to" Global. Global "will make offers of employment to certain CEG administrators and staff who are not enrolled in STRS. . ." In other words, certain CEG employees would become Global employees. Those individuals would continue to provide the same services to CEG, however, they would now be doing it as Global employees, provided to CEG by contract. Likewise, CEG would provide Global with CEG employees to serve as "certain executives and staff." (Exhibit 8.) The specifics of which employees were to be exchanged, and the scope of those employees' services, were to be specified in a later agreement, which, to District staff's understanding, has never been provided to the District. Therefore, it is not clear which staff at CEG and at its individual schools are employees of CEG and which are employees of Global.

As a result of these changes to Petitioner's Bylaws, Global is the organization that actually manages the Charter School. Petitioner and its Board have significantly limited their own governance and operations. CEG's ceding of its control to Global should have been brought to the District's Board as a material amendment of the charter. The District, as the charter authorizer, was never informed, and never approved, this substantial change in governance structure. CEG failed to notify the Charter Schools Division (CSD) that the Bylaws were changed in April 2012.⁴

⁴ When CEG submitted their petitions for the renewal of Celerity Cardinal and Celerity Palmati in September 2015, the Bylaws were dated February 5, 2012 and there was no reference to Celerity Global Development. In fact, the Bylaws dated February 5, 2012 stated that CEG is a corporation without members.

When Petitioner refuses to provide basic information about their respective charter schools that is possessed by an affiliated entity, it interferes with the District’s oversight. When the District made inquiries regarding CEG’s finances, an entity by the name of Charter School Management Corporation, Inc. (“CMSC”) responded. (Exhibit 10.) However, CEG does not have a contract with CSMC. When the District asked for contracts between CSMC and Global, CEG refused to provide them. (Exhibits 6 & 8.)

District staff has requested other specific documentation and information from CEG, but has received only partial or insufficient responses. Specifically, in a number of emails to Grace Canada between June 29, 2016 and August 26, 2016, District staff repeatedly requested copies of all contracts between CEG, Global, Celerity Development, LLC, and CSMC. (Exhibit 11.) In response, Ms. Canada replied: “As I shared, CEG does not have a contract with CSMC, and CEG does not possess copies of other entity contracts with CSMC.” (Exhibit 12, Email to Sharon Jennings, dated 7/19/16.) In a later email, Ms. Canada stated, “These are separate entities from CEG and we don’t have their corporate books and records.” Ms. Canada further stated, “CEG doesn’t possess copies of Global’s contracts—Global is a separate entity.” (Exhibit 13, Email to Sharon Jennings, dated 9/7/16.)

Further, as part of ongoing oversight, District staff reviewed CEG’s check register from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016, and identified checks issued by CEG to Global, Celerity Development, LLC, and Celerity Contracting Services, Inc. that total \$5,021,339.47, \$334,926.00, and \$321,943.23, respectively. (Exhibit 14.) Provided that these are separate, but affiliated, legal entities of CEG, and do business with CEG, CEG should have provided the District with the aforementioned requested items and financial information for Global. This insufficient response to the District’s reasonable inquiry—given Global is the sole statutory member of CEG and has the power to exercise various actions for CEG—interferes with the District’s assessment of the fiscal condition of CEG and its schools without understanding the fiscal condition of its sole statutory member, including identifying and managing risks to prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse.

Concerns over financial transactions also persist, and both the District and the Los Angeles County Office of Education (“LACOE”), have independently raised concerns regarding loans Petitioner provide to Celerity Development, LLC. On or about October 19, 2011, Petitioner executed a loan with Celerity Development, LLC, in the amount of approximately \$2.5 million⁵. Then on or about June 30, 2013, Petitioner loaned Celerity Development, LLC, approximately \$1.7 million⁶, for a total approximate loan amount of \$4.2 million. These loans are to be paid back over time. Despite requests for information, Petitioner has not disclosed sufficient details regarding these loans to demonstrate Petitioner’s fiscal solvency. The District does not know, and Petitioner will not disclose, whether Celerity Development will be able to pay back this loan and what Celerity Development is doing with the loaned funds, other than for the generic acquisition of facilities.

2. *There Are Potential Conflicts of Interests*

⁵ Specifically, the amount was \$2,447,687.65.

⁶ Specifically, the amount was \$1,746,325.98.

The Charter Schools Division (CSD) has identified potential conflicts of interests and the commingling of financial transactions between CEG and the prior mentioned separate, but affiliated, legal entities.

It has been long settled by the Fair Political Practices Commission, the agency charged with interpreting the Political Reform Act (“PRA”), that charter schools, their governing boards, and their employees are subject to the PRA. (See Walsh Advice Letter, No. A-98-234; Fadely Advice Letter, No. A-02-223; and Eisenberg Advice Letter, No. I-11-027.) In addition to being legally required to follow the PRA, Petitioner has voluntarily committed to comply with the terms of the PRA. (Conflict of Interest Code of the Celerity Charter Schools, effective 10/15/14.) By agreeing to follow the PRA in its charters, employees of CEG are treated as “public officials” for the purposes of the PRA and ultimately for determining whether conflicts of interest exist. (Gov. Code § 82048, subdivision (a), defining “public official” to mean every member, officer, employee or consultant of a [charter school].) A violation of the PRA by Petitioner’s employees in conducting business with CEG, would constitute both a violation of the Charter, and a violation of law.

The PRA disqualifies a public official from (1) making, (2) participating in making, or (3) using his position with the charter school to influence a charter school decision if it is reasonably foreseeable the decision will have a material effect on the public official’s financial interests. (See Gov. Code, §§ 87100, 87103.) Voting on or approving a matter is considered “making” a decision. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 18702.1.) “Participating” in a decision includes actions such as negotiating, studying, making recommendations, providing advice, or other actions that involve the exercise of judgment. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 18702.2.) “Influencing” a charter school decision could include acts such as contacting the charter school or appearing before it. (Cal. Code. Regs., tit. 2, § 18702.3.) Practically speaking, CEG employees may never make or participate in the making of a decision that will have a material financial effect on themselves.

Documents dating back to 2011 state that Vielka McFarlane held the following positions and conducted financial transactions between each of the following entities:

- **President and CEO of Celerity Educational Group**
(Email from CEG President/CEO Vielka McFarlane, dated 09/12/13 (Exhibit 15);
- **CEO of Celerity Global Development**
(Agreement for Management Services between Celerity Global Development and Celerity Educational Group, date July 2013 (Exhibit 16); and
- **CEO of Celerity Development, LLC.**
(\$2.4 million Promissory Note executed between Celerity Development, LLC. and Celerity Educational Group, date October 2011 (Exhibit 17)

Ms. McFarlane has subsequently removed herself from positions within CEG, however, checks were identified with her as an authorized signatory which suggests that she continues to be involved with the fiscal operations of the Celerity schools. In addition, it is unclear if conflicts of interest continue because Petitioner will not provide the information to identify the officers

and Directors in the other affiliated Celerity entities. However, such potential conflicts are not limited to Ms. McFarlane.

In a recent review of Celerity's operations and governance, when considering the renewal of its own Celerity-run charter school (Sirius), the Los Angeles County Office of Education noted:

A review of [CEG] Board audio recordings and minutes demonstrates the Board member who sits on both the CEG and Global Boards, has not properly recused himself when contracts for Global and its affiliate companies are presented to the CEG Board for approval, creating a possible conflict of interest. He has participated in the presentation of contracts and spoken in favor of their approval. These include contracts with Global for Management Services and Miscellaneous Service, contracts with Attenture, LLC and other companies associated with Global. On at least three (3) occasions (April 2012, August 2014 and December 2015) he voted to approve contracts or agreements with Global.

(Staff Findings on the Renewal Petition for Celerity Sirius Charter School (Grades K-8) Pursuant to Education Code Sections 47607 and 47605, Los Angeles County Office of Education, Charter School Office, February 2, 2016.)

When Petitioner refuses to provide basic information about the affiliated entity, it precludes a full assessment of whether conflicts of interests exist and calls into serious question the practices of the organizations, albeit the conditions described cause a clear appearance of conflict. For example, when Petitioner refuses to provide information about who sits on the Board of Directors for Global, it prevents examination of the transactions between Petitioner and Global. Petitioner has refused to provide that information. (See Exhibits 6 & 8.) While Petitioner promises to comply with Government Code section 1090 *et al.*, in regard to conflicts of interest, Global does not.

3. Petitioner's Use of "Internal Loans" Raises Concerns

Petitioner operates multiple charter schools within, and outside of, California. The District authorizes some, but not all, of Petitioner's charter schools. Petitioner "loans" funds between these charter schools without appropriate documentation or adequate explanation. This practice raises several concerns.

For example, when Petitioner develops the educational program for a particular charter school, the charter school's budget is the financial plan that outlines how Petitioner intends to deliver that educational program. If Petitioner is "loaning" money from one charter school to another, then it must provide the terms and conditions regarding these loans, such as repayment schedules, interest, purpose for the loan and plans in the event of a default. Loans may also have a direct impact on the school that is providing the cash. When funds are "loaned", the charter school loaning the money has less access to cash on hand, which in turn affects whether the charter school can still deliver the educational program as originally promised in its Charter.

However, if Petitioner is not facilitating loans, but rather is making “receivable and payable transactions” between charter schools, as it states in its response to the District regarding these issues, then Petitioner must explain the benefits and impacts on the originating school and the purposes for the transfer involved in these transactions. (Exhibit 18, CEG Response to the District’s October 5, 2015, Request for Documentation.) Regarding the question of whether they are facilitating “internal loans,” Petitioner had the following response:

There are no debt instruments between CEG, Celerity Schools and Celerity Global, and there is no board-adopted policy in that regard for the use of such loans per se. Among the Celerity Schools, you may be referring to receivable and payable transactions, sometimes referred to as intracompany “loans”. That terminology may have caused confusion. There is no debt associated with those types of transactions, and there is no specific policy in that regard. Such uses of funds are board approved, in keeping with applicable statutory requirements. In light of your inquiry, Celerity will consider some clarifying policy regarding the description of such transactions so as to avoid any further confusion. (Exhibit 18_, CEG Response to the District’s October 5, 2015, Request for Documentation.)

Based on CEG’s independent audit reports from fiscal year 2011-2012 to fiscal year 2014-2015, the following is a depiction of the intercompany receivables and intercompany payables that have occurred. For example, amounts listed below in BLACK, without parenthesis, indicate funds that were taken from the respective charter school in order to supplement Celerity operations elsewhere. Amounts listed below in RED, within parenthesis, indicate funds that were given to the respected charter school due to deficits experienced at that specific charter school. In other words, each red number below shows instances where a Celerity charter school needed funds, from other Celerity charter schools, in order to pay their obligations.

Intercompany Transactions											
Intercompany Receivables / (Intercompany Payables)											
Fiscal Year	Celerity Nascent	Celerity Dyad	Celerity Troika	Celerity Octavia	Celerity Palmati	Celerity Cardinal	Celerity Sirius ¹	Celerity Exa ²	CEG (Home Office)	Celerity Development, LLC	Celerity Global Development
2011-2012	\$3,833,339	\$580,699	(\$1,035,521)	(\$830,163)	(\$330,766)	(\$253,668)	(\$1,469,742)	(\$12,525)	\$73,412	(\$573,533)	\$18,468
2012-2013	\$3,367,424	\$763,928	(\$1,164,679)	(\$548,249)	(\$372,906)	(\$537,563)	(\$1,415,397)	(\$1,031,669)	\$939,111	N/A ³	N/A ³
2013-2014	\$4,175,692	\$1,729,054	(\$450,177)	(\$178,837)	(\$27,545)	(\$614,324)	(\$1,493,449)	(\$1,002,774)	(\$2,137,640)	N/A ³	N/A ³
2014-2015	\$4,442,139	\$2,265,896	(\$1,226,664)	\$81,708	\$601,506	\$3,147	(\$965,324)	(\$742,959)	(\$4,459,449)	N/A ³	N/A ³
Outstanding Balance as of June 30, 2015	\$4,442,139	\$2,265,896	(\$1,226,664)	\$81,708	\$601,506	\$3,147	(\$965,324)	(\$742,959)	(\$4,459,449)	N/A³	N/A³

¹ The Los Angeles County Office of Education denied Celerity Sirius' renewal petition and the school closed on June 30, 2016.

² The Pasadena Fire Department inspected Celerity Exa and found that the school did not meet several fire and life-safety codes. The school closed on September 3, 2014.

³ Celerity Educational Group no longer disclosed the financials for Celerity Development, LLC and Celerity Global Development in their audited financial statements.

Specifically, Celerity Troika and Petitioner’s corporation (CEG), have a history of receiving a substantial amount of intercompany funds over the past several years. Celerity Troika and CEG appear financially dependent on the transfer of funds in order to stay afloat. Without such transfers, it is unclear how Celerity Troika or CEG plans to remain solvent. Having one entity in

financial distress is problematic, however, having both the charter school and its operating company experiencing fiscal distress, over several years, raises serious concerns. Also, there are other indicators that reflect the poor fiscal condition of Celerity Troika and CEG. The table below indicates CEG’s downward trend in net assets that resulted in a total deficit of \$482,390 as of June 30, 2015. Celerity Troika also ended the 2014-2015 fiscal year with a total deficit of \$110,428. Similarly, Celerity Sirius and Celerity Exa were also dependent on intercompany borrowing and had net deficit values. These two schools closed on June 30, 2016 and September 3, 2014, respectively.⁷

Net Assets / (Net Deficit)		
Fiscal Year	CEG (Home Office)	Celerity Troika
2011-2012	\$1,140,921	\$118,496
2012-2013	\$462,662	\$238,381
2013-2014	\$86,827	\$296,566
2014-2015	(\$482,390)	(\$110,428)
Total Deficit as of June 30, 2015	(\$482,390)	(\$110,428)

At best, Petitioner’s response is that its use of the phrase “internal loans” is misapplied, and that Petitioner intends to clarify the description of these transactions. However, staff’s concerns regarding these transactions go beyond their label, and Petitioner must provide adequate documentation to address their concerns regarding these transactions. Whether these transactions are loans or payables, Petitioner has not provided adequate explanations of these transactions. Assuming that Petitioner will continue with this practice, Petitioner must comply with requests for information from District staff so that staff can determine whether funds are being used appropriately.

B. The Petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements. (Ed. Code § 47605(b)(5).)

The Petition serves as Petitioner’s proposal for the Charter School’s establishment and operation. As such, the Petition must provide reasonably comprehensive descriptions of certain elements in its program and operations as required in Education Code section 47605, subdivisions (b)(5)(A-O). The following elements do not meet this standard due to incomplete or inadequate information, which in some instances contradict the requirements of the law:

- i. *Educational Program (Element 1): The Petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the Charter School’s educational program.*

(1) Promotion/Retention of Students

Petitioner provides too brief a description of its proposed policies for the promotion and retention of students. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Elements 2 & 3.) Specifically, Petitioner provides that

⁷ The 2015-2016 independent audit report for CEG and its schools are not due until December 15, 2016. Therefore, there are no audited financials as of June 30, 2016.

“Students identified for retention must participate in a remediation program (i.e. after-school, tutoring, summer-school).” (*Id.*) As a preliminary matter, the District is concerned that the process for retention and promotion requires certain students to participate in academic instruction outside of the regular school day and class schedule.

Moreover, though Petitioner mentions this mandatory summer school instruction, it fails to detail this proposed summer program. Petitioner fails to discuss any of the following essential elements of a summer school program: (1) curriculum for each grade level; (2) staffing required for the program; or (3) the number of students expected to enroll.

As an additional concern, the Petition does not include any discussion of the qualifications of the staff who provide tutoring during the after-school program or the training such staff will receive. The reader is told only that “teachers communicate with the after-school tutoring staff to specifically target the supplemental instruction to meet each student’s needs.” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 1.) It is unclear how tutoring from non-credentialed staff will be sufficient to address the needs of students who are at risk of retention.

(2) Intervention Programs

Petitioner provides only a general description of its tiered intervention programs. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 1.) Under the proposed programs, students receive Tier 1 or Tier 2 interventions through the Charter School’s “pre-referral procedures.” (*Id.*) However, these procedures are not clearly described and the Petition fails to include a reasonably comprehensive description of the intervention strategies used in each tier, the thresholds for assigning tiers to students, and the threshold for evaluating student success through these tiered levels. (*Id.*) The Petition states that the Charter School’s after-school Expanded Learning Program is also offered “as intervention and enrichment,” but it does not explain how students receiving tiered interventions can receive “the same level of supports and services from after-school tutors as are provided in the classroom setting by credentialed teachers and other appropriately trained staff. Moreover, Parents are encouraged to sign a Family Agreement that provides, in part, that parents will agree to enroll their child “in academic enrichment programs (After School Institutes, Saturday classes, etc.) if the school deems it necessary.” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 4.) The Petition does not include any description of these additional classes and does not specify whether they are provided at no charge, or whether families are expected to shoulder the cost.

- ii. Governance (Element 4): *The Petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of Charter School’s governance structure.*

As originally submitted, the Petition allows the CEG Board to delegate any or all of its powers or duties to “an employee of the School.” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 4.) The Board’s duties are governed by policies and procedures, such as those provided in the Brown Act, to ensure public participation and Board transparency. District staff have serious concerns about a policy that allows the Charter School to bypass these policies and procedures by delegating the Board’s broad powers to a single employee. District staff requested that Petitioner clarify those powers that should not be delegated by the Board, but Petitioner chose instead to add only a single clause stating that “the Board shall not delegate duties of the Board that should be retained.” (Exhibit 1,

Petition, Element 4.) The Petition should clearly list which responsibilities the Board should retain, such as approval of the Charter School's budget, and hiring and evaluation of the CEO.

iii. Employee Qualifications (Element 5): The Petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the individuals to be employed by the Charter School.

Pursuant to Education Code section 47605 subdivision (b)(5)(E), a charter petition must include "the qualifications to be met by individuals to be employed by the school."

The job descriptions for the various positions set out in the Petition are not clearly defined and in several instances, overlap. For example, the CEO is charged with supervising and evaluating the performance of employees. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 5.) However, the Principal is responsible for "supervision of the Office Manager and other support staff as assigned," and the Curriculum Specialist/Administrator in Training supervises "classified staff under the direction of the Principal." This conflicts with the Petition's description of the selection and evaluation process for "Other Classified Staff" which states that "All classified staff report to and are evaluated by the Principal . . ." (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 5.) In addition, the Principal evaluates the Curriculum Specialist/Administrator in Training on the basis of a number of criteria, including "professional development implementation," "level of support provided to classroom teachers," developmentally appropriate teaching practices" and "subject matter competency," yet these criteria for evaluation are not reflected in the list of job duties assigned to the Curriculum Specialist/Administrator in Training. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 5.)

The Petition also charges the Office Clerk with responsibility for "minor disciplinary issues" without clarifying what "minor disciplinary issues" include, or any description of the qualifications and/or training regarding student discipline that will be provided to the Office Clerk.

Of particular concern, the Curriculum Specialist is responsible for, among other things, "diagnosing reading difficulties and planning appropriate intervention and accommodation strategies for all students." (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 5.) However the required skills and experience for this position do not specify any particular expertise, qualifications or training for these specialized and critically important responsibilities.

The Petition also makes references to the obligation of the Director of School Services to develop budgets and prepare and submit various District, state and federal compliance documents "in conjunction with the CFO," however, the Petition does not include a description of the duties and obligations of a "CFO." (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 5.)

In sum, the employee qualifications set forth in the Petition are not reasonably comprehensive.

iv. Suspension and Expulsion Procedures (Element 10): The Petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the Charter School's student suspension and expulsion procedures.

Pursuant to Education Code section 47605, subdivision (b)(5)(J), a charter petition must include “the procedures by which pupils can be suspended or expelled.” The Petition fails to adequately differentiate between the standard for suspending students and the standard for expelling students. For example, the Petition provides a list of twenty-two offenses that are grounds for *both* the discretionary suspension and the discretionary expulsion of a student. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 10.) However, the Petition fails to provide guidance detailing how the Board will differentiate between a suspendable offense and an expellable offense. For example, if the Board determines that a student “caused, attempted to cause, or threatened to cause physical injury to another person,” (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 10), how will the Board determine whether suspension of the student or expulsion of the student is the proper result? This raises due process concerns for students.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing, Staff recommends that the 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).

As stated in the comments 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 review of the Charter School’s 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.

In regard to increases in pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils served by the charter school:

1. Celerity Troika Charter achieved a moderate to strong overall record of academic achievement and growth. Its 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) results show levels of academic performance that are above the District average in English Language Arts (ELA) and above the District average in Mathematics.
2. Internal assessment data show moderate levels of academic achievement and growth both schoolwide and for the school’s numerically significant subgroups.
3. Historically, under the former API system, in the 2013-2014 and 2012-2013 school years, the Charter School earned a Statewide rank of 10 and a Similar Schools rank of 10.
4. In 2015-2016, Celerity Troika’s English Learner reclassification rate was 18.6%, which is higher than both the Similar and Resident School Median rates. In 2014-

2015, Troika's reclassification rate was 6% due to an office error in recording to CALPADS.

5. On the 2015-2016 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 68% of Troika students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 38%. In Math, 67% of Troika students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is higher than the Resident Schools Median of 28%.
6. On the 2014-2015 CAASPP (SBAC) assessment in English Language Arts, 66% of Troika's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards, which is greater than the Resident Schools Median of 33%. In Math, 58% of Troika's students Met or Exceeded the performance standards as compared to the Resident Schools Median of 24%.
7. The school's record of academic performance indicates that most of Celerity Troika's numerically significant student subgroups (African American, Latino, English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities), with the exception of English Learners, have achieved positive growth in academic performance. CAASPP (SBAC) data revealed that in ELA, African American students showed growth of 10 percentage points; Latino students showed a 1% increase; Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students showed an increase of 4%; and Students with Disabilities showed an increase of 7%, while English Learners showed a decrease of 8%. The data in Mathematics reveal that African American students showed growth of 37 percentage points; Latino students showed an 8% increase; Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students showed an increase of 11%; and Students with Disabilities showed an increase of 21%, while English Learners showed a decrease of 14% from 2014-2015 to 2015-2016.
8. Petitioner concedes that the academic performance of Students with Disabilities and English Learners enrolled in the Charter School lags behind the academic performance of the Charter School's pupils school-wide. (Exhibit 1, Petition, Element 1.)

And, District staff further finds that:

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

- d. The suspension and expulsion procedures of the charter school (Ed. Code, § 47605(b)(5)(J)).
2. The Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Petition, due, in part to Petitioner’s lack of transparency which seems to purposefully impinge on the District’s oversight of the Charter School, including monitoring Petitioner’s fiscal stability. The fact that the school seems to be dependent on loans from other CEG schools in order to operate gives great weight to this concern. Further, if the school is not solvent, providing a five year renewal of its charter at this time raises serious concerns.

District staff gives the greater single weight to the consideration of the academic metrics and increases for the school and its subgroups. It is noted that there was a lack of academic progress for English Learners, a population targeted for recruitment by Petitioners. Staff’s concerns regarding the lack of transparency from Celerity, and its impact on the District’s oversight, is so egregious that the cumulative concerns outweigh the academic increases.

District staff finds that the increases in academic achievement for the Charter School, as a whole, and for its student subgroups, are outweighed by the lack of growth in achievement for English Learners, the finding that Petitioner is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement its program, and the lack of comprehensive descriptions of all required elements provided in its Petition.

VII. 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/10-18-16BR162Exhibits.pdf>