



**Renewal Petition Staff Report
Pivot Charter School Riverside
April 21, 2026**

Part I. Executive Summary: Staff Report for Pivot Charter School Riverside

School Overview			
Charter Organization:	Roads Education Organization	Current Grades Served:	K-12
District Boundary	Corona-Norco Unified School District	Current Authorized Grades:	K-12
Year Opened:	2018	Current Enrollment:	170
Previous Renewal Year(s):	N/A	Term Expiration:	June 30, 2026

I. Background

Pivot Charter School Riverside operates a K-12, nonclassroom-based charter school in Corona that includes a single school site.

On February 6, 2026, Pivot Charter School Riverside (“Pivot” or “Charter School”) submitted a renewal petition (“Renewal Petition”) to the Riverside County Board of Education (“County Board”). On May 6, 2026, the County Board will hold a public hearing at which time it will either grant or deny the Renewal Petition. Riverside County Office of Education (“RCOE”) staff and legal counsel have reviewed the Renewal Petition for compliance with the requirements of the Charter Schools Act (the “Act”), Ed. Code §§ 47600, et seq., including any new legal requirements applicable to charter schools since Pivot’s original petition was granted in 2018. This report contains the analysis and proposed findings of fact related to the Renewal Petition for County Board consideration, including Staff’s analysis of whether Pivot appropriately addressed any changes in the law since its last petition approval.

II. Renewal Options for Board Action

It is recommended that the County Board take action to either grant or deny the proposed renewal petition. The County Board has the following options:

1. Grant the Renewal Petition for a 5-year term, commencing July 1, 2026, and concluding June 30, 2031, provided that the Memorandum of Understanding between the Charter School and RCOE be amended and/or the Petition revised to address findings and recommendations identified in the Staff Report prior to the date of commencement of the new term.
2. Deny the Renewal Petition, adopting the findings identified in the Staff Report, as findings of fact supporting legal reasons for denial.

III. Chartering Authority Responsibility

Outline on Renewal Decision

In the course of its oversight responsibility, the County Board holds the authority to assess whether the findings of fact outlined in the Renewal Staff Report by RCOE substantiate approval or denial, in accordance with the criteria set forth in Education Code Sections 47605, 47607, and 47607.2.

Legal Standards for Review

The following Executive Summary is presented to the County Board to support its decision regarding the approval or denial of the charter renewal petition submitted by Pivot.

Review and Analysis

RCOE applied a standardized and evidence-based methodology to evaluate the school's eligibility for charter renewal, consistent with the requirements of EC 47607(c)(1), 47607(c)(3), and 47607.2(b)(1)–(2). State law directs authorizers to determine whether a school and all pupil subgroups currently exceeds, meets, or is lower than state performance standards. For a charter school meeting state standard, Academic indicators, specifically English Language Arts and mathematics, must be afforded greater weight in this analysis. RCOE, therefore, based all determinations on verified performance data from the California School Dashboard, other publicly available data files, and multi-year student group results. Context was reviewed to support interpretation, not substituting for performance evidence.

IV. Executive Summary of Findings

A. Insufficient Progress Toward Standards ¹

¹ Only applicable to middle performance category

The County Board has the authority to deny renewal of the charter petition if it determines that all of the following are true:

- The school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward standards; AND
- Closure is in the best interest of students: AND
- This determination requires greater weight to be provided to performance on measurements of academic performance².

This evaluation incorporates two complementary but distinct standards: (1) snapshot measures of outcomes, including standards met, and (2) longitudinal analysis that tracks the same students across grade spans.

Findings for Consideration (Academic Performance)

No findings were determined for measures of academic performance.

Findings for Consideration (Other Academic Indicators)

Chronic Absenteeism

Pivot has not demonstrated meeting standards for Chronic Absenteeism in any year for the All-Students group or other student groups, based on publicly available data on the California School Dashboard.

The Chronic Absenteeism indicator measures the percentage of TK-8 students who are absent for 10 percent or more of instructional days. In alignment with Education Code section 47607(c)(1), staff reviewed the school's Chronic Absenteeism results to assess whether students met state-defined performance benchmarks. The school's Chronic Absenteeism results have been historically high and have not met state performance standards for multiple years. Although the 2025 Dashboard shows improvement over prior years, a single year's data is insufficient to reliably validate claims of progress. While the performance evaluation does not weigh Chronic Absenteeism as heavily as the core academic indicators, it provides important context regarding student access to instruction and overall engagement. The school's historical performance suggests that attendance remains an area in need of focused improvement, particularly given its direct relationship to student access, instructional time, and overall academic progress. The indicator, therefore, informs both the standards determination and the school's broader

² Education Code Section 47607.2(b)(2)

conditions for supporting student engagement.

Comments (Academic Performance)

No findings were determined. The absence of findings does not indicate insight into schoolwide performance; instead, it should be understood as indeterminate.

This report has identified a potentially recurring structural challenge in assessing school-wide performance and has correspondingly recommended that the school explore alternative measures to address this limitation.

B. Not Reasonably Comprehensive

The County Board has the authority to deny renewal of the charter petition if it determines that the petition has not been updated to include new legal requirements since the petition's last adoption.³

Findings for Consideration

The Renewal Petition incorporates mandatory legal updates enacted since its last renewal, but could benefit from a more comprehensive description and/or technical updates, which should be addressed in the following elements:

Element IV. Governance:

The Petition acknowledges that the Board will receive training on their responsibilities, which include, at a minimum, ethics training required by AB 2158. A more reasonably comprehensive description would also include reference to the mandatory school finance training required by AB 640, which was enacted on January 1, 2026.

Element VIII. Health and Safety Procedures.

- SB 857 requires charter schools serving pupils in grades 7-12 to adopt a policy establishing referral protocols for behavioral health by January 31,

³ Education Code Section 47607(b)

2026. The Renewal Petition, while containing references to mental health resources, does not explicitly address this requirement.

- Charter School operates a resource center that encompasses grades 7-12. To the extent the Charter School issues school ID cards, the back of the ID cards must include a number for the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline, a number for the National Domestic Violence Hotline, and a phone number for The Trevor Project’s LGBTQ suicide hotline.

Element XVI. Dispute Resolution

This element requires technical updates as it still refers to “District” when discussing dispute resolution procedures rather than the “RCOE”.

C. Significant Fiscal Deficiencies

The County Board has the authority to deny renewal of the charter petition if it determines that the school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to fiscal concerns, and all of the following are true:⁴

- The charter school has been provided with at least 30 days’ notice of fiscal violation(s);
- The charter school has been provided with a reasonable opportunity to cure the violation(s);
- The corrective action proposed by the charter school has been unsuccessful; OR
- The violation(s) are sufficiently severe and pervasive as to render a corrective action plan unviable

Findings for Consideration

No findings were determined.

D. Governance Mismanagement

The County Board has the authority to deny renewal of the charter petition if it determines that, the school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to governance concerns, and all of the following are true:⁵

⁴ Education Code Section 47607(e)

⁵ Education Code Section 47607(e)

- The charter school has been provided with at least 30 days' notice of governance violation(s);
- The charter school has been provided with a reasonable opportunity to cure the violation(s);
- The corrective action proposed by the charter school has been unsuccessful; OR
- The violation(s) are sufficiently severe and pervasive as to render a corrective action plan unviable

Findings for Consideration

No findings were determined.

E. Enrollment Pattern Concerns

The County Board has the authority to deny renewal of the charter petition if it determines that the school is not serving all students who wish to attend⁶ and all the following are true:

- The charter school has been provided with at least a 30-day notice of enrollment violations; AND
- The charter school has been provided with a reasonable opportunity to cure the violation(s); AND
- The corrective action proposed by the charter school has been unsuccessful; OR
- The violation(s) are sufficiently severe and pervasive as to render a corrective action plan unviable

Findings for Consideration

No findings were determined.

END OF PART ONE

Refer to page 1 Renewal Options for Board Action

⁶ Education Code Section 47607(d)(3)

Part II. DETAILED ANALYSIS: Staff Report for Pivot Charter School Riverside

I. Legal Review Parameters

A. Renewal Considerations

California Assembly Bill 1505 modified the framework for charter school renewals. To renew a petition, the chartering authority must assess whether the charter school meets the criteria outlined in Education Code Sections 47605, 47607, and 47607.2. In making its determination, the following factors shall be considered:

- School performance
- New petition requirements
- Ongoing fiscal issues
- Governance concerns
- Pupil enrollment patterns

Renewal petitions must include a reasonably comprehensive description of any new requirements for charter schools enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed. (Ed. Code, § 47607(b).)

B. Renewal Evaluation Categories

As an additional criterion, Education Code section 47607, subdivision (c), requires an authorizer to consider the charter school’s placement in performance categories based on its performance on the California School Dashboard (“Dashboard”).⁷ The California Department of Education (“CDE”) designates charter schools as “low-performing,” “middle-performing,” or “high-performing.”

Renewal Performance Tiers			Non-Tier
HIGH	MIDDLE	LOW	DASS
Presumptive Renewal Performance Evaluation <u>Not</u> Required for Approval	Performance Evaluation Required for Approval	Presumptive Denial Performance Evaluation Required for Approval	Performance Evaluation Required for Approval

Figure 1: Renewal Tier Performance Categories

⁷ See <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/about/accountability>.

School performance determinations are based on the two most recent, consecutive years of Dashboard data. Schools qualifying for Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) are held to a different renewal evaluation standard.⁸

The following two criteria are used to determine the performance category (i.e., High, Middle, or Low) of a charter school:

1. **Criterion 1:** Based on the performance colors received for all of the state indicators on the Dashboard for the two previous Dashboard years. The Dashboard state indicators are:
 - English language arts/literacy (ELA)
 - Mathematics
 - Chronic Absenteeism Indicator
 - English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)
 - Graduation Rate Indicator
 - College/Career Indicator (CCI)
 - Suspension Rate Indicator
2. **Criterion 2:** Based on the “Status” (also known as current year data) for all academic indicators with a performance color for the two previous Dashboard years. Education Code section 47607, subdivision (c)(3) defines academic indicators as:
 - ELA
 - Mathematics
 - ELPI
 - CCI

For reference, there are five performance colors on the Dashboard: blue, green, yellow, orange, and red. Blue represents the highest performance and red represents the lowest performance: CDE has designated Pivot as “middle-performing” charter school pursuant to Education Code section 47607.2, subdivision (b).

For middle-performing schools, a chartering authority **must** consider schoolwide performance data and performance of all subgroups on state and local indicators in its renewal petition review process. Greater weight must be provided to “performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.”⁹:

C. Denial Standards

⁸ See <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/activeschools.asp>.

⁹ Ed. Code § 47607.2(b)(2).

Pursuant to Education Code section 47607.2(b)(3), a chartering authority **may deny** the renewal of a middle-performing charter school only upon making written findings, setting forth specific facts to support the finding, that:

- The charter school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to the pupils of the school; and
- Closure of the charter school is in the best interest of pupils; and
- The decision not to renew gives “greater weight” to the charter school’s performance on measurements of academic performance.

In addition, pursuant to Education Code 47607(e), irrespective of the performance criteria, a chartering authority **may deny** renewal of a charter school if:

- The charter school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial fiscal or governance factors; or
- The charter school is not serving the pupils who wish to attend, as documented by aggregate data reflecting pupil enrollment patterns at the charter school.

CDE has designated Pivot as a “middle-performing” charter school pursuant to Education Code section 47607.2. RCOE has confirmed Pivot qualifies for a Middle-Tier Performance Review based on its performance on the 2024 and 2025 California School Dashboard. The Review Team’s detailed evaluation follows.

[remainder intentionally left blank]

II. School Review

A. Performance Review

1. Performance Review: Middle Tier

Review Standards ¹⁰	
Dashboard Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Schoolwide performance on the state indicators• Student group performance on the state indicators• Dashboard reporting on the local indicators• Greater weight shall be provided to measures of academic performance: ELA, Math, and English Learner Progress
Verified Data ¹¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measurable increases in academic achievement demonstrated by a year's progress for each year in school; or• Strong postsecondary outcomes defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers

Figure 2: Middle-Tier Performance Review Standards

2. Performance Review: Scope and Scale

The Review Team analysis is grounded in a phased protocol derived from Education Code to ensure findings were thorough and designed with statutory requirements.

¹⁰ Education Code Sections 47607(c), 47607.2(b)

¹¹ RCOE will continue to accept and consider the Charter School's use of verified data following the sunset of the applicable Education Code provision as additional information related to Charter School's performance, provided that the submission adheres to state-recommended data use procedures.

Figure 3 Middle-Tier Performance Evaluation Protocol

Protocol Step	Subsection	Description	Ed Code Grounding
Step 1 – Data Record	1.1 Data Collection	Collect Dashboard indicators (ELA/Math DFS, ELPI, Chronic Absenteeism, Suspension, Grad Rate, CCI) over 3–5 years.	47607(c)(1) – pupil outcomes
	1.2 Participation Verification	Document participation rates, LOSS penalties, continuous enrollment factors.	47607(c)(1)
	1.3 Subgroup Data Protocol	Extract multi-year subgroup performance and identify disparities.	47607(c)(3) – subgroup outcomes
Step 2 – Standard Met	2.1 Status Determination	Determine if each indicator meets state standard (Yes/No) based on most recent Status.	47607(c)(1); 47607.2(b)(1)
	2.2 Validation	Cross-check Status with Additional Reports and Five-by-Five tables.	47607.2(b)(1)
Step 3 – Longitudinal Trajectory	3.1 Trajectory Classification	Classify multi-year pattern as Sustained High, Rising, Static, Inconsistent, Persistent Low.	47607(c)(1) – analysis of multi-year trends
	3.2 Pattern Detection	Review 3–5 years for directional patterns including cohort changes, penalties, volatility.	47607.2(b)(1)–(2)
	3.3 Subgroup Trajectory	Apply same trajectory classification to subgroups and identify persistent gaps.	47607(c)(3)
Step 4 – Local Evidence	4.1 Local Measures	Analyze multi-year patterns in NWEA, i-Ready, common assessments, course completion.	47607.2(b)(2) – use of local indicators
	4.2 Consistency Check	Verify alignment between local and state measures; document discrepancies.	47607.2(b)(2)
	4.3 Validation	Ensure reliability of local data; require explanations where necessary.	47607(c)(1)
Step 5 – Renewal Determination	5.1 Standards Compliance	Identify how many indicators met state standard; document persistent failures.	47607(c)(1)
	5.2 Trajectory Synthesis	Evaluate overall multi-year trajectory across all indicators.	47607.2(b)(1)–(2)
	5.3 Contextual Analysis	Consider contextual factors (program shifts, leadership, SPED systems, enrollment).	47607(c)(1)
	5.4 Final Determination	Synthesize all evidence into a clear renewal determination.	47607(c)(1); 47607.2(b)(1)–(2)
	5.5 Documentation & Transparency	Publish the finalized one-pager; include in board docs; archive.	47607.2(b)(2)

3. Performance Review: Pivot

Does the School Meet Standards in ELA and Mathematics?

(All Students; Student Groups)

Consistent with EC 47607(c)(1), the current Dashboard Status results were reviewed to determine whether the school meets state performance standards. For a school to be considered meeting state performance standards, it needs to achieve either of the following: (1) the school receives a blue or green indicator, or (2) the school has a DFS ≥ 0 . Neither the school’s ELA nor mathematics results meet the standard for schoolwide performance; due to small n-size, the school does not have sufficient data to reliably analyze successive annual results for any student groups. Because the school does not meet standards in the core academic indicators, it does not satisfy the “meeting standards” condition. This determination is based on the current Dashboard Status, independent of trajectory/growth.

Figure 4: ELA/Math Standards Met/Not Met

	Student Groups	Dashboard Color	DFS	Total	Percent	Meets Standards
English Language Arts	All	0/4	0/5	0/4	0%	Not Met
	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	0/2	0/2	0/2		NA
	Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	NA		NA
	Hispanic	NA	NA	NA		NA
	White	NA	NA	NA		NA
	Mathematics	All	0/4	0/5	0/4	0%
	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	0/2	0/2	0/2		NA
	Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	NA		NA
	Hispanic	NA	NA	NA		NA
	White	NA	NA	NA		NA

Determination: Pivot does not meet standards in English Language Arts or Mathematics for the All-Students group.

Has the School Made Sufficient Progress towards Meeting Standards?

Pursuant to EC 47607.2(b)(1)–(2), multi-year trajectories may be examined to assess whether a school has made progress toward meeting academic standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics. However, publicly available data is not configured to support longitudinal analysis and lacks the level of detail necessary to conduct such analysis in accordance with sound evaluation of student growth.

To address this limitation, the review team relied on supplemental data provided by the school. This evidence complied with state guidance on verified data use and was deemed appropriate and sufficiently reliable for analysis. Accordingly, the review team considered

the school's submitted local assessment data to evaluate student performance and growth patterns.

This approach differs from traditional longitudinal analysis. Rather than tracking individual student cohorts across grade spans over time, the review team analyzed within-year growth across successive academic years. These annual growth snapshots, derived from distinct testing periods, serve as a valid proxy for identifying patterns in student progress over time.

English Language Arts and Mathematics

Pivot administers iReady as its primary interim assessments across grades K–12. Submitted student-level score data from 2023–24 and 2024–25 reflect an average testing population of approximately 130–140 students across both years. Tested cohorts within individual grade levels ranged from 3 to 22 students per grade per year.

Determination: Pivot meets the standard of sufficient progress in English Language Arts and Mathematics for the All-Students group in grades 9-12; however, for TK-8, the determination is indeterminate.

Context: Grade-level class sizes ranging from 14 to 31 students limit the inferential weight that can be placed on any single administration or year-over-year comparison. Small cohorts are highly sensitive to enrollment fluctuation, assessment participation rates, and cohort characteristics unrelated to instructional conditions. Accordingly, point-in-time scores and year-over-year comparisons cannot reliably be attributed to school-wide academic trends. Considered in isolation, Summative CAASPP scores and local assessment results carry limited inferential weight. Given the record on hand, the evidence supports reasonable confidence in the growth for the high school element of the program, whereas the small n-size of the TK-8 program and the limited evidence do not support reliable analysis. Individual student longitudinal growth data, tracked over multiple years and reported separately from group-level results, may offer a more viable pathway for the school to demonstrate academic progress in the early grades.

Does the School Meet Standards in Other State Indicators?

For state indicators other than English Language Arts and Mathematics, including both academic (ELPI) and non-academic indicators (Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension), Dashboard Status results were reviewed to determine whether the school meets state performance standards. The Dashboard provides a standardized, statewide accountability framework and serves as the primary evidence for assessing performance on these indicators. Under the Dashboard accountability system, a school is considered to have met standards for a given indicator when it receives a blue or green performance level. Multi-year Dashboard results over the term of the charter were reviewed to assess whether performance was generally consistent with meeting standards over time, recognizing that individual years may not fully reflect a school's typical performance.

English Language Progress Indicator

The English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) measures the proportion of English learners making annual progress toward English language proficiency. Consistent with Education Code section 47607(c)(1), staff reviewed California School Dashboard ELPI results to assess the school’s performance over the term of the charter. As shown in Figure 5, Pivot did not receive a performance level in any of the five reporting years.

Figure 5: ELPI Performance on the CA Dashboard

English Learner Progress					
Student Group:	2019	2022	2023	2024	2025
All	Fewer than 11 students				

Determination: ELPI data is limited due to the minimum student count required to generate a performance level on the California Dashboard, resulting in no color designation across the charter term. No supplemental evidence was provided. Accordingly, the available data does not support a meaningful analysis of trends or progress toward English language proficiency.

College and Career Indicator

The College/Career Indicator (CCI) evaluates the extent to which high school students graduate prepared for postsecondary education or meaningful career pathways. In alignment with EC 47607(c)(1), staff reviewed the school’s CCI results to assess whether students met state-defined preparedness benchmarks. As reflected in Figure 6, Pivot received a performance level in only one of the four reporting years.

Figure 6: CCI Performance on the CA Dashboard

College/Career					
Student Group:	2019	2022	2023	2024	2025
All	0%		Very Low 3.2%	0%	26.9%

Determination: CCI performance display is limited by the 30-student minimum requirement in the California Dashboard. The presence of a single year does not support longitudinal analysis. The school did not receive a color designation on the CCI because it did not meet the minimum student count required in both the current and prior year to generate a performance level on the California Dashboard. While Status results may be displayed for informational purposes, these values are based on small cohorts and do not constitute a reportable performance level color. Accordingly, the available data does not

support a formal evaluation of performance or trends over time.

Chronic Absenteeism

The Chronic Absenteeism indicator measures the percentage of students who are absent for 10 percent or more of instructional days. Consistent with Education Code section 47607(c)(1), staff reviewed multi-year absenteeism trends to assess current performance and progress over time. As reflected in Figure 7, Pivot received a performance level color in four of the five reporting years.

Figure 7: Chronic Absenteeism Performance on the CA Dashboard

Chronic Absenteeism					
Student Group:	2019	2022	2023	2024	2025
All		Very High			
Hispanic		Very High			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged		Very High			

Determination: Pivot does not meet standards for Chronic Absenteeism.

Context: Chronic Absenteeism data is reported on the California Dashboard for grades TK–8. The school received Dashboard performance levels based on Status (the percentage of students chronically absent) and Change (year-over-year differences), consistent with state methodology. Additional evidence was not provided for this indicator. Given the importance of this measure as an indicator of student engagement, it is recommended that the school conduct a comprehensive review of attendance patterns and the underlying causes of chronic absenteeism. If such an analysis has been completed, it should be provided to the authorizing entity for informational purposes.

Graduation Rate

The Graduation Rate indicator measures the proportion of students who successfully complete high school within four years. Staff reviewed multi-year graduation outcomes, pursuant to EC 47607(c)(1), to evaluate both current performance and progress over time. As reflected in Figure 8, Pivot received a performance level in only one of the five reporting years.

Figure 8: Graduation Rate Performance on the CA Dashboard

Graduation Rate					
Student Group:	2019	2022	2023	2024	2025
All	66.7%	Low 74.2%	67.6%	50%	75%

Determination: Graduation rate performance data is subject to the California Dashboard’s minimum student count requirement of 30 students in both the current and prior year to generate a performance level (color). The availability of only a single year of color-level results does not support longitudinal trend analysis. While underlying percentage results are available, they are based on small cohorts and should be interpreted with caution. Notwithstanding these limitations, the available data suggest the school has maintained a relatively strong graduation rate across the reporting period.

Suspension Rate Indicator

The Suspension Rate indicator reflects the percentage of students receiving one or more suspensions during the academic year. Consistent with Education Code sections 47607(c)(1) and 47607(c)(3), staff reviewed California School Dashboard Suspension Rate results to assess performance over the term of the charter. As shown in Figure 9, Pivot’s Suspension Rate results indicate that the school meets performance standards across the majority of years and student groups, except for the most recent Dashboard for Students with Disabilities and White students.

Figure 9: Suspension Rate Performance on the CA Dashboard

Suspension Rate					
Student Group:	2019	2022	2023	2024	2025
All		Very Low			
Hispanic		Very Low			
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged		Very Low			
Students with Disabilities		Very Low			
White		Very Low			

Determination: Pivot meets the standard for Suspension Rate. Results indicate that the

school has maintained a Very Low Status level across multiple years across multiple student groups on the California Dashboard. The most recent year reflects a deviation from the prior trend and should be interpreted with caution, given the preceding performance.

Recommendations

Due to the school's size and Dashboard methodology constraints, it is unclear whether the school's future performance will yield sufficient data for conclusive indicator-level determinations.

The limitations identified in the section above suggest the school would benefit from developing additional recurring metrics to better monitor and report TK-8 growth and progress toward standards. Staff recommends that the school explore this development through metrics created in collaboration with RCOE.

Additionally, due to the school not meeting standards across student groups for Chronic Absenteeism, it is recommended that the school develop and implement a Comprehensive Improvement Plan to address Chronic Absenteeism, containing the following:

- Clear, measurable goals for growth disaggregated by the All-Student Group and all other student groups
- Specific, research-aligned intervention strategies the school will use to address areas of need
- Defined timelines and progress benchmarks
- Growth metrics
- Mid-Year and Annual Updates to RCOE and/or the Board

B. Legal Updates to the Charter Petition

Review Standards

New Legal Requirements	The petition has been updated to include reasonably comprehensive descriptions for any new legal requirements imposed since its last update.
Reasonably Comprehensive	Descriptions for new legal requirements must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Be substantive, not a list ● Address all aspects of each element ● Be specific to this charter

Figure 10: Petition Document Review Standards

Denial Standard

The petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the new requirement(s) imposed since its last update.

Determinations for Consideration

The Renewal Petition incorporates nearly all mandatory legal updates enacted since its last renewal, but does not provide a comprehensive description of the following legal requirements

Element IV. Governance:

The Petition acknowledges that the Board will receive training on their responsibilities which include at a minimum ethics training required by AB 2158. Finance training falls within the broad list of topics within the Board's responsibility, but a more reasonably comprehensive description would reference AB 640. AB 640 requires all charter school governing board members in service as of April 1, 2027, including board members of nonprofit public benefit corporations operating charter schools, to receive training on K-12 public education school finance laws. (Ed. Code § 35221.)

Element VIII. Health and Safety Procedures:

SB 857 requires charter schools serving pupils grades 7-12 to adopt a policy establishing referral protocols for behavioral health by January 31, 2026. The Renewal Petition, while containing references to mental health resources, does not address this requirement. Before July 1, 2029, during the proposed charter term if renewed, Charter School must certify to CDE that all of its certificated employees and nearly half (40%) of its classified employees with direct pupil contact receive behavioral health training at least once. (Ed. Code § 49428.2(c).)

Suicide Prevention Resources:

Charter School serves students in grades 7-12. Therefore, to the extent Charter School issues school identification (ID) cards to students, the back of the ID cards must include a number for the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline and the National Domestic Violence Hotline. No later than July 1, 2026, the back of the ID cards must include a telephone number and text line for The Trevor Project's LGBTQ suicide hotline. (Ed. Code § 215.5.)

C. Fiscal Review

Monitoring a charter school's fiscal viability is a fundamental component of the chartering authority's ongoing oversight responsibilities. Fiscal concerns are typically identified and addressed throughout the charter term. While the renewal process does not impose a separate or heightened review of fiscal factors, the chartering authority may consider such concerns if they are persistent or indicate systemic financial instability.

Figure 11: Fiscal Oversight Review Standards

Review Standards	
Fiscal Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adheres to generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) ● Maintains a balanced budget ● Submits all legally required reports accurately and on time ● Completes audits timely with clean findings ● Implements approved internal fiscal control policies and procedures ● Discloses related LLCs, 501(c)(3) organizations, and charter management organizations (CMOs) ● Transparently reports current debt and lease agreements
Fiscal Viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Maintains MOU-required reserves ● Positive multi-year financial projection ● Positive cash flow ● Appropriate days of Cash on Hand ● Sustainable enrollment ● Efficient spending ● Effective debt management
Due Process	<p>Ensure the school has been provided due process, to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● At least 30 days' notice of the alleged violation ● Reasonable opportunity to cure the violation, including a corrective action plan proposed by the charter school

Denial Standard

The school is unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial fiscal factors, with either of the following findings:

- The charter school has been provided with at least 30 days' notice of fiscal violation(s);
- The charter school has been provided with a reasonable opportunity to cure the violation(s);
- The corrective action proposed by the charter school has been unsuccessful; OR

- The violation(s) are sufficiently severe and pervasive as to render a corrective action plan unviable

Determinations for Consideration

No findings were determined.

D. Governance Review

Monitoring the viability of a charter school's governance is a fundamental component of the chartering authority's ongoing oversight responsibilities. Governance concerns are typically identified and addressed throughout the charter term. While the renewal process does not impose a separate or heightened review of fiscal factors, the chartering authority may consider such concerns if they are persistent or indicate systemic financial instability.

Figure 12: Governance Oversight Review Standards

Review Standards	
Compliance with Legal and Charter Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistently complies with all state and federal laws, charter petition, and bylaws • Adheres to the Brown Act, Political Reform Act, Public Records Act, LCAP, and Nonprofit Corporation Code requirements • Ensures all staff are properly vetted, qualified, and credentialed • Maintains safe, permitted, and insured facilities • Keeps all health and safety policies and procedures up to date
Board Oversight and Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board has the capacity to fulfill its responsibilities effectively • Maintains independence and avoids conflicts of interest • Actively participates in meetings, coming prepared and engaged • Oversees resources and budgets responsibly • Addresses audit findings and implements corrective actions • Ensures stable and effective school leadership • Engages educational partners in decision-making processes • Meets or actively works toward the student outcomes outlined in the charter
Due Process	<p>Ensure the school has been provided due process, to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 30 days' notice of the alleged violation • Reasonable opportunity to cure the violation, including a corrective action plan proposed by the charter school

Denial Standards

The school is unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial governance factors, with either of the following findings:

- The charter school has been provided with at least 30 days' notice of fiscal violation(s);
- The charter school has been provided with a reasonable opportunity to cure the violation(s);
- The corrective action proposed by the charter school has been unsuccessful; OR
- The violation(s) are sufficiently severe and pervasive as to render a corrective action plan unviable

Determinations for Consideration

No findings were determined.

Figure 13: Student Enrollment Oversight Review Standards

Review Standards	
Substantiated Complaints	Consider any substantiated complaints of non-compliance pertaining to any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Suspension● Expulsion● Involuntary Removal
Enrollment Pattern Data	Consider any enrollment data provided by the CDE in response to an authorizer request for information (Optional, authorizer discretion)
Due Process	Ensure the school has been provided with due process, to include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">● At least 30 days' notice of the alleged violation● Reasonable opportunity to cure the violation, including a corrective action plan proposed by the charter school

E. Enrollment Review

As part of its ongoing oversight responsibilities, the chartering authority regularly monitors student enrollment trends and reviews complaints. When evaluating a charter renewal petition, the authorizer must consider whether the charter school is serving all students who wish to attend.

Denial Standards

- Finding(s) of fact for denial if the charter school is not serving all pupils who wish to attend
- Evidence to support any finding of fact under this part will be included in the report

Determinations for Consideration

No findings were determined.

END OF DOCUMENT

Refer to page 1 Renewal Options for Board Action