

STAFF REPORT

Ipsos Charter High School Charter Petition



September 26, 2016

San Rafael City Schools

Board of Education Meeting





CHARTER REVIEW OVERVIEW

Petition Review Timeline



- Petition submitted to district
 - June 27, 2016
- Petition is received by the Board to start review process
 - August 8, 2016
- Within 30 days, a public hearing is held to assess support among teachers, employees and parents
 - August 22, 2016
- Within 60 days, board must approve or deny, variation “conditional approval”
 - September 26, 2016

Petition Components



Petition must contain:

- Signatures
 - Parent signatures representing 1/2 of students estimated to enroll **or** teacher signatures representing 1/2 of teachers estimated to be employed in first year; “Meaningfully interested”
- Legal affirmations
 - Nonsectarian program; no tuition; no discrimination; admission not according to residence of pupil or parents
- “Reasonably comprehensive” descriptions of 15 statutory criteria
- Proposed operation and potential effects of the school on the district
 - Facilities to be utilized
 - Provision of administrative services
 - Potential civil liability effects on district, if any
 - Financial statements

Petition Components, 15 Criteria



“Reasonably comprehensive” descriptions of 15 statutory criteria:

1. Description of educational program
2. Measurable pupil outcomes
3. Method for assessing pupil progress
4. Governance structure of the school
5. Employee qualifications
6. Health and safety procedures
7. Means to achieve race/ethnic balance reflective of district
8. Admission requirements
9. Manner in which annual financial audits shall be conducted
10. Student suspension & expulsion procedures
11. Staff coverage by STRS, PERS or social security
12. Public school attendance alternatives
13. District employee leave & return rights
14. Dispute resolution process
15. Procedures for closure of school

Review Process



- Convene a team of District staff members for review of petition
- Review the State Board of Education standards
- Listen to public testimony
- Consult with individual Board members
- Consult with legal counsel
- Develop recommendation for the Board



DISTRICT ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

District Recommendation



Denial of the petition is recommended based on the following conclusions:

- **Section 1:** The petition fails to provide a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements of a charter petition, including:
 - Element 1: Description of educational program
 - Element 4: Governance structure
 - Element 6: Health and safety
 - Element 7: Means to achieve race/ethnic balance reflective of district
 - Element 8: Admissions requirements
 - Element 10: Student suspension and expulsion procedures
 - Element 15: Procedures for closure of school
- **Section 2:** The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program presented

Element 1:

Educational Program



The petition does not contain a sufficient description of the educational program:

- Small Learning Community, a core component of its educational program
 - Teacher-student ratio of 33:1
 - 132 students will utilize the same physical space for 3 hours a day for core instruction
- Curriculum and Course Offerings:
 - Physical Education
 - Tutorials
- Independent Study / Foreign Language Instruction
- Professional Development

Element 1: *Educational Program*



- **Targeted Student Populations: Students with disabilities**
 - Petition has contradictory language with regard to its obligation to meet the needs of students with disabilities
 - Misunderstanding regarding the requirement to provide a full continuum of alternative services, placement and supports to meet the unique needs of students
 - Concerns with the charter's possible status as it's own "Local Educational Agency"

Element 1:

Educational Program



- **Targeted Student Populations: English Learners**

- English Language Development (ELD) occurs at the same time as Innovate Lab
- No evidence that students are receiving Integrated ELD instruction (a core subject)
- Use of ELD Standards are not included in the description of curriculum
- No evidence of research-based curriculum materials being used for ELD
- Unclear how the school will differentiate instruction for students at different levels of language proficiency
- Amount of instructional minutes dedicated to ELD is unclear
- Monitoring and reclassification process is not clearly defined
- Lacks mention of a transitional plan from CELDT to ELPAC

Element 1:

Educational Program



- Lack of discussion or plan for addressing some of the unique needs of other student populations including:
 - Immigrant students
 - Students with interruptions in schooling
 - Undocumented students
 - Teenage mothers or pregnant teens
 - Homeless
 - Foster youth

Element 1:

Educational Program



- **Parent Committees:**

Lack of plan for how parent committees will be formed to ensure equitable representation of all students, including the target student population of socioeconomically disadvantaged students, English learners and students with disabilities.

Element 4: Governance



- Inconsistent Provisions Regarding Board Membership
- Conflict of Interest Provisions
- Brown Act Compliance / Meeting Locations Unclear
- Permissive Education Code Provision
- Delegation of Authority
- Board Committees
- Administrative Staffing

Element 6: Health and Safety



- **Mandated Reported Training**

- Page 131 of Ipso Petition states: “All employees will be mandated child abuse reporters and will follow all applicable reporting laws, the same policies and procedures used by the District.”
 - Lack of indication that the charter has read the policies or knows what is involved in mandating reporting
 - Charter schools have a responsibility beyond ensuring their employees follow policies and procedures

Element 7:

Means to Achieve Racial and Ethnic Balance



- Petition lacks sufficient description of how Ipsos will achieve racial and ethnic balance among its pupils that is reflective of the District
- Petition provides a “plan” to recruit socioeconomically disadvantaged students but no concrete actions are identified
- The method of recruitment is of concern in that parents are expressing concerns that limited information is being provided to sway opinions

Element 8: Admissions Requirement



- Inadequate residency verification
- Unclear enrollment preferences for lottery purposes
 - Siblings of enrolled students and children of Ipso teachers, staff, board members, and founding team members are listed before residents of the San Rafael High School District

Element 10: *Student Suspension and Expulsion Procedures*



- Does not contain a sufficient description of the procedures by which students can be expelled or suspended
- Parents must inquire to obtain the school's discipline policy
- Petition authorizes changes to discipline policy without revision to charter
- Ipso will not have enough certificated employees to appropriately staff an administrative expulsion panel
- Parent could trigger a manifestation determination by simply requesting that their child be evaluated

Element 15: Closure Procedures



- Not a sufficient description of the procedures to be used if the charter closes
- Does not designate an entity or individual who is responsible for closure-related activities
- Important to note: The petitioners cannot defer delegation of closure-related activities to another time, especially to the time of closure

The Petitioners are Demonstrably Unlikely to Successfully Implement the Program



- Level of community support is low
- Master calendar does not align to Marin County calendars
- Lack of school governance experience by school leadership
- Instructional minutes inaccurate / fall short of requirements
- Food program and budget inconsistent
- Financial reporting is unclear
- Lack of specificity regarding location and facility

The Petitioners are Demonstrably Unlikely to Successfully Implement the Program, Staffing Concerns



Staffing plan does not match educational program goals

- **Administrative Staffing**

- IPSO 2 FT Administrators for 132 students, 66 Students per Administrator
- SRCS 205.7 Students per Administrator

- **Teacher Staffing**

- IPSO 33:1 Pupil to Teacher Ratio
- SRCS 20.4:1 Pupil to Teacher Ratio

The Petitioners are Demonstrably Unlikely to Successfully Implement the Program, Credentialing Concerns



- **Proposes hiring 4 credentialed teachers in year 1**
 - Credentials required:
 - English
 - Math
 - Social Science
 - Science
 - Biological Science, Chemistry, Geosciences and Physics require different credentials
- **Unclear who would be teaching electives**
 - PE, Health, Music and Art require the appropriate credential
 - Learning Coach - no credential required

The Petitioners are Demonstrably Unlikely to Successfully Implement the Program, Budget Deficiencies



Proposed budget significantly overstates revenues and under-estimates expenditures. According to our analysis, the budget:

- Relies on revenues from grants that have not been obtained or promised after the current year
- States that the LCFF funding rate for the District will be used by the charter, the budget uses a per-ADA amount that is greater than the District's rate, resulting in a \$100,000 overstatement of revenue
- Special education encroachment costs were under-budgeted by almost half
- Costs for instructional materials and equipment are under-budgeted
- Insufficient information about ongoing professional development, making it impossible to verify whether the amounts budgeted are sufficient
- We could not find evidence of BYU foreign language tuition in the budget

The Petitioners are Demonstrably Unlikely to Successfully Implement the Program, Budget Deficiencies



When a budget is prepared based on more realistic assumptions, including reducing revenues for overstated grants and LCFF funding, and increasing expenses to cover instructional materials, special education and tuition for foreign language classes, the District believes that Ipsos will be financially insolvent starting in Year 2.

- After revising for above, the District believes there will be annual deficit spending of \$460,000, \$750,000 and \$715,000 in years two, three and four result in a negative ending fund balance of almost (\$2,000,000) by the end of four years.
- Even if the potential additional grant funding is obtained, it would be insufficient to meet expenditure and reserve requirements.

District Recommendation



Denial of the petition is recommended based on the following conclusions:

- **Section 1:** The petition fails to provide a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements of a charter petition, including:
 - Element 1: Description of educational program
 - Element 4: Governance structure
 - Element 6: Health and safety
 - Element 7: Means to achieve race/ethnic balance reflective of district
 - Element 8: Admissions requirements
 - Element 10: Student suspension and expulsion procedures
 - Element 15: Procedures for closure of school
- **Section 2:** The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program presented



QUESTIONS