



Renewal Petition Staff Report

LPS Oakland R&D

Posted: December 18, 2024

Decision Hearing: January 2, 2025

School Overview

LPS Oakland R&D			
Charter Management Organization (CMO):	Leadership Public Schools	Previous Renewal Year(s):	2008, 2012, 2017
Year Opened:	2005	Campus Address:	8601 MacArthur Blvd, Oakland CA 94605
Neighborhood:	Castlemont	OUSD Attendance Area(s):	Castlemont / CCPA / Madison
OUSD Board District:	District 7	Current Enrollment: ¹	172
Current Grades Served:	9-12	Current Maximum Authorized Enrollment:	500
Current Authorized Grades:	9-12	2-Year Projected Enrollment	175, 180

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the LPS Oakland R&D (“LPS Oakland” or “Charter School”) renewal petition for a two-year term (July 2025 to June 2027) be **denied**.

Summary of Findings:

Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none">High graduation rates, above the OUSD average in all years of the charter term.High A-G graduation rates for most years of the charter term, with the exception of 2023-24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">ELA proficiency rates declined in each of the last four years, and were below the OUSD average in each of these years.Math proficiency rates declined each of the last four years and were well below the OUSD average. Only 2% of students were proficient in Math 2023-24.Verified data submitted by the school does not conclusively show one year’s progress for each year in school or strong postsecondary outcomes.Enrollment has declined 65% from its peak in 2019-20.Pattern of Board-approved budgets which substantially overproject enrollment.Extremely low teacher retention and high number of mid-year teacher exits.The PIP, while addressing most necessary performance indicators, overlooks crucial organizational challenges such as leadership instability and teacher recruitment/retention.

¹ Per census day enrollment spreadsheet submitted to OUSD on October 18, 2024.

Criteria for Evaluation and Procedural Background

Criteria for Renewal


The Charter Schools Act of 1992 established the criteria by which charter renewal applications must be evaluated. In order to recommend the approval of a charter school renewal, Office of Charter Schools (OCS) Staff must determine that the charter school has met the requirements set forth in Education Code (Ed Code) Sections 47605, 47607, and 47607.2. Specifically, in order to be recommended for renewal, Staff determines whether the charter school has met the following renewal criteria:

- I. *Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?*
- II. *Is the Charter School Demonstrably Likely to Successfully Implement the Proposed Educational Program?*
- III. *Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?*
- IV. *Is the School Serving All Students Who Wish to Attend?*

Renewal Tier Analysis

In addition to the criteria outlined above, Education Code outlines a three-tiered system of performance categories for most² charter schools seeking renewal. This system provides additional criteria and conditions for evaluating the charter school’s renewal petition based on the performance category, or “tier”, in which the school is placed. Figure 1 below shows a summary of the criteria used by the California Department of Education to determine LPS Oakland’s renewal tier. For a more detailed analysis of the Charter School’s renewal tier, including analyses of each criterion and sub-criterion, please see Appendix A.

Figure 1: LPS Oakland Renewal Tier Analysis



Sources: California School Dashboard; CDE Charter School Performance Category Data File; CDE “Determining Charter School Performance Category” Flyer

As indicated in Figure 1 above, the CDE placed⁵ the Charter School in the Low renewal tier. As discussed previously, there are additional criteria and conditions for evaluating a charter school’s petition depending on the assigned tier. Figure 2 below outlines the renewal conditions and additional evaluation guidance applicable to schools placed in the Low tier.

² The three-tiered system does not apply to schools that qualify for the Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) program.

³ For the 2022 California School Dashboard, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, status “levels” were assigned to each indicator in place of colors. For the tier analysis, the State used these levels as a proxy for colors, as expressed in Criterion 1. For more information, please see Appendix B.

⁴ “Academic indicators” refer to the ELA, Math, English Learner Progress, and College and Career Readiness Indicators on the California School Dashboard.

⁵ Charter school performance categories for all California charter schools can be found here: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/performcategorydf.asp>

Figure 2: Renewal Tier Additional Guidance

LOW TIER - Additional Guidance and Decision Criteria	
Term	May only be renewed for a 2-year term.
Additional Renewal Conditions	<p>Shall generally not renew; however, the chartering authority shall consider the following factors and may renew only upon making both of the following written factual findings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The charter school is taking meaningful steps to address the underlying cause(s) of low performance, which are or will be written in a plan adopted by the governing body of the charter school; and</i> <i>There is clear and convincing evidence, demonstrated by verified data⁶, showing either:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school; or</i> <i>Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.</i>

Source: Education Code §47607.2(a)

Procedure

1. The OUSD review team conducted an interview with 3 members of the LPS Governing Board on August 1, 2024, after all members submitted a self-evaluation to assess strengths and gaps in the Governing Body.
2. The OUSD review team conducted a site visit on October 15, 2024. This site visit involved classroom observations and focus group interviews with students, families, teachers, and school leadership.
3. The Charter School submitted a renewal petition to the District on October 28, 2024.
4. The review team conducted a review of the school's documents, policies, financials, academic performance, and renewal petition to assist in developing the staff report.
5. The initial public hearing was held on December 9, 2024.
6. Staff findings were made public by the 15-day posting requirement, which was December 18, 2024.
7. The decision public hearing is being held on January 2, 2025.

⁶ Ed Code §47607.2(c) defines verified data as data derived from nationally recognized, valid, peer-reviewed, and reliable sources that are externally produced. The State Board of Education established criteria to define verified data and identify an approved list of valid and reliable assessments that shall be used for this purpose. For more information, please review the CDE's Verified Data website page: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/verifdata.asp>

Table of Contents

I. Renewal Criteria I: Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?	5
A. School Performance Analysis	5
B. Schoolwide Academic Performance	6
C. Key Student Group Academic Performance	7
D. 2023 CORE Growth	8
E. Graduation Metrics	9
F. English Learner Progress	10
G. Renewal Site Visit Summary	11
H. Additional Verified Data Provided by the School	13
I. Performance Improvement Plan	17
II. Renewal Criteria II: Is the Charter School Demonstrably Likely to Successfully Implement the Proposed Educational Program?	22
A. Enrollment	22
B. Financial Condition	23
C. Enrollment Demographics	25
D. Notices of Concern and/or Notices to Cure and Correct	28
E. Board Health and Effectiveness	29
F. Staffing and Teacher Credentialing	30
III. Renewal Criteria III: Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?	32
A. The Required Fifteen Elements	32
B. Other Required Information	33
C. OUSD-Specified Requirements	33
IV. Renewal Criteria IV: Is the Charter School Serving All Students Who Wish to Attend?	34
A. State-Provided Enrollment Data	34
B. Substantiated Complaints and Notices of Concern Related to Noncompliance with Suspension / Expulsion Requirements	35
V. Recommendation Summary	36
A. Renewal Criteria I: Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?	36
B. Renewal Criteria II: Is the Charter School Demonstrably Likely to Successfully Implement the Proposed Educational Program?	37
C. Renewal Criteria III: Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?	37
D. Renewal Criteria IV: Is the School Serving All Students Who Wish to Attend?	38
E. Analysis of Other Public School Options if Renewal is Denied	38
F. Recommendation	39
VI. Appendices	40
Appendix A. Complete Renewal Tier Analysis	40
Appendix B. Additional California School Dashboard Analyses – including SPA and Local Indicators	41
Appendix C. Additional Program Implementation Information	45

I. Renewal Criteria I: Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?

In order for a charter school's renewal petition to be approved, it must present a sound educational program for its students. For schools in the Middle Tier, the District is required to consider the school's performance on California School Dashboard indicators, providing greater weight to performance on academic indicators. Although Education Code does not specifically reference similar criteria for schools meeting the Low renewal tier criteria (outside of the Renewal Tier Analysis), the following is being included for context. To provide a comprehensive overview of the educational program, the evaluation below includes evidence from the California School Dashboard as well as results from the CAASPP state assessments, graduation data, CORE growth data, ELPAC results, a summary of the renewal site visit, and verified data submitted by the Charter School.

A. School Performance Analysis

The District's School Performance Analysis ("SPA") was developed to serve as a tool for determining whether schools meet a minimum performance threshold on a variety of indicators based on the California School Dashboard and, if applicable, CORE Academic Growth⁷. For each indicator, the school may meet the threshold both (a) schoolwide, and (b) for an "equity" category consisting of a combination of historically underserved student groups. In order to be considered "Met", an indicator must have either a California School Dashboard Color Orange / Low Status Level or higher or CORE Growth Level "Average" or higher (i.e. growth > 30th percentile). Schools meeting more than 50% of indicators/categories for which data is available are generally considered to be meeting the minimum performance level for purposes of renewal. Please note, due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, colors were not assigned to indicators for the 2022 Dashboard, so status level was used as a proxy for each. A summary of the SPA analyses for the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years is shown below (for more information about the California School Dashboard Indicators and for the full SPA analyses, please see Appendix B). As shown in the table below:

- LPS Oakland has met the minimum performance threshold for both the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years.

Figure 3: School Performance Analysis (SPA) Summary – 2022 and 2023

Indicator	2022		2023	
	SCHOOLWIDE	EQUITY	SCHOOLWIDE	EQUITY
English Language Arts	Not Met Dashboard: Very Low	Not Met Dashboard: 0 of 3 student groups ≥ Low	Met Dashboard: Red CORE: Average	Not Met Dashboard: 1 of 3 student groups ≥ Orange
Mathematics	Not Met Dashboard: Very Low	Not Met Dashboard: 0 of 3 student groups ≥ Low	Not Met Dashboard: Red CORE: Below Average	Not Met Dashboard: 0 of 3 student groups ≥ Orange
English Learner Progress	Met Dashboard: Low	N/A	Met Dashboard: Yellow	N/A
Suspension	Met Dashboard: High	Met Dashboard: 4 of 4 student groups ≥ Low	Not Met Dashboard: Red	Met Dashboard: 2 of 4 student groups ≥ Orange
Chronic Absenteeism	Met	Met	N/A	N/A

⁷ The CORE Academic Growth Model measures the year-over-year growth of students on state tests, compared to similar students across the state based on prior test score history and several demographic factors.

	Dashboard: High	Dashboard: 4 of 4 student groups \geq Low		
Graduation	Met Dashboard: Medium	Met Dashboard: 3 of 3 student groups \geq Low	Met Dashboard: Green	Met Dashboard: 3 of 3 student groups \geq Orange
College/Career⁸	N/A	N/A	Met Dashboard: Low	Met Dashboard: 3 of 3 student groups \geq High
Total To meet, school must meet >50% of schoolwide/equity indicators for each year.	Met (Met 64%; 7 of 11)		Met (Met 64%; 7 of 11)	


Source: California School Dashboard; CORE Insights Dashboard

B. Schoolwide Academic Performance

To supplement the information provided in the California School Dashboard, the results from the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (“CAASPP”) Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments (“SBAC”) are provided below. Specifically, the figures include results for both LPS Oakland and OUSD schools which serve students in grades 9-12. As shown below:

- **ELA**
 - Pre-pandemic, LPS Oakland’s proficiency rates were higher than the District average.
 - Post-pandemic, LPS Oakland’s proficiency rates have been declining and have been below the District average. In 2023-24, LPS Oakland’s ELA proficiency rate declined about 2 percentage points and was about 15 percentage points below the District average.

Figure 4: Schoolwide ELA SBAC Results Over Time – LPS Oakland and OUSD (Schools Serving Grades 9-12 Only)*



Source: Downloadable CAASPP Research Files


*Testing for 2019-20 was cancelled due to COVID-19. Testing for 2020-21 was optional.

⁸ Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the College/Career Indicator was not reported in the 2022 California School Dashboard. Therefore, the indicator was not assigned a color in the 2023 California School Dashboard and was reported as “Status only”.

- **Math**

- *LPS Oakland's proficiency rates have been consistently lower than the District average.*
- *Pre-pandemic, LPS Oakland's proficiency rate was following an upward trend.*
- *Post-pandemic, LPS Oakland's proficiency rate declined significantly. In 2023-24, LPS Oakland had a Math proficiency rate of 2% and was about 13 percentage points below the District average.*
- *LPS Oakland's Math proficiency rates are significantly lower than the ELA proficiency rates.*

Figure 5: Schoolwide Math SBAC Results Over Time – LPS Oakland and OUSD (Schools Serving Grades 9-12 Only)*



Source: Downloadable CAASPP Research Files

*Testing for 2019-20 was cancelled due to COVID-19. Testing for 2020-21 was optional.

C. Key Student Group Academic Performance

The following comparison of academic performance is included to assess whether the Charter School's educational program is sound for *all* students. The figures below compare the school's performance on the ELA and Math SBAC to the District average for the respective student groups (including only schools which serve students in grades 9-12 for the following student groups: Socioeconomically disadvantaged students, Hispanic/Latino students, students with disabilities, and English Learners). Please note, despite the comparisons below, students within the same group may be quite different from one another (e.g. severity of disability for special education students, progress levels for English Learners). Additionally, results for the California Alternate Assessments (CAAs) were not included as LPS Oakland did not surpass the required threshold of tested students and, therefore, no data is available. As shown in the figures below:


- **ELA**

- *Pre-pandemic, LPS Oakland's Hispanic or Latino and Socioeconomically disadvantaged student groups were outperforming the District's respective student groups. Post-pandemic, LPS Oakland's Hispanic or Latino and Socioeconomically disadvantaged student group performance declined over four consecutive years and were below the District's respective student groups.*
- *In both 2022-23 and 2023-24, English Learners had a proficiency rate of 0% in ELA.*

- **Math**

- *Post-pandemic, proficiency for LPS Oakland’s Hispanic or Latino and Socioeconomically disadvantaged student groups declined for four consecutive years, each year averaging below the District’s respective student groups in Math.*
- *In both 2022-23 and 2023-24, English Learners had a proficiency rate of 0% in Math.*

Figure 6: 2023 SBAC Results Over Time by Student Group – LPS Oakland and OUSD (Schools serving Grades 9-12) Only)*



Source: Downloadable CAASPP Research Files

D. 2023 CORE Growth


As explained previously, the CORE Growth metric measures the year-over-year growth of students on state tests, compared to similar students across the state based on prior test score history and several demographic factors. The growth percentile indicates the percentage of similar students that students at the school outperformed (i.e. 50th percentile indicates average growth). CORE categorizes growth percentile rankings as follows:

- “Below Average” or “Low” growth: 30% or below
- “Average” or “Medium” growth: above 30% and less than or equal to 70%
- “Above Average” or “High” growth: above 70%

Due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on state testing, CORE growth measures are only available for 2023, not 2022. Therefore, the figures below represent the 2023 CORE growth measures at LPS Oakland. As shown below:


- **Math:** Students at LPS Oakland had average growth in math compared with similar students, with growth estimated to be in the 21st percentile. Students are estimated to have grown 17 scale score points fewer than similar students.
- **ELA:** Students at LPS Oakland had average growth in ELA compared with similar students, with growth estimated to be in the 43rd percentile. Students are estimated to have grown 4 scale score points fewer than similar students.

Figure 7: 2023 Math CORE Growth by Grade Span and Grade



Source: CORE Insights Dashboard

Figure 8: 2023 ELA CORE Growth by Grade Span and Grade




Source: CORE Insights Dashboard

E. Graduation Metrics

The figures below compare the four-year cohort graduation and A-G graduation rates between OUSD and LPS Oakland. As shown below:


- LPS Oakland's four-year cohort graduation rate and A-G graduation rates have been higher than the OUSD graduation and A-G rate for all years of the charter term, with the exception of their A-G rate in 2021-22.
 - In 2023-24, LPS Oakland's A-G graduation rate fell about 30 percentage points.
- In 2023-24, LPS Oakland's four-year cohort graduation was higher than its respective OUSD rate for all key student groups.

Figure 9: Four Year Graduation Rate – Charter School and OUSD




Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

Figure 10: Four Year A-G Graduation Rate – Charter School and OUSD⁹



Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

Figure 11: 2023-24 Four Year Graduation and A-G Rate – Charter School and OUSD



Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

F. English Learner Progress


In the 2018-19, 2021-22, 2022-23, and 2023-24 school years, LPS Oakland tested 106, 85, 98, and 71 students on the Summative English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPAC), respectively. The figure below shows the percentage of

⁹ The A-G Rate in 2021-22 was impacted by an error in uploading CALPADS reports.

these students who progressed at least one English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) level, maintained ELPI level 4, maintained lower ELPI levels, and decreased at least one ELPI level. As shown below:

- In 2023-24, approximately 28.2% of English Learner students at LPS Oakland made progress towards English language proficiency, representing an 11.6% decrease from 2022-23.
- As shown in the graph below, the percentage of English Learner students at LPS Oakland making progress towards English language proficiency has decreased each year for which data is available.

Figure 12: Summative ELPAC Results



Source: California School Dashboard

G. Renewal Site Visit Summary

School Quality Review Rubric Report

Charter school renewal site visits are guided by the District’s School Quality Review (SQR) process. The process is based on a rubric¹⁰ which describes three key domains (Mission and Vision, Quality Program Implementation, and Collective Leadership and Professional Learning) which are further broken into three threads (Instruction, Culture, and Systems and Structures). In order to gather evidence for each of these domains, the OUSD Review Team conducted classroom observations, document reviews, an interview with Charter School leadership, and focus groups with students, families, and teachers. Following the renewal site visit, the OUSD Review Team rated each domain and sub-domain collaboratively using the SQR Rubric Ratings range from 1 (low) to 4 (high): 1 = Emerging, 2 = Developing, 3 = Implementing, and 4 = Sustaining.

Figure 13: Renewal Site Visit Summary

LPS Oakland Renewal Site Visit, October 15, 2024			
OUSD Review Team: Kelly Krag Arnold (OCS Director), Madison Thomas (OCS Deputy Director), Guadalupe Nuño (OCS Community Liaison), Marwa Doost (OCS Compliance Specialist), Jason Yamashiro (Academic Consultant)			
SQR Domains and Threads	Domain 1: Mission and Vision	Domain 2: Quality Program Implementation	Domain 3: Collective Leadership and Professional Learning
Thread A: Instruction	2.5	2.6	2.4

¹⁰ The School Quality Review Rubric can be found here: <https://www.ousd.org/officeofcharterschools/for-charter-school-staff/charter-petitions#renewal>

Thread B: Culture	2.6	2.3	2.7
Thread C: Systems and Structures	2.5	2.5	2.2

Within each Domain and Thread in the SQR Rubric, there are multiple “sub-domains”. The following represent the three highest rated and the three lowest rated sub-domains for LPS Oakland .

Figure 14: Highest and Lowest Rated SQR Sub-Domains

Highest Rated Sub-Domains		
Score	Sub-Domain	Description of Sub-Domain
3.2	2A.4 Engaging Extra Curricular and Enrichment Opportunities	Students have access to enrichment opportunities that nurture their sense of joy and curiosity, honor their identities, and provide an outlet for creative expression.
3.0	2C.2 Safety	The school has a comprehensive safety plan that is focused on building and implementing systems and structures to ensure a physically safe campus. The plan includes an articulated crisis plan to respond to immediate and acute emergencies. All members of the school community know what to do in case of emergency and report feeling safe on the campus.
3.0	3B.2 Communication Practices	The school utilizes timely and effective communication practices with staff, students and families to convey important messages, decisions and potential impact through newsletters, website and other media. The school has established norms for communication and for dealing with conflict, including restorative practices for adults to learn from conflict.
Lowest Rated Sub-Domains		
Score	Sub-Domain	Description of Sub-Domain
1.4	3C.3 Family Partnership Structures	Family members have authentic leadership roles at the school, are involved in decision-making, and feel ownership for the success of the school. Family partnership structures cultivate parent leadership across the school to build and nurture academic partnership and increase communication with families linked to learning. Families are informed and engaged to be active participants and contributors to their child’s education. The school provides equitable language access to ensure that all families can participate in meetings, events, parent-teacher conferences, etc.
2.0	1A.3: Ambitious Student Learning Goals	The school has an ambitious set of long and short term student outcomes for cognitive and social-emotional growth and achievement. These outcomes can be measured using available standards-aligned state and local assessments and/or other relevant measures of student success.
2.0	2A.1 Quality Standards-Based Curriculum and Instruction	High quality instructional materials are consistently used to provide daily standards-based instruction, with a focus on differentiation and equity. Curriculum is grade-level appropriate, language rich, well-sequenced, and coherently builds student understanding within and across grade levels/disciplines. School has clear expectations for implementation of the standards-aligned, high quality curriculum, including integrated and designated ELD, and systems to support teachers and hold them accountable for implementation.

Renewal Site Visit Strengths and Areas for Improvement

The OUSD Review Team noted the following strengths and areas for improvement based on the evidence collected throughout the site visit.

Strengths:

1. There is a strong positive social culture among LPS Oakland students that is reflected in attendance data and in the way students support each other at school.

2. The college and career pathways at LPS Oakland have shown growth in the past year. They are better defined and student enrollment and engagement in the pathways classes is improved.
3. Site and CMO leadership state that they survey and talk with students and teachers often to elicit feedback on a number of school site programs and issues. This feedback is listened to and results in improvements at LPS Oakland.

Areas for Improvement

1. The school has had significant leadership turnover, with principals leaving mid-year during the current and last school years.
2. There has been a significant enrollment decline at LPS Oakland in recent years that threatens the programmatic opportunities at the site. While leadership is implementing plans to increase enrollment, additional actions need to be considered to support increased enrollment.
3. Parent involvement and leadership were identified as a challenging area by multiple stakeholder groups. Continued efforts need to be taken to increase parent involvement and develop parent leadership at LPS Oakland.
4. In order to improve from very low performance on 11th grade SBAC, LPS Oakland needs to continue to build teacher capacity to teach in ways that strengthen student engagement with grade level content.

H. Additional Verified Data Provided by the School

Verified Data Background

For schools in the Middle or Low renewal tiers, Education Code requires that the District consider clear and convincing evidence, demonstrated by verified data, showing either of the following:

- The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school; or
- Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.

The California State Board of Education ("SBE") adopted a list¹¹ of academic progress indicators and post-secondary indicators that met the established criteria outlined in Education Code Section 47607.2 and that may be used in the renewal process. Assessments or data sources that are not on this list may not be used as verified data. To be eligible for inclusion as verified data, a data source must include the results of at least 95 percent of eligible students.

The Charter School provided the District with NWEA MAP Growth data for grades 9-12 to be considered as academic progress indicators, for the purposes of verified data. The Charter School also provided the District with the Charter School's National Student Clearinghouse StudentTracker packet and the California Department of Education DataQuest College-Going Rate to be considered as postsecondary indicators, for the purposes of verified data. Upon review, LPS Oakland did surpass the 95 percent participation threshold for all verified data submissions, and thus, the District's analysis is included below. Additionally, the Charter School's Performance Report, included in the renewal petition, includes the Charter School's own analysis of the results.

Verified Data Analysis – NWEA MAP (Grades 9-12), Academic Progress Indicator

NWEA MAP utilizes Conditional Growth Index (CGI) values for individual students or groups of students. The CGI is an indicator of how much individual students or groups of student growth deviates from their respective norms. A CGI of zero means a student showed gains that were equivalent to the growth norms. A positive CGI means a student's growth was above the norm, while a negative CGI means a student's growth was below the norm. **For both the student and school CGI values, a CGI range of –0.2 to 0.2 (or greater) could be used as an approximation of one year's growth (or**

¹¹ A full list of the adopted academic progress and postsecondary indicators can be found here: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/verifdataacadprogress.asp>

more) in a subject and indicates that the growth observed is generally consistent with the amount of growth observed by students in the same grade and subject with the same starting achievement level receiving a similar amount of instructional exposure. Figure 15 below shows LPS Oakland's school CGI values by grade level and student group, respectively. Figure 16 below shows the percentage of students with a student CGI value of -0.2 or higher. According to this data, the analysis is below:

- In 2023-24, LPS Oakland's school CGI values varied among grade levels and student groups. While a majority of LPS Oakland's Math grade-level CGI values were below the -0.2 threshold that is used to approximate one year's growth, a majority of LPS Oakland's Reading grade-level CGI values were above the -0.2 threshold.
- Similarly, the percentage of students above the -0.2 threshold varied across grade levels and student groups. Overall, 50% of students showed one year's progress in Math and 55% of students showed one year's progress in Reading.

Figure 15: 2023-2024 School CGI Values by Grade Level and Student Group; MAP Growth by NWEA, Grades 9-12

		Math 2023-2024	Reading 2023-2024
All Students	9	1.35	-0.26
	10	-0.88	0.68
	11	-2.41	-1.62
	12	-0.26	-0.11
	All grades	-0.15	-0.12
ELL	9	5.50	-0.98
	10	-1.58	1.51
	11	-1.51	-0.83
	12	-0.11	-0.12
SED	9	1.53	0.61
	10	-1.44	0.42
	11	-3.30	-1.80
	12	0.07	-0.06

Source: Verified Data submitted by LPS Oakland to OUSD

Figure 16: 2023-2024 Percent of Students with a Student CGI Value of -0.2 or Higher by Grade Level and Student Group; MAP Growth by NWEA, Grades 9-12

		Math 2023-2024	Reading 2023-2024
All Students	9	50%	52%
	10	39%	64%
	11	43%	33%
	12	56%	55%
	All grades	50%	55%
ELL	9	63%	56%
	10	38%	69%
	11	20%	33%
	12	47%	40%
SED	9	50%	55%
	10	38%	57%
	11	41%	38%
	12	51%	41%
		Percent Met Projected Growth	Percent Met Projected Growth

Source: Verified Data submitted by LPS Oakland to OUSD

Verified Data Analysis – National Student Clearinghouse StudentTracker, Postsecondary Indicator


The National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) offers longitudinal data to analyze the outcomes of high school graduates through its StudentTracker report. This data can be used to track and analyze the college enrollment, persistence, and completion of high school students at postsecondary institutions. Per the California State Board of Education November 2020 Agenda Item #14, *“In the Charter School Data Landscape Survey, stakeholders reported using the NSC High School Benchmarks reports...the report presents charts on national results by high schools that serve different student populations, including high-poverty, low-income, and high-minority schools. In addition, the report provides data results for individual high schools, including public charter high schools, to use to better understand the meaning of their students’ college access and persistence outcomes.”* In order to evaluate evidence of strong postsecondary outcomes equal to similar peers, the District considered the Charter School’s comparisons as well as comparisons to District schools in the Charter School’s High School attendance area, Castlemont/CCPA/Madison, for additional context.

College Enrollment

Figures 17 and 18 below show the percentage of students enrolled in college the first Fall immediately after high school and percentage of students enrolled in college at any time during the first year after high school, respectively. According to this data, the analysis is below:


- For the graduating classes of 2022 and 2023, LPS Oakland’s first Fall college enrollment rate is below the national high poverty schools average, though is similar to the comparison OUSD District schools, with the exception of Coliseum College Prep Academy.

Figure 17: College Enrollment the first Fall after High School, National Student Clearinghouse



Source: Verified Data submitted by LPS Oakland to OUSD; National Student Clearinghouse StudentTracker

Figure 18: College Enrollment Any Time the First Year after High School, National Student Clearinghouse



Source: Verified Data submitted by LPS Oakland to OUSD; National Student Clearinghouse StudentTracker

College Persistence

Figure 19 below shows the percent of students enrolled in college the first year after high school who returned for a second year, or freshmen to sophomore year persistence. According to this data, the analysis is below:

- *The freshman to sophomore year persistence for LPS Oakland's graduating class of 2021 was higher than their comparison OUSD District schools as well as the national high poverty schools average.*

Figure 19: Freshman to Sophomore Year Persistence, National Student Clearinghouse

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
LPS	79%	84%	71%	69%	58%	80%
Castlemont	68%	73%	64%	50%		51%
CCPA	81%	84%	78%	78%	80%	79%
Madison Park 6-12		72%	78%	74%		74%
High Poverty Schools	77%	76%	76%	73%	72%	76%

Source: Verified Data submitted by LPS Oakland to OUSD; National Student Clearinghouse StudentTracker

College Completion

Figure 20 below shows the percent of the 2016 and 2017 high school graduate class who completed a degree within six years. According to this data, the analysis is below:

- *LPS Oakland's graduate class of 2016 and 2017 had a higher completion rate than the national high poverty, and with the exception of CCPA's 2016 class, had a higher completion rate than their comparison OUSD District Schools.*

Figure 20: Six Year Completion Rate, National Student Clearinghouse*

2016	LPS	28.0%
	Castlemont	10.0%
	CCPA	43.0%
	High Poverty Schools	25.0%
2017	LPS	40.0%
	Castlemont	10.0%
	CCPA	30.0%
	Madison Park 6-12	22.0%
	High Poverty Schools	25.0%

Source: Verified Data submitted by LPS Oakland to OUSD; National Student Clearinghouse StudentTracker

*There is no data available of Madison Park 6-12's 2016 Six Year Completion rate.

Verified Data Analysis – CDE College-Going Rate, Postsecondary Indicator

As defined by the CDE, the College-Going Rate (CGR) is the percentage of California public high school students who completed high school and enrolled in any public or private postsecondary institution within 12 or 16 months of completing high school. The CDE's online data reporting system, DataQuest, allows users to search for the CGR by school, district, county, and state. The data is reported by race and ethnicity, student group, and multiyear. Similar to the National Student Clearinghouse analyses, in order to evaluate evidence of strong postsecondary outcomes equal to similar peers, the District considered the Charter School's comparisons as well as comparisons to District schools in the Charter School's High School attendance area, Castlemont/CCPA/Madison, for additional context.

College Enrollment

Figure 21 and 22 below shows the College-Going Rate for LPS Oakland and the 9 District and charter high schools in the Castlemont/CCPA/Madison high school attendance area. According to this data, the analysis is below:


- In 2021-22, LPS Oakland's College-Going Rate was higher than 3 of 9 comparison schools.
- In 2021-22, LPS Oakland's College-Going Rate was lower than the weighted average of all the comparison school's College-Going Rate across all student groups.

Figure 21: College Going Rate for LPS and 9 high schools in the Castlemont/CCPA/Madison High School Attendance Area, CDE

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
LPS	74.5%	72.2%	70.9%	74.1%	63.7%	53.2%	55.7%	50.0%
Aspire Golden State	70.0%	77.6%	69.2%	71.2%	67.7%	60.0%	45.1%	53.1%
Bay Area Technology	68.2%	63.6%	50.0%	56.7%	57.1%	27.3%	50.0%	42.9%
Castlemont High	55.7%	49.0%	54.0%	40.2%	48.5%	35.0%	34.9%	37.3%
CCPA	69.8%	90.6%	66.7%	65.2%	69.0%	59.4%	52.5%	74.2%
Lighthouse High	76.5%	79.3%	63.3%	71.9%	74.6%	72.9%	64.1%	66.7%
Madison Park 6-12			49.0%	67.2%	46.3%	55.8%	50.0%	50.0%
Oakland Charter High	81.8%	80.6%	64.9%	74.5%	69.5%	64.5%	67.0%	77.9%
Oakland Unity High	65.2%	82.0%	62.7%	64.3%	59.7%	61.0%	52.2%	63.0%
Aspire Lionel Wilson	70.4%	84.3%	69.4%	70.7%	66.0%	50.9%	49.2%	41.4%

Source: Verified Data submitted by LPS Oakland to OUSD; CDE DataQuest

Figure 22: College Going Rate for LPS vs. Weighted Average for HSAA Comparison Schools*



Source: Verified Data submitted by LPS Oakland to OUSD; CDE DataQuest

*Includes 9 schools that serve high school grades in the Castlemont/CCPA/Madison HSAA

I. Performance Improvement Plan

Charter schools meeting the Low renewal tier criteria may only be renewed if the District determines that the charter school is taking meaningful steps to address the underlying cause(s) of low performance, which are or will be written in a plan adopted by the charter school's governing board.¹² The OUSD Office of Charter Schools created an optional

¹² EC §47607.2(a)

template for these plans, which notes that a comprehensive Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) should address the following:¹³

- **Performance:** All Red and Orange California School Dashboard indicators (including all school-wide and individual student group indicators) from either of the most recent two years of California School Dashboard data.
- **Operations:** The charter school’s finances, enrollment and/or ADA, demographics of student population, and/or board health and effectiveness, as necessary.

Although LPS Oakland did not use the OUSD template, a performance improvement plan was adopted by the LPS Oakland’s governing board on October 10, 2024, and is included in the Charter School’s petition. The PIP lists five goals (“PIP Goals”) and five focal areas (“PIP Focal Areas”). The five PIP Goals are shown in the figure below, and each has an associated “action plan” in the PIP.

Figure 23: LPS Oakland Performance Improvement Plan Goals

PIP Goals
Academic Performance: Improve student academic performance by fostering deeper engagement through meaningful learning experiences that connect curriculum to real-world applications, promote active participation, and support personalized pathways to success.
Family and Student Engagement: Improve systems to foster family and student engagement in school programs and enhance practices to promote a positive and a caring learning environment for all students.
Interventions: Remove barriers to attendance, learning, and graduation by offering wellness counseling, Tier 2 interventions, and credit recovery opportunities to students who are experiencing trauma, mental health challenges, or academic learning gaps.
Enrollment: Implement a comprehensive Enrollment Plan designed to share the educational program and philosophy with educational partners, community members and families, to reflect how LPS Oakland will meet students' specific learning, academic, and social-emotional needs and provide them with a quality education in a safe, culturally relevant, and caring school environment.
Student Population: Increase the enrollment and retention of African American students at LPS Oakland by implementing targeted outreach, engagement, and culturally supportive strategies.

Source: Performance Improvement Plan submitted with Renewal Petition

The five PIP Goals identify some of the most critical areas for the Charter School to address across both academic and non-academic factors, and the associated action plans provide additional detail on implementation and, for the most part, include clearly defined timelines and roles. However, the PIP Goals and associated action plans have few specific and measurable metrics or growth targets and minimal baseline data, making it difficult to measure the progress or success of each goal. Additionally, the action plans rely greatly on robust and consistent staffing, which has been one of the school’s primary challenges over the last several years.

In addition to the five PIP Goals and their associated action plans, as described above, the PIP includes five PIP Focal Areas, each with growth targets. While some of these PIP Focal Areas align with the PIP Goals, some do not. A summary and analysis of each of the Charter School’s PIP Focal Areas is included below.

PIP Focal Area 1: Increase Academic Performance on the CA Dashboard in English Language Arts

The Charter School used 2023 Dashboard data for their baseline for Focal Area 1, with Year 1 and Year 2 targets based on the 2025 and 2026 Dashboards, respectively. OCS has added the column with 2024 Dashboard data below for

¹³ The OUSD Charter Renewal Performance Improvement Plan Template can be found at: <https://www.ousd.org/officeofcharterschools/for-charter-school-staff/charter-petitions#renewal>.

additional context. The school additionally included targets for Dashboard Status and Color. However, the PIP incorrectly associated each “status” and “color”. For example, the school set a year 1 goal for a status of “Very Low (Orange)”; however, “Very Low” should be “Red”, as shown in Appendix B. The school’s Dashboard goals are therefore unclear and are not included in the figure below. The school also included goals for NWEA MAP testing for some, but not all, student groups, which can be found in the school’s full PIP included in the renewal petition.

Figure 24: PIP Focal Area 1 - ELA Growth Targets

Student Group	Metric	School Baseline (2023 Dashboard)	2024 Dashboard*	Year 1 Goal (2025 Dashboard)	Year 2 Goal (2026 Dashboard)
All students	Percent Proficient	22%	20.4%	27% (+5% from 2023)	32% (+10% from 2023)
	DFS	-66.9	-89.1	-56.9 (+10 from 2023)	-44.9 (+22 from 2023)
English Learners	Percent Proficient	0%†	0%	13% (+13% from 2023)†	23% (+20% from 2023)
	DFS	-116.4	-154.6	-101.4 (+15 from 2023)	-86.4 (+30 from 2023)
	English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)**	39.8%	28.2%	43.8% (+5% from 2023)	48.8% (+10% from 2023)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Percent Proficient	24.6%†	22.9%	27% (+2% from 2023)	32% (+10% from 2023)
	DFS	-63.6	-81.5	-53.6 (+10 from 2023)	-43.6 (+20 from 2023)
Hispanic	Percent Proficient	23%	20.0%	23% (+5% from 2023)	34% (+10% from 2023)
	DFS	-66.7	-87.7	-56.7 (+10 from 2023)	-44.7 (+20 from 2023)

Source: Performance Improvement Plan submitted with Renewal Petition; California State Dashboard; CAASPP

*The 2024 Dashboard results were not included in the PIP but were included in this table for further context.

**The ELPI is a separate indicator from the ELA Indicator, but was included in this table in the PIP.

†The school used incorrect numbers in the PIP. Instead of showing incorrect numbers as written in the PIP, OUSD provided correct numbers here.

Schoolwide ELA proficiency declined between baseline year (2023) and 2024. As such, the targets outlined by the school of a 5% increase in proficiency may be realistic, yet ambitious. However, English Learners are the only group with a 10% growth target each year, rather than 5%, and the PIP does not provide additional context for why and how this student group is expected to make more progress towards proficiency than the school as a whole. Additionally, as stated above, the PIP identifies Dashboard color and status goals that are contradictory (for example, a goal of “Low (Yellow)”, and thus OCS is not able to evaluate this part of the PIP’s goals.

PIP Focal Area 2: Increase Academic Performance on the CA Dashboard in Mathematics

The Charter School used 2023 Dashboard data for their baseline for PIP Focal Area 2, with Year 1 and Year 2 targets based on the 2025 and 2026 Dashboards, respectively. OCS has added the column with 2024 Dashboard data below for additional context. The school additionally included targets for Dashboard Status and Color. However, the PIP incorrectly associated each “status” and “color”. For example, the school set a year 1 goal for a status of “Very Low (Orange)”; however, “Very Low” should be “Red”, as shown in Appendix B. The school’s Dashboard goals are therefore unclear and are not included in the figure below. The school also included goals for NWEA MAP testing for some, but not all, student groups, which can be found in the school’s full PIP included in the renewal petition.

Figure 25: PIP Focal Area 2 - Math Growth Targets

Student Group	Metric	School Baseline (2023 Dashboard)	2024 Dashboard*	Year 1 Goal (2025 Dashboard)	Year 2 Goal (2026 Dashboard)
All students	Percent Proficient	3.7%	2.0%	9% (+5% from 2023)	14% (+10% from 2023)

	DFS	-177.8	-191.1	-167.8 (+10 from 2023)	-157.8 (+20 from 2023)
English Learners	Percent Proficient	0%	0%	5% (+10% from 2023)	10% (+20% from 2023)
	DFS	-218.4	-240.4	-208.4 (+10 from 2023)	-198.4 (+20 from 2023)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Percent Proficient	3.1%†	2.9%	7% (+4% from 2023)†	12% (+10% from 2023)
	DFS	-162	-174.4	-152 (+10 from 2023)	-142 (+20 from 2023)
Hispanic	Percent Proficient	3%	2.2%	8% (+5% from 2023)	13% (+10% from 2023)
	DFS	-180.3	-189.9	-170.3 (+10 from 2023)	-160.3 (+20 from 2023)

Source: Performance Improvement Plan submitted with Renewal Petition; California State Dashboard; CAASPP

*The 2024 Dashboard results were not included in the PIP but were included in this table for further context.

†The school used incorrect numbers in the PIP. Instead of showing incorrect numbers as written in the PIP, OUSD is provided correct numbers here.

Schoolwide Math proficiency declined between the Charter School’s baseline year (2023) and 2024. As such, the targets outlined by the school, of 5% growth in proficiency each year, may be realistic, yet ambitious. Additionally, as stated above, the PIP identifies Dashboard color and status goals that are contradictory (for example, a goal of “Low (Yellow)”, and thus OCS is not able to evaluate this part of the PIP’s goals.

PIP Focal Area 3: Reduce suspension rates on the CA Dashboard

The Charter School used 2023 Dashboard data for their baseline for Focus Area 3, with Year 1 and Year 2 targets based on the 2025 and 2026 Dashboards, respectively. OCS has added the column with 2024 Dashboard data below for additional context. The school additionally included targets for Dashboard Status and Color. However, the PIP incorrectly associated each “status” and “color”. For example, the school set a year 1 goal for a status of “Medium (Green)”; however, “Medium” should be “Yellow” for the Suspension Indicator, as shown in Appendix B

Figure 26: PIP Focal Area 3 - Suspension Rate Targets

Student Group	School Baseline (2023 Dashboard)	2024 Dashboard*	Year 1 Goal (2025 Dashboard)	Year 2 Goal (2026 Dashboard)
English Learners	7.5%	6.2%	4% (-3.5% from 2023)	1% (-6.5% from 2023)
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	6.9%	4.4%	4% (-2.9% from 2023)	1% (-5.9% from 2023)
Hispanic	7.7%	4.7%	4% (-3.7% from 2023)	1% (-6.7% from 2023)
Students with Disabilities	8.3%	8.6%	4% (-4.3% from 2023)	1% (-7.3% from 2023)

Source: Performance Improvement Plan submitted with Renewal Petition; California State Dashboard

*The 2024 Dashboard results were not included in the PIP but were included in this table for further context.

The goal of a 1% suspension rate for each of the four identified student groups in 2026 will be extremely challenging and may be unrealistic. It should also be noted that the suspension rate for students with disabilities increased between 2023 and 2024, making the reduction in years 1 and 2 even more challenging. While ambitious, such rapid reductions in the suspension rates will require comprehensive changes at the schoolwide level. Additionally, as stated above, the PIP identifies Dashboard color and status goals that are contradictory (for example, a goal of “Medium (Green)”, and thus OCS is not able to evaluate this part of the PIP’s goals.

Focal Area 4: Increase LPS Oakland enrollment

The Charter School used 2023-24 enrollment data for their baseline for PIP Focal Area 4, with Year 1 and Year 2 targets based on the 2025-26 and 2026-27 enrollment, respectively. 2024-25 census day enrollment is included below for additional context. The Charter School’s baseline data, as reported in the PIP, contains significant errors in reporting the actual Census Day data – for example, the PIP shows that there were 41 12th graders enrolled in 2023-24, but the actual number was 72. OUSD has provided the correct numbers in the “2023-24 Enrollment” column.

Figure 27: PIP Focal Area 4 - Enrollment Targets

	2023-24 Enrollment (School Baseline)	2024-25 Census Day Enrollment*	Year 1 Goal (2025-26 Enrollment)	Year 2 Goal (2026-27 Enrollment)
Grade 9	48†	47	47 (-1 from 2023-24)	50 (+2 from 2023-24)
Grade 10	41†	46	46 (+5 from 2023-24)	48 (+7 from 2023-24)
Grade 11	57†	39	42 (-15 from 2023-24)	42 (-15 from 2023-24)
Grade 12	72†	40	40 (-32 from 2023-24)	40 (-32 from 2023-24)
Total	218†	172	175 (-43 from 2023-24)	180 (-38 from 2023-24)

Source: Performance Improvement Plan submitted with Renewal Petition; 2024-25 Census Day Enrollment Spreadsheet submitted to OUSD

*The 2024-25 enrollment totals were not included in the PIP, but were included in this table for further context.

†The school used incorrect numbers in the PIP. Instead of showing incorrect numbers as written in the PIP, OUSD is provided correct numbers here.

The enrollment growth targets in the PIP are minimal. In particular, the projected 9th grade class sizes – which are the primary path for future enrollment stability – maintain approximately the current enrollment level. However, given the recent years of substantial year-over-year enrollment decline, maintaining current levels could be considered a relatively ambitious target.

Focal Area 5: Increase LPS Oakland’s student demographics to reflect the diversity of the local community

The Charter School used 2023-24 enrollment data for their baseline for PIP Focal Area 5, with Year 1 and Year 2 targets based on the 2025-26 and 2026-27 enrollment, respectively.

Figure 28: PIP Focal Area 5 - Student Demographics

	2023-24 Enrollment (School Baseline)	2024-25 Enrollment	Year 1 Goal (2025-26 Enrollment)	Year 2 Goal (2026-27 Enrollment)
African American students enrolled	7	6	11 (+4 from 2023-24)	16 (+9 from 2023-24)
Total school enrollment	218	172	175	180
Percent African American students enrolled	3%	3%	6% (+3% from 2023-24)	9% (+6% from 2023-24)

Source: Performance Improvement Plan submitted with Renewal Petition; 2024-25 Census Day Enrollment Spreadsheet submitted to OUSD

*The 2024-25 enrollment totals were not included in the PIP but were included in this table for further context.

The Charter School’s goal to increase the number and percentage of African American students enrolled at LPS Oakland shows a commendable commitment to increasing diversity and African American student representation, particularly given that the number of African American students dropped between 2023-24 and 2024-25, according to the school. However, they will require robust, proactive strategies to recruit and retain a more diverse student body.

Conclusion

The Charter School's PIP addresses most necessary performance indicators with, for the most part, suitably ambitious goals. The four goals that are not performance-related also have thorough action plans that outline project ownership, resource requirements, timelines, and monitoring approaches. However, most action plans lack measurable baseline data and measurable growth targets, as well as a misalignment of Dashboard status and color ratings, which significantly undermines the ability to assess their potential impact. Additionally, the PIP overlooks crucial organizational challenges such as leadership instability and teacher recruitment/retention, which appear to be a significant part of the underlying reason for the school's enrollment and performance decline.

If the Charter School is renewed, the school will be expected to meet all Year 1 goals from their PIP prior to submitting a renewal petition for a renewal term beginning in July 2027.

II. Renewal Criteria II: Is the Charter School Demonstrably Likely to Successfully Implement the Proposed Educational Program?


In order for a charter school's renewal petition to be approved, it must be demonstrably likely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.¹⁴ Evidence considered for this criterion include an analysis of the Charter School's financial condition, enrollment, enrollment demographics, compliance with regulatory elements (Notices of Concern), board health and effectiveness, and staffing and credentialing.

A. Enrollment

Total Enrollment by Year

Over the course of the charter term, the total enrollment has declined significantly. As of Census Day, October 2, 2024, the Charter School reported an enrollment of 172 for the current school year, representing an approximate 65% decrease from 2019-2020.

Figure 29: Total Enrollment Over Time




Source: 2017-18 through 2023-24 Enrollment – CDE Downloadable School Enrollment Data Files

¹⁴ EC §47605(c)(2)

Enrollment by Grade Level

Figure 30: 2023-24 Enrollment by Grade Level




Source: 2023-24 Enrollment – CDE Downloadable School Enrollment Data Files

Student Retention

The figure below shows the Charter School’s student retention rate, or the percent of students who were at the school in the prior year and returned (excluding graduating grade levels). As shown below, the Charter School’s retention rate has decreased slightly in recent years, but has decreased significantly over the last three years.

Figure 31: Annual Student Retention Rate



Source: Annual Fall Census Day student-level enrollment reports submitted to OUSD

B. Financial Condition

Despite the Charter School’s significant decline in enrollment, LPS is currently in good fiscal standing with a high ending fund balance. Throughout the charter term, there have been no major audit findings, no deficit spending, and the school has maintained a 3% reserve with a debt ratio of less than 1. Its most recent annual financial audit report did not identify any material weaknesses. Its most recent unaudited actuals reported an ending fund balance of \$13,622,747 for the Charter School. However, the school’s 2024-25 Board-approved budget stated a beginning fund balance of \$7,722,645 – a difference of \$5,900,102. LPS responded to OUSD’s inquiry about this discrepancy and stated that the 2024-25 budget was approved by the LPS board prior to the completion of the full accounting of the Prop 51 construction project, and that the 2024-25 First Interim was updated such that the beginning fund balance for 2024-25 matches the 2023-24 unaudited actuals.¹⁵

¹⁵ Full text of LPS response to OUSD inquiry: “During the development of the FY2024-25 Budget presented to the Board on June 20, 2024 for approval and developed during the prior months, the full accounting of the Prop 51 construction project had not been completed, therefore the full revenue, liabilities, and impact on the fund balance were not reflected. During the completion of the FY2023-24 Unaudited Actuals the actual expenses to the Prop 51 Construction and Renovation project

Figure 32: Financial Analysis

Financial Indicator	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24 (unaudited)
Ending Fund Balance <i>Typically represents unrestricted funds, although in some cases, restricted funds that were not fully spent in previous years may be included.</i>	\$966,357	\$1,388,808	\$4,275,999	\$5,935,352	\$7,691,912	\$13,622,747
Deficit Spending <i>Deficit spending is indicated by a number in parentheses. A school's fund balance and reserves are depleted when expenditures exceed revenues, and over time could lead to insolvency.</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Deficit-to-Ending Fund Balance Ratio <i>This ratio measures how large the deficit spending is in relation to the overall fund balance. The larger the ratio, the faster the fund balance is being depleted.</i>	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Debt Ratio <i>A ratio less than 1 indicates the school has lower debts than assets, representing a low level of financial risk.</i>	0.33	0.62	0.48	0.43	0.81	0.55
3% Reserve <i>A minimum 3% reserve is standard as a set aside for to prepare for potential liabilities. Below 3% is indicative of a poor financial condition.</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Audit Opinion <i>"Unmodified" indicates compliance with required accounting standards. "Qualified" indicates there are material misstatements found, where the auditors are unable to obtain sufficient appropriate evidence.</i>	Unmodified	Unmodified	Unmodified	Unmodified	Unmodified	N/A
Major Audit Finding <i>Any major or repeat audit findings are described in the paragraph above.</i>	None	None	None	None	None	N/A

Source: 2018-19 through 2022-23 Annual Audit Reports and 2023-24 unaudited actuals

The enrollment projections in the multi-year budget projection are aligned to the projected enrollment listed in Element 1 of the charter petition. The school's enrollment projections for 2025-26 and 2026-27 rely on a slight enrollment increase from the school's current enrollment of 172 to a projected 175 then 180 students. However, the school's enrollment has declined significantly each of the last five years (see Figure 32 above). The school's budget, which is based on these enrollment projections, therefore may not accurately project the financial reality for the two years of the new charter term, if renewal is granted.

Figure 33: Multi-Year Budget Projection Summary

	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28
Projected Enrollment	175	180	191
Projected ADA	158	162	171
Projected Total LCFF Entitlement	\$2,584,600	\$2,732,743	\$2,950,915
Projected LCFF Entitlement per ADA	\$16,358	\$16,869	\$17,257

Source: Multiyear Budget Projections submitted with Renewal Petition

Similarly, the Charter School's governing board has repeatedly approved budgets that substantially overproject enrollment, resulting in a significant difference between the enrollment on which the adopted budget was based and

were reconciled and subsequently half of the expenses were recognized as revenue and half as the loan liability as outlined by the Prop 51 allocation. The FY 2024-25 First Interim Report has been updated so that the beginning fund balance for FY 2024-25 matches the FY 2023-24 Unaudited Actuals"

the school's actual enrollment. Figure 34 below shows the enrollment in the adopted budget, actual census day enrollment, and the enrollment in the first and second interims for the four most recent school years. The difference between the enrollment on which the adopted budget was based and the actual census day enrollment ranged from approximately 14% in 2021-22 to approximately 20% in each of the last three years. This difference demonstrates a concerning pattern of the school's governing board approving budgets that rely on unrealistic enrollment figures.

Figure 34: Budgeted enrollment at budget adoption compared to action enrollment at Census Day, 1st interim, and 2nd interim

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Budgeted enrollment in adopted budget	510	438	310	217 ¹⁶
Census day enrollment	436	348	218	172
Budgeted enrollment in 1st interim	435	348	221	172
Budgeted enrollment in 2nd interim	436	348	217	n/a

Source: 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25 Budget, First interim, and Second Interim reports submitted to OUSD

Additionally, in the MYP submitted with the petition, the Charter School projects a modest amount of deficit spending for the 2024-25 school year, as well as for both years of the new charter term, if the school is renewed. Given the pattern of overprojecting enrollment for the budget, it may be possible that future deficit spending is higher than projected. However, the school does project to have a significant ending cash balance of approximately \$6.9M in 2025-26 and \$6.5M in 2026-27, despite the projected deficit spending. Even if deficit spending is higher than projected, the school does have a fairly large fund balance to absorb additional deficit spending, if necessary.

C. Enrollment Demographics

Per California Education Code Section 47605(c)(5)(G), a charter school must include in the renewal petition a reasonably comprehensive description of “*the means by which the charter school will achieve a balance of racial and ethnic pupils, special education pupils, and English learner pupils, including redesignated fluent English proficient pupils, that is reflective of the general population residing within the territorial jurisdiction of the school district to which the charter petition is submitted*”. This description is included on page 149 of the charter petition. The current section includes a summary of the school's enrollment demographic data for further context.

Enrollment Demographics Comparison

Enrollment demographics for the 2023-24 school year are included in the table below. Although Education Code specifies that a charter school should aspire to achieve a demographic balance which is reflective of the *entire* District, the average enrollment demographics of the District schools which serve a similar grade span and are located in the High School Attendance Area (HSAA) in which the majority of the Charter School's students reside, Castlemont/CCPA/Madison, is included for reference.

Figure 35: 2023-24 Enrollment Demographics

Student Group Type	Student Group	Charter School	OUSD schools in Comparison HSAA ¹⁷	OUSD
Race/ Ethnicity	Hispanic/Latino	95.0%	73.4%	47.3%
	Black/African American	3.2%	18.5%	20.1%
	Asian	0.5%	1.7%	9.8%

¹⁶ The MYP approved by the LPS governing board and submitted to OUSD uses a projected enrollment of 217 for 2024-25. However, the MYP included in the charter petition uses an enrollment of 175 for 2024-25.

¹⁷ Includes 3 OUSD-operated schools serving students in grades 9-12 located in the Castlemont/CCPA/Madison HSAA. Specifically, Coliseum College Prep, Castlemont High, and Madison Park Academy 6-12.

	White	0.0%	1.3%	11.5%
	Two or More Races	0.5%	1.6%	6.8%
	Other Race/Ethnicity	0.0%	2.1%	1.9%
	Not Reported	0.9%	1.4%	2.6%
Other Student Groups	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	70.6%	99.0%	81.4%
	English Learners	37.2%	43.3%	32.9% (9-12 only: 28.5%)
	Special Education	15.1%	18.3%	16.3% (9-12 only: 18.1%)

Source: Ethnicity/English Learners – CDE Downloadable Data Files (School Enrollment, English Learners); Socioeconomically Disadvantaged/Special Education – CDE DataQuest School Enrollment by Subgroup Report

English Learner Enrollment

As shown previously, during the 2023-24 school year, 37.2% of LPS Oakland's total enrollment were English Learners. The following tables are included to further disaggregate this data to give a fuller context of the English Learners served at LPS Oakland and their level of need. As a note, this data does not provide any indication as to how well the Charter School is serving these students. The English Learner Progress Indicator on the California School Dashboard is a more appropriate metric for evaluating the strength of the English Learner program. As shown below:

- The Charter School has a larger percentage of English Learner students who were placed in a higher ELPAC level compared with OUSD in the same grade span.
- Approximately ½ of the Charter School students, or about 54%, are considered Reclassified Fluent English students.
- The Charter School has significantly lower percentage of students who have been English learners between 0-3 years compared to OUSD, which may suggest fewer newcomer students. The Charter School has a larger percentage of English Learners classified as Long-Term English Learners than OUSD.

Figure 36: 2023-24 ELPAC Levels – Charter School vs. OUSD (Grades 9-12 only)

ELPAC Level	Charter School	OUSD (Grades 9-12 Only)
Level 4 – Well Developed	10.8%	5.7%
Level 3 – Moderately Developed	21.6%	17.7%
Level 2 – Somewhat Developed	50.0%	19.6%
Level 1 – Minimally Developed	17.6%	56.9%

Source: 2023-24 Summative ELPAC Results

Figure 37: 2023-24 Enrollment by English Language Acquisition Status and Grade

Grade	English Only (EO)	Initial Fluent English Proficient (IFEP)	English Learner (EL)	Reclassified Fluent English (RFEP)	To Be Determined (TBD)
9	4.2%	2.1%	39.6%	50.0%	4.2%
10	9.8%	0.0%	43.9%	46.3%	0.0%
11	8.8%	0.0%	35.1%	56.1%	0.0%
12	6.9%	1.4%	33.3%	58.3%	0.0%
Total	7.3%	0.9%	37.2%	53.7%	0.9%

Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

Figure 38: 2023-24 English Learner Breakdown by Grade Span and Category

	EL 0-3 Years	At-Risk 4-5 Years	LTEL 6+ Years	EL 4+ Years Not At-Risk or LTEL
Charter School	7.4%	8.6%	55.6%	28.4%
OUSD (9-12 Only)	39.1%	11.7%	34.9%	14.3%


Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

Special Education Enrollment


As shown previously, during the 2023-24 school year, 15.1% of LPS Oakland’s total enrollment were students with disabilities. The following figures are included to further disaggregate this data to give a fuller context of the students with disabilities served at LPS Oakland and their level of need. As shown below:

- *Approximately 75% of students with disabilities at LPS Oakland have a specific learning disability as the primary disability.*
- *Approximately 82% of students with disabilities at LPS Oakland are in a regular classroom setting for 80 percent or more of the school day. The percentage of students who are in a regular classroom setting for less than 80% of the day is significantly less than the District, at 18.2% compared with 35.3%.*
- *Over 90% of students with disabilities at LPS Oakland are receiving less than 450 service minutes weekly.*

Figure 39: 2023-24 Special Education Enrollment by Disability Type



Source: CALPADS 2023-24 End-of-Year SELPA 16.12 Report - Students with Disabilities – Education Plan by Primary Disability (EOY 4)

Figure 40: 2023-24 Special Education Enrollment by Program Setting

Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

Figure 41: Special Education by Placement and Weekly Service Minutes

	2022-23	2023-24
Percentage of students with IEPs receiving fewer than 450 ¹⁸ service minutes weekly	93.1%	94.4%
Percentage of students with IEPs receiving more than 450 service minutes weekly	6.9%	5.6%
Percentage of students with IEPs in nonpublic school (NPS) placement	0%	0%

Source: Charter School Performance Report

D. Notices of Concern and/or Notices to Cure and Correct

If credible evidence suggests that a charter school has violated state or federal law or the terms of its charter petition, the Office of Charter Schools will send the school, charter school board, or charter management organization a Notice of Concern regarding the issue, which includes remedies the charter school must implement to rectify the issue and resolve the Notice of Concern.¹⁹ LPS Oakland R&D Campus has received 5 Notices of Concern over the course of the current charter term. Furthermore, the Charter School's CMO, Leadership Public Schools, has been issued 1 Notices of Concern during the current charter term.

¹⁸ The 450 minute threshold was chosen as a conservative estimate of the point at which a student may be considered to have moderate needs.

¹⁹ If, after sending a Notice of Concern, the Office of Charter Schools determines that the violation listed in the notice did not occur, the notice may be rescinded. In such instances, the notice is removed from the school's record.

Figure 42: Notices of Concern and/or Notices to Cure and Correct

School Year	Notices of Concern	Area(s) of Concern	Remedy
2017-18	1	Violation of Suspension/Expulsion Policy	LPS Oakland R&D acknowledged the concern and responded to all remedies, including providing the student their due process right and an offer to re-enroll.
2018-19	1	Brown Act Violation	LPS acknowledged the Brown Act Violation and responded to all remedies.
2019-20	1	Violation of Suspension/Expulsion Policy	LPS Oakland R&D acknowledged the concern and responded to all remedies, including aligning its Suspension and Expulsion policies with the District's policy.
2020-21	0		
2021-22	0		
2022-23	2	CALPADS Missed Certification; Enrollment Practices for Students with Disabilities	LPS Oakland R&D acknowledged the concern and established a plan to ensure a timely CALPADS state required submission; LPS Oakland R&D acknowledged the concern and responded to all remedies including offering enrollment to the student and a detailed plan to ensure SPED students are supported on site.
2023-24	1	Enrollment Decline	LPS Oakland acknowledged fiscal concerns and responded to all remedies, including revising current fiscal fund balance accounts for the enrollment decline.

Source: OUSD Office of Charter Schools Notice of Concern documentation

E. Board Health and Effectiveness

A charter school governing board's decisions have a significant impact on the health and viability of its schools, as well as the quality of education students receive. Governing boards are responsible for decisions on the operations, vision, and policies of the charter school. Most importantly, governing boards are also responsible for ensuring that the charter school and its charter management organization (if applicable) is serving the best interest of students. The below table provides an overview of the Leadership Public Schools Governing Board and its composition.

Figure 43: Charter School Governing Board Overview and Composition

Leadership Public Schools Governing Board Overview			
Schools Overseen	3	Total Enrollment of all Schools	1300 students
Required Minimum # of Members	5	Current # of Members	6
Regular Meeting Frequency	Monthly	Committees	None
Leadership Public Schools Governing Board Composition			
Name, Role	Time on Board	Name, Role	Time on Board
Dr. Jennifer Pellegrine, Chair	2.5 years	Dr. Emmanuel Barrera, Vice Chair	2.5 years
Dr. Elizabeth Baham, Member	1.5 years	Vaile Fujikawa, Member	2.5 years
Jocelyn Lee, Member	6 months	Dr. Irene St. Roseman, Member	6 months

Source: Charter School Board Self-Evaluations submitted to OUSD; LPS Board Website; CDE Dataquest

As part of the renewal process, Staff evaluates the governing board’s overall health and effectiveness using the Charter School’s performance report, a governing board interview, governing board audits, a board self-evaluation tool, and Element 4 of the charter renewal petition (along with any supporting documentation). These components are used as evidence in order to evaluate the Charter School governing board on the “Board Effectiveness Core Competencies” found below. The scale used for rating is aligned with the SQR Rubric Ratings, where the scores range from 1 (low) to 4 (high): 1 = Emerging, 2 = Developing, 3 = Implementing, and 4 = Sustaining.

Figure 44: Board Core Competency Ratings

Core Competency	Description	Score
Board Composition	Board members possess a diversity of backgrounds and an array of appropriate and relevant skills with which to oversee the school/CMO.	2.8
Mission Alignment	Board members have a shared understanding of and commitment to the school’s mission and vision.	2.8
School Familiarity	Board members are knowledgeable about the school’s operations, successes, and challenges.	2.4
Role Familiarity	Board members demonstrate an understanding of their role in providing oversight to the charter school.	3.0
Community Engagement	Board members actively engage with school staff, families, and community members in order to govern effectively.	1.4
Accessibility	All governing board meetings are accessible to the community and the decision-making process is clear and transparent.	3.0
Compliance	The board complies with (and has systems in place to ensure compliance with) its own board policies and bylaws as well as with applicable state and federal laws regarding governance. The board is free of real or perceived conflicts of interest.	2.8
Effectiveness	The governing board is an effective decision-making body which is active and meets its governance obligations.	2.8

Source: Staff evaluation of Charter School performance report, Charter School renewal petition, Charter School board member self-evaluations, Charter School board member interview, Charter School board observations

F. Staffing and Teacher Credentialing

Education Code section 47605(l)(1) requires all charter school teachers to hold the credential required for their assignment. Pursuant to Education Code Section 44258.9, all charter schools must participate in annual teacher assignment monitoring through the California Statewide Assignment Accountability System (“CalSAAS”). The OUSD Office of Charter Schools acts as the “Monitoring Authority” for all charter schools authorized by OUSD, which requires the annual review of educator assignments. The figures below represent the CalSAAS results for educator assignments in the 2022-23 school year, the most recent year for which data is available. As shown below:


- *During the 2022-23 school year, the majority of assignments at LPS Oakland were authorized by an educator holding a clear or preliminary credential or by a local assignment option. However, 39.4% of assignments were considered “Ineffective”, or were authorized by an emergency credential, variable term waiver, or substitute permit.*
- *During the 2022-23 school year, there were 41 total misassignments at LPS Oakland out of 96 total assignments.*

Figure 45: 2022-23 Educator Credentials by Type

	Charter School	OUSD
Clear <i>Authorized by clear or preliminary credential or by local assignment option</i>	57.1%	60.9%
Intern <i>Authorized by intern credential</i>	0.0%	3.9%
Out-of-Field <i>Authorized by GELAP, SELAP, short-term waiver, emergency EL permit, or Local Assignment Option</i>	0.0%	1.2%
Ineffective <i>No legal authorization or authorized by emergency credential (PIP, STSP), variable term waivers, or substitute permits</i>	39.4%	31.6%
Incomplete <i>Missing or incorrect information was reported to CALPADS about the assignment</i>	3.5%	2.3%

Source: CDE Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcomes by FTE Report

Figure 46: 2023-24 California Statewide Assignment Accountability System (“CalSAAS”) Results



Source: 2023-24 CalSAAS Monitoring Audit Report

In addition to the CalSAAS results, the Charter School submitted information regarding educator retention as part of its Renewal Performance Report. As shown below:

- *The Charter School has struggled to retain its educators, with over 75% leaving in both 2022-23 and 2023-24.*
- *In recent years, the Charter School has also struggled with educators leaving mid-year, with over 60% of their staff leaving mid-year in 2022-23.*

Figure 47: Educator Retention Over Time (Self-Reported)

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Percent of Educators Retained from Prior Year	47%	78%	76%	50%	24%	18%	54%
Early Separations	2/18	0/21	0/24	5/21	7/11	4/13	-

Source: Charter School Renewal Performance Report

III. Renewal Criteria III: Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?

In order for a charter school’s renewal petition to be approved, the petition must include all of the following, which are described in detail in this section:

- Reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all 15 required elements
- All other information required by the Ed Code
- All OUSD-specific requirements

Evidence considered for this criterion includes a review of the corresponding sections of the charter petition, including changes made from the prior petition, as well as checks for any additional requirements enacted since the charter was last approved.

A. The Required Fifteen Elements

All charter petitions must include a “reasonably comprehensive” description of 15 required elements related to the school’s operation.²⁰ The following table summarizes staff findings related to whether this standard was met for each element.

Figure 48: Petition Element Analysis

Element	Reasonably Comprehensive?
1. Description of the educational program of the school, including what it means to be an “educated person” in the 21st century and how learning best occurs.	Yes
2. Measurable student outcomes	Yes
3. Method by which student progress is to be measured	Yes
4. Governance structure	Yes
5. Qualifications to be met by individuals employed at the school	Yes
6. Procedures for ensuring health and safety of students	Yes
7. Means for achieving a balance of racial and ethnic, English learner, and special education students	Yes
8. Admission policies and procedures	Yes
9. Manner for conducting annual, independent financial audits and manner in which audit exceptions and deficiencies will be resolved	Yes
10. Suspension and expulsion procedures	Yes
11. Manner for covering STRS, PERS, or Social Security	Yes
12. Attendance alternatives for students residing within the district	Yes
13. Employee rights of return, if any	Yes
14. Dispute resolution procedure for school-authorizer issues	Yes
15. Procedures for school closure	Yes

Source: Ed Code §47605(c)(5) subsection (A) thru (O) and staff analysis of the charter renewal petition

²⁰ EC §47605(c)(5)

B. Other Required Information

In addition to the required 15 elements, the Education Code also requires all charter petitions to include the following information.

Figure 49: Other Required Information

Required Information	Included in Petition?
An affirmation of each of the conditions described in EC §47605(h).	Yes
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 Government Code §3540 thru 3540.2.	Yes
Information regarding the proposed operation and potential effects of the charter school on the authorizer, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The facilities to be used by the charter school, including specifically where the charter school intends to locate.• The manner in which administrative services of the charter school are to be provided.• Potential civil liability effects, of the charter school on the authorizer.	Yes
Financial statements that include the annual operating budget and 3-year cashflow and financial projections, backup and supporting documents and budget assumptions (i.e. anticipated revenues and expenditures, including special education, and projected average daily attendance).	Yes
If the school is to be operated by, or as, a nonprofit public benefit corporation, the petitioner shall provide the names and relevant qualifications of all persons whom the petitioner nominates to serve on the governing body of the charter school.	Yes

Source: Ed Code §47605(c)(4), §47605(c)(6), and §47607(g); staff analysis of the charter renewal petition

C. OUSD-Specified Requirements

Figure 50: OUSD-Specified Requirements

OUSD-Specified Requirement	Included in Petition?
District Required Language	Yes
Charter Renewal Performance Report	Yes

Source: Staff analysis of the charter renewal petition

IV. Renewal Criteria IV: Is the Charter School Serving All Students Who Wish to Attend?

In order for a charter school's renewal petition to be approved, the school must be serving all students who wish to attend.²¹ By State law, evaluation of this criteria is limited to consideration of two sources of information (1) State-provided enrollment data and (2) any substantiated complaints related to noncompliance with suspension/expulsion requirements included in law and/or the charter school's procedures. Denial under this criterion may only occur if (1) there is sufficient evidence in the abovementioned information sources demonstrating that the charter school is not serving all students who wish to attend and (2) the school has been given a reasonable opportunity to cure the violation. Therefore, evidence considered for this criterion includes:

- State-provided enrollment data
- Substantiated complaints and notices of concern related to noncompliance with suspension/expulsion requirements

A. State-Provided Enrollment Data

State law mandates that, upon request, the State provide charter school authorizers with certain aggregate data, specified in the law, reflecting student enrollment patterns for authorized charter schools. The State does not provide any guidance regarding how this data should be interpreted. This data includes the following for each year of the charter term²²:

- **Data Set 1:** The percentage of students enrolled at any time between the beginning of the school year and the census day who were not enrolled at the end of the same school year, and the average State test results for these students from the prior school year, if available.
- **Data Set 2:** The percentage of students enrolled during the prior school year who were not enrolled as of the census day of the school year in question (excluding students who completed the highest grade served by the school), and the average State test results for these students from the prior year, if available.

The tables below summarize the data provided by the State. To avoid exposing potentially personally identifiable information, State test results are excluded for any group with fewer than 11 students. Additionally, it is important to note the data provided is limited in that it can only show correlation, *not causation*. Therefore, while an analysis is included below, the data, on its own, cannot definitively show whether or not the school is serving all students who wish to attend. With this limitation in mind, the analysis is below:

- **Data Set 1:** For the first set of data, the Charter School did not have a numerically significant number with State test results for any year of the charter term.
- **Data Set 2:** For the second set of data, the Charter School did not have a numerically significant number with State test results for any year of the charter term, with the exception of ELA results in 2022-23 where students who left the charter schools only performed slightly below the Charter School average.

²¹ EC §47607(e)

²² At the time of this report, the State provided data for 2016-17 through 2019-20 and 2022-23. Due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, there was insufficient data available for the 2020-21 and 2021-22 school years.

Figure 51: Charter School Enrollment Data – Education Code Section 47607(d)(1)(B)

Data Set 1	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2022-23
Percent of students enrolled at the Charter School between start of the school year and census day who were not enrolled at the end of the school year	6.14% (27 of 440)	7.52% (38 of 505)	5.86% (30 of 512)	10.03% (36 of 359)
Number of these students with State test results from the prior year	ELA: 3 Math: 2	5	3	2
ELA: Difference between average DFS of unretained students and schoolwide average	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*
Math: Difference between average DFS of unretained students and schoolwide average	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*

Source: Aggregate enrollment-pattern data provided by the State

* Data excluded due to an insufficient number of students with results for this group

Figure 52: Charter School Enrollment Data – Education Code Section 47607(d)(1)(C)

Data Set 2	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2022-23
Percent of students enrolled at the Charter School during the prior school year who were not enrolled as of the census day for the specified year (excluding graduating students)	11.05% (41 of 371)	8.64% (38 of 440)	9.50% (48 of 505)	14.78% (69 of 467)
Number of these students with State test results from the prior year	3	4	3	ELA: 13 Math: 10
ELA: Difference between average DFS of unretained students and schoolwide average	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	-5.52 Unretained = -64.92 School = -59.4
Math: Difference between average DFS of unretained students and schoolwide average	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*

Source: Aggregate enrollment-pattern data provided by the State

* Data excluded due to an insufficient number of students with results for this group

Due to the lack of statistically significant subgroups, no conclusion is drawn as to whether the charter school is serving all students who wish to attend, based upon the above data.

B. Substantiated Complaints and Notices of Concern Related to Noncompliance with Suspension / Expulsion Requirements

During the current charter term, the Office of Charter Schools issued two Notices of Concern to LPS R&D Oakland for noncompliance with expulsion procedures. The first notice, on June 6, 2018, addressed the school's failure to provide timely written notice of the charges against the student and an explanation of the pupil's basic rights and due process rights. The second notice, on December 3, 2019, cited the school's failure to provide timely notice of the expulsion hearing to the family. In both cases, the school violated the notification requirements outlined in its Board-approved charter petition and the OCS Disciplinary and Expulsion Documentation Requirement policy. While these are procedural noncompliance issues, they do not indicate the school is failing to serve all students who wish to attend, but rather reflect issues with adherence to timelines.

V. Recommendation Summary

To determine if the Charter School has adequately met each renewal criteria, Staff considered evidence gathered from the school's petition and supporting documentation, the site visit, and the school's performance during its previous charter term. The following section outlines the Charter School's identified strengths and challenges related to each renewal criteria, as well as a determination of whether the Charter School adequately met the criteria for purposes of renewal.

A. Renewal Criteria I: Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?

Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Met the majority of School Performance Analysis indicators in the last two years.• High graduation rates, above the OUSD average in all years of the charter term.• High A-G graduation rates for most years of the charter term.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• While the school's ELA proficiency rates grew and were higher than the OUSD average in the two years prior to the pandemic, their ELA proficiency rates declined each of the last four years and was below the OUSD average for each of these years.• Post-pandemic, the Hispanic/Latino and socioeconomically disadvantaged student group ELA performance declined over four consecutive years and were below the District's respective student groups.• Although the school's Math proficiency rate grew in the year prior to the pandemic, the Math proficiency rates declined each of the last four years and was substantially below the OUSD average for each of these years.• Post-pandemic, the Hispanic/Latino and socioeconomically disadvantaged student group Math performance declined over four consecutive years and were below the District's respective student groups, with 0% proficiency for English Learners in 2022-23 and 2023-24.• There was a significant decline in A-G graduation rates from 99% in 2022-23 to 68.7% in 2023-24.• The percentage of English Learners making progress towards English language proficiency has decreased each year.• Verified data does not conclusively show one year's progress for each year in school or strong postsecondary outcomes.• The PIP, while addressing most necessary performance indicators, overlooks crucial organizational challenges such as leadership instability and teacher recruitment/retention.

Determination

Based on this analysis, LPS Oakland has **not** presented a sound educational program.

B. Renewal Criteria II: Is the Charter School Demonstrably Likely to Successfully Implement the Proposed Educational Program?

Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Despite the significant decline in enrollment, the school remains financially stable and has consistently had a healthy reserve balance and no audit findings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enrollment has declined by 65% from its peak in 2019-20, with year-over-year student retention dropping quickly in 2022-23 and 2023-24 and remaining below the Oakland charter average in 2024-25. Pattern of Board-approved budgets which substantially overproject enrollment and therefore revenue. Enrollment demographics and key student groups do not reflect the diversity of OUSD as a whole, nor the diversity of OUSD schools in the comparison attendance area. The school serves a lower percentage of Black/African American students and socioeconomically disadvantaged students than the OUSD average. The Charter School and CMO have received six notices of concern during the current charter term. There have been extremely low year-over-year teacher retention rates and a high number of mid-year teacher exits. Governing board has low scores in several core competencies including Community Engagement and School Familiarity.

Determination

Based on this analysis, LPS Oakland is **not** demonstrably likely to successfully implement the proposed educational program.

C. Renewal Criteria III: Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?

Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charter petition contains reasonably comprehensive descriptions of the required 15 elements. OUSD-specified requirements are included in the petition. 	N/A

Determination

Based on this analysis, the petition for LPS Oakland is reasonably comprehensive.

D. Renewal Criteria IV: Is the School Serving All Students Who Wish to Attend?

Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence in State-provided enrollment data that suggests the school is failing to serve all students who wish to attend. There have been no substantiated complaints or Notices of Concern related to noncompliance with suspension/expulsion requirements. 	N/A

Determination

Based on this analysis, LPS Oakland is serving all students who wish to attend.

E. Analysis of Other Public School Options if Renewal is Denied

When determining whether to recommend denial, District staff consider other public school options available to the charter school's current students. The following provides an overview of the attendance areas where LPS Oakland students live, where students who have transferred from the school enroll in the subsequent year, and how nearby schools serving high school students perform relative to LPS Oakland.

LPS Students Attendance Areas

Students attending LPS Oakland in 2023-24 lived in 4 different OUSD attendance areas. Additionally, 6 of its students reside outside of Oakland. The table below shows all high school attendance areas where at least 20 LPS students lived.

Figure 53: Charter School Enrollment by Attendance Area and Grade Span

Attendance Area Grade Level	Attendance Area	Number of 2023-24 [Charter School] Students Living in Attendance Area (Percent of Total Enrollment)
High	Castlemont/CCPA/Madison	195 (95.7%)

Source: OUSD Department of Research, Assessment, and Data Live/Go Dashboard

Performance Comparison with Nearby Schools/Target Student Population Area

In order to evaluate the performance of LPS Oakland relative to other public-school options available to the Charter School's current students, the following list of comparison schools was created to include (A) any schools serving similar grade spans within the High School Attendance Area(s) for which at least 20 students currently live and (B) any schools serving similar grade spans within the High School Attendance Area (HSAA) for which the school is located. The Figure below summarizes 2022-23 State test outcomes (in terms of Distance from Standard (DFS)) and 2022-23 Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates for these schools, comparing outcomes to LPS Oakland. The table also includes some demographic information from that same year for additional context. Although demographics can substantially impact schools' DFS outcomes, making school-to-school comparisons less useful, CORE growth controls for some of these differences by comparing individual student's performance relative to a set of similar students. As shown in Figure 54:

- Math:** LPS Oakland had a DFS which was greater than 7 of 10 comparison schools. LPS Oakland had a higher CORE growth percentile than 2 of 7 comparison schools.
- ELA:** LPS Oakland had a DFS which was greater than 4 of 10 comparison schools. LPS Oakland had a higher CORE growth percentile than 1 of 7 comparison schools.
- Graduation Rate:** LPS Oakland had a higher graduation rate than 8 of 9 comparison schools.

Figure 54: Performance Comparison of Nearby Schools

School	Grade Span	% SED	% EL	% SWD	Math DFS	Math CORE Growth	ELA DFS	ELA CORE Growth	Graduation Rate
LPS Oakland	9-12	72%	39%	13%	-117.8	22%	-66.9	43%	94.5%
CCPA	6-12	97%	46%	21%	-132.6	47%	-63.9	75%	93.4%
Castlemont High	9-12	98%	48%	19%	-280.5	16%	-222.7	3%	61.3%
Madison 6-12	6-12	97%	44%	16%	-163.9	68%	-83.4	54%	87.2%
Lighthouse High	9-12	96%	31%	12%	-159.2	16%	1.6	92%	92.4%
Aspire Golden State	6-12	86%	25%	14%	-137.7	N/A	-58.8	N/A	91.3%
Alternatives in Action	9-12	91%	59%	15%	-250.5	N/A	-191.8	N/A	61.5%
Lodestar	K-11	92%	45%	12%	-115.3	32%	-80.7	54%	N/A
Bay Tech	6-12	84%	26%	16%	-117.7	73%	-55.1	73%	92.9%
Aspire Lionel Wilson	6-12	85%	27%	14%	-120.2	N/A	-40.9	N/A	97.2%
Oakland Unity High	9-12	92%	29%	15%	-89.6	99%	14.5	97%	92.0%

Source: English Learners – CDE Downloadable Data Files (School Enrollment, English Learners); Socioeconomically Disadvantaged/Special Education – CDE DataQuest School Enrollment by Subgroup Report; OUSD Special Education/Distance From Standard/CORE Growth Percentile – OUSD Department of Research, Assessment, and Data

F. Recommendation

Based on the analysis outlined therein, Staff recommends denial of the renewal petition for LPS Oakland R&D. Because the Charter School was placed into the Low Tier by the CDE, the Board “shall not renew” the charter, and no additional findings are required for denial. However, should the OUSD Board vote to approve the charter, both of the following written findings must be made:

- *The charter school is taking meaningful steps to address the underlying cause(s) of low performance, which are or will be written in a plan adopted by the governing body of the charter school; and*
- *There is clear and convincing evidence, demonstrated by verified data, showing either:*
 - *The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year’s progress for each year in school; or*
 - *Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.*

VI. Appendices

Appendix A. Complete Renewal Tier Analysis

Summary of State Renewal Tier Analysis

As mentioned previously, Education Code Section 47607 outlines a three-tiered system of performance categories for most²³ charter schools seeking renewal. In this system, charter schools are placed into one of three categories (“High Tier”, “Low Tier”, or “Middle Tier”) based on an evaluation of student outcomes over the prior two years. Two criteria determine the performance category of a charter school. Criterion 1 is based on the **colors** received for all the **schoolwide** state indicators in the Dashboard. Criterion 2 is based on the **status** for all **academic** indicators with 30 or more students, using **both** schoolwide and student-group data (Criterion 2a and 2b, respectively). Analyses of both for LPS Oakland can be found below, including more detailed descriptions of each criterion.

Criterion 1 Analysis

Criterion 1 is based on the performance colors or “levels”²⁴ received for **all** the state indicators on the Dashboard for the two previous State Dashboard years. Per Education Code, if all state indicators are Blue/Very High or Green/High, the charter school is assigned to the High Tier. If all state indicators are Orange/Low or Red/Very Low, the charter school is assigned to the Low Tier. In all other circumstances, an evaluation of Criterion 2 is necessary to determine the charter school’s tier. As shown in Figure 55 below, LPS Oakland did not fit the requirements for Low Tier or for High Tier in Criterion 1, thus, an evaluation of Criterion 2 is necessary.

Figure 55: Criterion 1 Analysis – Schoolwide Results

Indicator	2022	2023
ELA	Very Low	Red
Math	Very Low	Red
EL Progress	Low	Yellow
College/Career	N/A	Low
Graduation Rate	Medium	Green
Suspension Rate	High	Red
Chronic Absenteeism	High	N/A

Source: California School Dashboard

Criterion 2 Analysis

Criterion 2 is based on the “Status” (or the current year data) for all **academic** indicators (ELA, Mathematics, EL Progress, and College/Career) with a performance color for the two previous Dashboard years. Performance determinations are then based on the overall status compared with the statewide averages for the previous two Dashboard years. Criterion 2 is broken into two sub-criteria – Criterion 2a evaluates the Charter School’s schoolwide performance and Criterion 2b evaluates the Charter School’s student group performance, specifically for student groups which scored below the

²³ The three-tiered system does not apply to schools that qualify for the Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) program.

²⁴ For the 2022 California School Dashboard, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, status “levels” were assigned to each indicator as a proxy for colors (See Appendix B for more details).

statewide average²⁵. Per Education Code, if (Criterion 2a) all **schoolwide** academic indicators are same or higher than the statewide average *and* (Criterion 2b) the majority of eligible student groups are higher than their group's respective statewide average, then the Charter School is placed in the High Tier. If (Criterion 2a) all **schoolwide** academic indicators are same or lower than the statewide average *and* (Criterion 2b) the majority of eligible student groups are lower than their respective statewide average, then the Charter School is placed in the Low Tier. In all other circumstances, the Charter School is placed in the Middle Tier. As shown in Figure 56 and Figure 57 below, the Charter School met the requirements for Low Tier, thus, LPS Oakland is placed in the Low Tier.

Figure 56: Criterion 2a Analysis

Academic Indicator	2022			2023		
	School Status	State Status	Result	School Status	State Status	Result
ELA	-59.4	-12.2	Lower	-66.9	-13.6	Lower
Math	-155.7	-51.7	Lower	-177.8	-49.1	Lower
EL Progress	42.4%	50.3%	Lower	39.8%	48.7%	Lower
College / Career	N/A	N/A	N/A	22.7%	43.9%	Lower

Source: California School Dashboard

Figure 57: Criterion 2b Analysis

Indicator	Student Group	2022			2023		
		School Status	State Status	Result	School Status	State Status	Result
ELA	English Learner	-114.8	-61.2	Lower	-116.4	-67.7	Lower
	Hispanic/Latino	-56.4	-38.6	Lower	-66.7	-40.2	Lower
	SED	-58.8	-41.4	Lower	-63.6	-42.6	Lower
Math	English Learner	-174.7	-92	Lower	-218.4	-93.4	Lower
	Hispanic/Latino	-152.6	-83.4	Lower	-180.3	-80.8	Lower
	SED	-152.5	-84	Lower	-162	-80.8	Lower
College/Career	English Learner	N/A	N/A	N/A	18.0%	15.3%	Higher
	Hispanic/Latino	N/A	N/A	N/A	24.0%	35.5%	Lower
	SED	N/A	N/A	N/A	21.4%	35.4%	Lower
EL Progress		42.4%	50.3%	Lower	39.8%	48.7%	Lower

Source: California School Dashboard

Appendix B. Additional California School Dashboard Analyses – including SPA and Local Indicators


Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on California School Dashboard Indicators

Typically, the California School Dashboard displays colors for each indicator (see below) which are assigned based on two factors: the current year's data and the difference between the current year's data and the prior year's data, or "Change". Due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on statewide testing and accountability systems, there was insufficient data to calculate "Change" for the 2022 California School Dashboard, and thus the 2022 California School Dashboard displayed "Status levels" (Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low) in place of colors. For purposes of

²⁵ For more information regarding which student groups are included in the analysis for Criterion 2b, please see the CDE's Performance Categories Flyer: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/documents/categoryflyer.pdf>

the Renewal Tier Analysis and the School Performance Analysis, these Status Levels were used as proxies for color as shown below.

Figure 58: 2022 and 2023 California School Dashboard Indicator Levels



Source: California School Dashboard

The only exceptions to the categorization rules above are the Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Indicators for which the 2022 scale is reversed such that “Very High” corresponds to the lowest performance, or the “Red” color.

Additionally, there was insufficient data to assign a status level to the College and Career Readiness indicator for the 2022 California School Dashboard, so the indicator is not available for the 2022 California School Dashboard and is categorized using a status level, not a color, for the 2023 California School Dashboard. For more information about the California School Dashboard, please visit the CDE’s support page at.

Complete School Performance Analyses – Schoolwide and Equity

The School Performance Analysis (SPA) Summary is found in Part 1 of this Staff Report. The below analyses represent the Schoolwide and Equity SPAs for 2022 and 2023. As a reminder, in order to be considered “Met” in the SPA, an indicator must have either a California School Dashboard Color Orange / Low Status Level or higher **or** CORE Growth Level Medium or higher (i.e. growth > 30th percentile).

For the Schoolwide SPA to be considered as “Met”, the school must meet the threshold for greater than 50% of the available indicators. For the Equity SPA to be considered as “Met”, the school must meet the thresholds for greater than 50% of available student groups.

Figure 59: 2022 and 2023 Schoolwide School Performance Analyses

		2022		2023	
Indicator	Data Source	Performance	Met/Not Met	Performance	Met/Not Met
English Language Arts State Test	Dashboard Color/Level	Very Low DFS = -59.4	Not Met	Red DFS = -66.9; decreased 4.5 points	Met
	CORE Growth Level	N/A		Average Growth Percentile = 43 rd	
Mathematics State Test	Dashboard Color/Level	Very Low DFS = -155.7	Not Met	Red DFS = -177.8; decreased 10.5 points	Not Met
	CORE Growth Level	N/A		Below Average Growth Percentile = 22 nd	

English Learner Progress	Dashboard Color/Level	Low 42.4% making progress	Met	Yellow 39.8% making progress; increased 12.3%	Met
Suspension	Dashboard Color/Level	High 0% suspended	Met	Red 7.8% suspended; increased 7.8%	Not Met
Chronic Absenteeism	Dashboard Color/Level	High 0% chronically absent	Met	N/A	-
Graduation	Dashboard Color/Level	Medium 89.1% graduated	Met	Green 94.6% graduated; increased 5.5%	Met
College/Career	Dashboard Color/Level	N/A	-	Low 22.7% prepared	Met
Schoolwide SPA Result		Met (Met 67%; 4 of 6)		Met (Met 67%; 4 of 6)	

Source: California School Dashboard, CORE Insights Dashboard

Figure 60: 2022 Equity School Performance Analysis

Indicator	Data Source	Student Group								Met/Not Met
		Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino	Pacific Islander	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	English Learner	Special Education	Homeless	Foster Youth	
English Language Arts State Test	Dashboard Color (DFS; change)	N/A	Very Low -56.4	N/A	Very Low -58.8	Very Low -114.8	No Status Level	N/A	N/A	Not Met (0 of 3)
Mathematics State Test	Dashboard Color (DFS; change)	N/A	Very Low -152.6	N/A	Very Low -152.5	Very Low -174.7	No Status Level	N/A	N/A	Not Met (0 of 3)
Suspension	Dashboard Color (% suspended once; change)	No Status Level	High 0%	N/A	High 0%	High 0%	High 0%	N/A	N/A	Met (4 of 4)
Graduation	Dashboard Color (% graduated; change)	N/A	Medium 89.1%	N/A	Medium 88.9%	Low 77.8%	No Status Level	N/A	N/A	Met (3 of 3)
Equity SPA Result										Met (Met: 50%; 2 of 4)

Source: California School Dashboard, CORE Insights Dashboard

Figure 61: 2023 Equity School Performance Analysis

Indicator	Data Source	Student Group								Met/Not Met	
		Black/ African American	Hispanic/ Latino	Pacific Islander	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	English Learner	Special Education	Homeless	Foster Youth		
English Language Arts State Test	Dashboard Color (DFS; change)	No Color	Red -66.7 ↓-7.2	N/A	Red -63.6 ↓-1.7	Orange -116.4 ↑4.1	No Color	N/A	N/A	Not Met (1 of 3)	Met
	CORE Growth Level (percentile)	N/A	Medium 44%	N/A	Medium 45%	Medium 51%	N/A	N/A	N/A	Met (3 of 3)	
Mathematics State Test	Dashboard Color	No Color	Red -180.3	N/A	Red -162	Red -218.4	No Color	N/A	N/A	Not Met (1 of 3)	Met

	(DFS; change)		↓-15.5		↑0.1	↓-28.1					
	CORE Growth Level (percentile)	N/A	Low 22%	N/A	Low 24%	Low 22%	N/A	N/A	N/A	Met (3 of 3)	
Suspension	Dashboard Color (% suspended once; change)	No Color	Red 7.7% ↑7.7%	N/A	Red 6.9% ↑6.9%	Orange 7.5% ↑7.5%	Orange 8.3% ↑8.3%	N/A	N/A	Met (4 of 4)	
Graduation	Dashboard Color (% graduated; change)	No Color	Green 94.2% ↑5.1%	N/A	Green 94.2% ↑5.3%	Green 94.1% ↑16.3%	No Color	N/A	N/A	Met (3 of 3)	
College/ Career	Dashboard Color (% prepared; change)	N/A	Low 24%	N/A	Low 21.4%	Low 18%	No Status Level	N/A	N/A	Met (3 of 3)	
Equity SPA Result										Met (Met: 100%; 5 of 5)	

Source: California School Dashboard, CORE Insights Dashboard

California School Dashboard Local Indicators

Charter schools are required to report annually on five State Board of Education (SBE)-approved local indicators aligned to State priority areas where other State data is not available. In order to meet each local indicator, the SBE requires charter schools to (1) annually measure their progress based on locally available data, (2) report the results at a public charter school board meeting, and (3) report the results to the public through the California School Dashboard. The school uses self-reflection tools included within the California School Dashboard to report its progress on the local indicators. If a charter school does not submit results to the California School Dashboard by the given deadline, including completing the self-reflection tool, the school's California School Dashboard will reflect *Not Met* for the indicator by default. Earning a performance level of *Not Met* for two or more years for a given local indicator may be a factor in being identified for differentiated assistance, provided by an outside agency (typically the local school district or county office of education) as required by State law.²⁶ LPS Oakland was not identified for differentiated assistance during the current charter term.

Figure 62: California School Dashboard Local Indicators

Local Indicator	2017	2018	2019	2022	2023
Basics: Teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilities	N/A	Met	Met	Met	Met
Implementation of Academic Standards	N/A	Met	Met	Met	Met
Parent and Family Engagement	N/A	Met	Met	Met	Met
Local Climate Survey	N/A	Met	Met	Met	Met
Access to a Broad Course of Study	N/A	Met	Met	Met	Met

Source: California School Dashboard

²⁶ Detailed criteria for differentiated assistance can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/leaproposedcrit.asp>.

Appendix C. Additional Program Implementation Information

Proposed Charter School Projected Student Enrollment and Grade Levels Served (as outlined in Petition)

In its renewal petition (pg. 22), LPS Oakland is proposing to serve a maximum enrollment of 500 and a projected student enrollment at each grade level and at all grade levels combined in each of the years below. Please note, LPS Oakland is only eligible for a 2-year term given their status as Low Tier, but included 5 years in their petition, as shown below.

Figure 63: Projected Enrollment

Projected Student Enrollment for Each Year by Grade Level and Total Enrollment					
Grade Level	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
9	47	50	55	60	65
10	46	48	50	55	55
11	42	42	44	45	50
12	40	40	42	42	42
Total	175	180	191	202	212

Source: LPS Oakland Renewal Petition

Admissions Preferences

In the event of a public random drawing, the LPS Oakland admissions preferences are as shown below:

Figure 64: LPS Oakland Admissions Preferences

#	Admissions Preference
1	Siblings of students admitted to or attending LPS Oakland
2	Children of LPS staff
3	Foster/Homeless youth
4	Students who reside within the Castlemont High School attendance area
5	Students not meeting grade level standards
6	Students who reside within the Oakland Unified School District boundaries

Source: LPS Oakland Renewal Petition

Charter School Enrollment Demographics Over Time

Figure 65: Learning Without Limits Enrollment Demographics

Student Group Type	Student Group	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22	22-23	23-24
Ethnicity	Hispanic/Latino	89%	89%	92%	93%	94%	94%	95%
	Black/African American	8%	8%	6%	6%	5%	4%	3%
	Asian	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
	White	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
	Two or More Races	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%

	Other Race/Ethnicity	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%
	Not Reported	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%
Other Student Groups	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	96%	98%	94%	94%	94%	72%	71%
	English Learners	30%	28%	38%	38%	40%	39%	37%
	Special Education	10%	11%	10%	11%	13%	13%	15%

Source: ETHNICITY/SOCIOECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED/ENGLISH LEARNERS/SPECIAL EDUCATION – CDE Dataquest (School Enrollment by Subgroup Report)

2024-25 Charter School Educator Demographics

Figure 66: 2024-25 Educator Demographics

Race / Ethnicity	24-25
Hispanic/Latino	30%
Black/African American	20%
Asian	0%
White	40%
Other Race/Ethnicity	10%

Source: Charter School Performance Report

Charter School Complaints to OUSD

The OUSD Office of Charter Schools logs the complaints it receives for OUSD-authorized charter schools. However, unless the allegations meet specific criteria²⁷ or identify a potential violation of local, state, or federal law, the Office of Charter Schools typically refers the complainant to school leadership, who is ultimately responsible for addressing the complaint in compliance with its adopted complaint policy. Therefore, complaints included in the table below may not necessarily have been substantiated. Instead, the table is a record of what has been reported to the Office of Charter Schools staff. Additionally, some complainants may not know that they can submit complaints to the Office of Charter Schools. Therefore, the absence (or a low number) of complaints does not necessarily mean that other complaints were not reported directly to the school or charter management organization.

During the current seven-year charter term, the Office of Charter Schools received 3 complaints regarding LPS Oakland R&D and the Leadership Public School CMO.

Figure 67: LPS Oakland R&D Complaints to OUSD

School Year	Complaints	Areas of Concern
2017-18	0	-
2018-19	0	-
2019-20	0	-
2020-21	1	Hiring/Staffing, Communication
2021-22	1	Covid, Retaliation, Communication, Bullying, Corruption, Financial Mismanagement
2022-23	1	Student Health/Safety, Staff Conduct
2023-24	0	-
2024-25	0	-

Source: OUSD Office of Charter Schools Complaint Records

²⁷ Complaints where Office of Charter School staff will become involved include those alleging a severe or imminent threat to student health or safety, employee discrimination per Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, or violations outlined in Education Code §47607(c).

Charter School English Learners by Language

Figure 68: 2023-24 Language Group Data

Language	English Learners (EL)	Fluent English Proficient (FEP) Students	Percent of Total Enrollment that is EL and FEP
Spanish; Castilian	73	115	86.24%
Uncoded languages	7	2	4.13%
Mayan languages	0	2	0.92%
Arabic	1	0	0.46%

Source: CDE Dataquest