

**FINDINGS OF FACT IN SUPPORT OF DENIAL OF THE
RENEWAL CHARTER PETITION FOR
PREPA TEC - LOS ANGELES
BY THE LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

BOARD OF EDUCATION REPORT
November 17, 2025

I. INTRODUCTION

On August 21, 2025, PREPA TEC - Los Angeles (“Charter School” or “Petitioners”) submitted a renewal petition application (“Renewal Petition”) to the Charter Schools Division (“CSD”) of the Los Angeles Unified School District (“LAUSD” or “District”), seeking to renew its charter to serve up to 388 students in grades 6-8 for a five-year term, July 1, 2026, to June 30, 2031. (See Exhibit 1, PREPA TEC - Los Angeles Charter Renewal Petition). Charter School currently operates on a private site (non-District owned facility) at 8001 Santa Fe Avenue, Walnut Park, CA, 90255, which is located in Board District 5 and Region East. Charter School is operated by Alta Public Schools (“APS”), a California nonprofit public benefit corporation that also operates one other LAUSD-authorized charter school.¹

Pursuant to the Charter Schools Act (Ed. Code, § 47600 *et seq.*) and the adopted *LAUSD Policy and Procedures for Charter Schools* (“LAUSD policy” or “District policy”), LAUSD’s Board of Education (“Board”) has 90 days upon receipt of the renewal petition to either grant or deny the renewal petition unless an extension of an additional 30 days is mutually agreed upon by the parties. No later than 60 days following receipt of the renewal petition, the LAUSD Board must hold an initial public hearing to consider the level of support for the renewal petition by teachers employed by the District, other employees of the District, and parents. At the second public hearing, at which the Board will either grant or deny the charter, the petitioner shall have equivalent time and procedures to present evidence and testimony to respond to District staff’s recommendation and findings. The LAUSD Board must publish all staff recommendations, including the recommended findings regarding the renewal petition, at least 15 days before the public hearing at which the LAUSD Board will either grant or deny the renewal petition.

The District evaluates renewals petitions in accordance with the standards and criteria specified in the Charter Schools Act. Based on a comprehensive review of the Renewal Petition application and the record of performance of Charter School, as described in greater detail below, District staff has determined that Charter School has not met the requirements set forth in Education Code sections 47605, 47607, 47607.2 and/or

¹ LAUSD provides oversight of its charter schools and the entities managing charter schools, and unless otherwise stated, for the purpose of these Findings of Fact, the names “Charter School,” “Petitioners,” and “APS” may be used interchangeably, with the duties and responsibilities of Charter School, Petitioners and APS being the same under these Findings of Fact.

47611.5, and therefore recommends denial of the Renewal Petition.

II. CRITERIA FOR RENEWAL AND GROUNDS FOR NONRENEWAL

Upon submission, District staff comprehensively reviews each renewal petition application to determine whether the charter school has met the requirements for renewal set forth in Education Code sections 47605, 47607, 47607.2 and 47611.5. The renewal criteria prescribed in Education Code sections 47607 and 47607.2 requires a three-pronged analysis:

Criterion 1:

The Charter Schools Act provides that renewals are governed by the standards and criteria described in Education Code section 47605 applicable to initial petitions. The first criterion considered in reviewing a renewal petition requires an analysis of the following:

- Whether the petition includes a sound educational program;
- Whether the petition contains a reasonably comprehensive description of the 15 elements required for petitions;
- Whether the petition contains an affirmation of each of the conditions described in Education Code section 47605(e); and
- Whether petitioners are not demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition. Education Code section 47607(b) provides that renewals are governed by the standards and criteria described in section 47605 applicable to initial petitions.

While Criterion 1 is similar to the criteria for a new petition, for renewal petitions, there is more information and data regarding past performance since the initial petition for establishment of the charter school was granted. Thus, soundness of the educational program and capacity for implementation are assessed through the past performance of the existing charter school as indicators of likely future performance, including any applicable benchmarks that have been established. The LAUSD Board will examine the charter school's record in four key areas of charter school performance:

- 1) Governance
- 2) Student Achievement and Educational Performance
- 3) Organizational Management, Programs and Operations
- 4) Fiscal Operations

As part of its analysis, the LAUSD Board is to assess the extent to which charter school governing board members and staff have successfully implemented the terms of their charter, addressed deficiencies, and demonstrated capacity to continue to do so in the future based on evidence of past performance.²

² See LAUSD policy, pp. 28-29.

Criterion 2:

The LAUSD Board is required to consider the charter school's performance on the California School Dashboard accountability indicators. Education Code sections 47607 and 47607.2 prescribe three-tiers of performance classification in which a charter school falls within one of the following categories - "high," "middle," or "low" performing. The state will publish an annual list of charter schools and their performance classification. The three-tier classification considers a charter school's performance on the California School Dashboard accountability indicators, with an emphasis on the measurements of academic performance. "Measurements of academic performance" refers to the state indicators included on the California School Dashboard that are based on statewide assessments in the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress System (CAASPP), or any successor system, English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI), or any successor system, and the College/Career Indicator (CCI). A charter school submitting a renewal petition should include in its application all evidence and data related to the charter school's performance on the California School Dashboard.

Middle Performing Charter Schools

For all charter schools that do not meet the High performing or Low performing criteria, the LAUSD Board shall consider the charter school under Middle performing criteria. (Ed. Code, § 47607.2(b)(1).) Pursuant to Education Code section 47607.2(b), the LAUSD Board shall consider the following:

- (1) The schoolwide performance and performance of all student groups of pupils served by the charter school on both the state and local indicators on the California School Dashboard;
- (2) The LAUSD Board shall provide greater weight to the performance on measurements of academic performance on the California School Dashboard;
- (3) Until January 1, 2026, the LAUSD Board shall also consider clear and convincing evidence, demonstrated by verified data, showing either of the following:
 - a. The charter school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school, or
 - b. Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.

Effective January 1, 2021, pursuant to Education Code section 47607.2(c)(2), the State Board of Education adopted criteria to define verified data³ and identified an approved

³ "Verified data" means data derived from nationally recognized, valid, peer-reviewed, and reliable sources that are externally produced. (Ed. Code, §47607.2(c)(2).)

list of valid and reliable assessments.⁴ Staff's review of Charter School's submitted materials will be based on verified data sources and related information adopted by the State Board of Education. (Ed. Code, § 47607.2(c)(3)). Charter schools submitting verified data for this purpose must adhere to the state-approved criteria.

The LAUSD Board may deny a renewal of a Middle performing charter school pursuant to Education Code section 47607.2(b) upon making each of the following written factual findings:

- (1) The charter school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to pupils of the school;
- (2) The closure of the charter school is in the best interest of the pupils; and
- (3) The decision provided greater weight to the performance on the measurements of academic performance.

When determining whether to deny a renewal petition under prong 1 or 2, LAUSD will consider the full oversight record of the charter school, providing greater weight to performance on the measurements of academic performance. This consideration will include a comparison to Resident Schools' performance on the measurements of academic performance (e.g., Long-term English Learner (LTEL) rates, and percentage of students Met or Exceeded Standards as measured on the CAASPP as compared to the state averages, California School Dashboard data, four-year cohort graduation rates). A list of Resident Schools is generated, based on students' addresses as reported in CALPADS.

As a Middle performing charter school, if renewed, the chartering authority (LAUSD Board) must grant a renewal for a period of five years. (Ed. Code, § 47607.2(b)(7).)⁵

Criterion 3:

Notwithstanding Criterion 1 and 2, the LAUSD Board will also consider whether the charter school's enrollment or dismissal practices are discriminatory as grounds for nonrenewal. (Ed. Code, § 47607(e).) Additionally, the LAUSD Board shall consider whether the charter school has substantial fiscal or governance factors as grounds for nonrenewal. (*Id.*)

Specifically, the LAUSD Board may deny renewal of any charter petition, regardless of whether the charter school satisfies the High, Middle, or Low performing criteria, upon a finding that either:

- (1) The charter school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the

⁴ <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/verifdatacrit.asp>

⁵ See LAUSD policy, pp. 35-37.

program set forth in the renewal petition due to either:

- (a) Substantial fiscal factors, or
- (b) Substantial governance factors.

Pursuant to the District Policy, substantial fiscal factors may include, but are not limited to, issues related to the charter school's fiscal solvency, mismanagement of funds, cash flow concerns, or outstanding financial liabilities owed to the District and/or others (e.g., contractual obligations, judgments/settlements, unpaid bills or debts, fee-for-service arrangements, facilities related costs, Prop. 39 over-allocated space reimbursements, etc.). Substantial governance factors may include, but are not limited to, issues related to the retention of faculty (such as school leadership and teachers) which rise to the level of disruption of delivery of educational programs; conflicts of interest; or, violations of the Brown Act or California Public Records Act.

(2) The charter school is not serving the pupils who wish to attend.

Upon a finding that the charter school is not serving all pupils who wish to attend, LAUSD must identify evidence supporting this finding, including aggregate data reflecting pupil enrollment patterns at the charter school. (Ed. Code, § 47607(d).)⁶

Prior to a nonrenewal determination pursuant to number 1 or 2 noted above, LAUSD shall provide the charter school with at least 30 days' notice of the alleged violation and provide the charter school with a reasonable opportunity to cure the violation, including providing an opportunity for the charter school to present a proposed corrective plan. (Ed. Code, § 47607(e).) After providing notice of the alleged violation and reasonable opportunity to cure the violation, the LAUSD Board may deny a renewal petition if it finds that either:

- 1) The corrective action proposed by the charter school has been unsuccessful, or
- 2) The violations are sufficiently severe and pervasive as to render a corrective action plan unviable.

III. FINDINGS OF FACT IN SUPPORT OF DENIAL OF CHARTER RENEWAL

Based on a comprehensive review of Charter School's Renewal Petition application and Charter School's record of academic and governance performance, District staff recommends that the LAUSD Board **deny** the renewal and adopt these *Findings of Fact In Support of Denial of the Renewal Charter Petition for PREPA TEC - Los Angeles* based on the following ground(s):

- Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Renewal Petition due to substantial governance factors. (Ed.

⁶ See LAUSD Policy, pp. 37-38.

Code, § 47607(e).) (Criterion 3); and

- Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Renewal Petition. (Ed. Code § 47605(c)(2).) (Criterion 1)

A. Charter School is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Renewal Petition due to substantial governance factors. (Ed. Code § 47607(e).)

On July 23, 2025, the District issued Charter School a Notice of Alleged Violations (“NOAV”) pursuant to Education Code section 47607(e). The NOAV provided facts to explain why Charter School is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program due to substantial governance factors consistent with statutory requirements. As operationalized by the District, District Policy explains that “substantial governance factors” may include, but are not limited to “issues related to the retention of faculty (such as school leadership and teachers) which rise to the level of disruption of delivery of educational programs; conflicts of interest; or, violations of the Brown Act or California Public Records Act.”⁷ The District’s NOAV also indicated that failing to take corrective actions in response to the NOAV could lead to LAUSD’s recommended denial of Charter School’s Renewal Petition based on either of the following findings: (1) the corrective action proposed by the charter school has been unsuccessful; or (2) the violations are sufficiently severe and pervasive as to render a corrective action plan unviable. (See Ed. Code, § 47607(e); see also Exhibit 2, PREPA TEC - Los Angeles Notice of Alleged Violation July 23, 2025).

The District requested that Charter School provide a response to the NOAV by August 22, 2025, as consistent with the timeline set forth by statute. Charter School’s response to the NOAV was insufficient, and was received by the District after the deadline, on August 29, 2025, following a request for an extension. Additionally, the NOAV was specific to substantial governance factors that would be considered in Charter School’s renewal, and therefore the District requested, as part of the NOAV, that the APS Board address the NOAV and adopt a plan to cure the areas of noncompliance. However, the agenda for the APS Board Meeting that was submitted by Charter School, as part of its response, does not include the NOAV on the agenda, but only included a Notice to Cure for APS’ other charter school. Hence, no evidence was provided that showed APS’ Board considered, discussed, or provided any plan in response to the NOAV. Furthermore, the plan that was provided in the response was the same plan previously provided in response to the March 2025 Notice to Cure, and does not specifically address the August 2025 NOAV, as discussed in more detail below. Notwithstanding Charter School’s response to the NOAV, as shown below, the corrective action proposed by Charter School has been unsuccessful. (Ed. Code, § 47607(e).)

⁷ See LAUSD Policy, pg. 37.

1. APS Board Failed to Cure Violations and Comply with Proposed Corrective Actions RE: Special Education Services and Data Compliance.

Charter School is part of the Los Angeles County Charter Special Education Local Plan Area (“LAC Charter SELPA”). Consistent with LAUSD policy⁸ and Charter School’s operative charter, Charter School entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with LAUSD regarding the provision and funding of special education services with applicable law. A key term of this MOU is regarding the use of Welligent, as follows:

“The Charter School will use forms that align to District standards to develop, maintain, and review assessment and IEPs and will enter accurate assessment and IEP data into the District’s designated data system (Welligent) in accordance with LAUSD policies and procedures. The Charter School will maintain copies of assessments and IEP materials for District review. The Charter School will submit to the District all required reports, as needed, including but not limited to CALPADS, SSPT data at student level and Welligent IEPs, in a timely manner as necessary to comply with state law, federal special education laws and regulations.”

On March 3, 2025, the District issued a Notice to Cure to APS for its failure to maintain mandated IEP timeline records and accurate service provision records in Welligent. (See Exhibit 3, NTC March 3, 2025). On April 4, 2025, APS requested an extension to complete entry of service minutes into Welligent. On May 9, 2025, the District provided APS with a follow-up letter requesting a timeline as to when it planned to update all Welligent records in accordance with applicable legal mandates. APS did not respond by the deadline of May 23, 2025, and has not submitted the requested information to the District, as of writing of this report. District’s recent review of Welligent service tracking reports indicates that Charter School has not fully and completely updated its service tracking records, and as a result, the CSD is unable to verify whether Special Education services have been delivered to students in accordance to their IEPs.

Charter schools are required to adhere to all provisions of federal and state law related to students with disabilities including, but not limited to, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA). Specifically, the IDEA sets forth an affirmative duty to provide an appropriate education to students with disabilities. Thus, charter schools must ensure students with disabilities are afforded a free appropriate public education (FAPE)⁹, and as such, are expected to know their responsibilities under the law for special education students and how the school would provide or access special education programs and services. Consistent with applicable authorities and requirements, Charter School is/was expected to develop and implement systems to meet

⁸ See LAUSD policy, pgs. 63-64.

⁹ LEAs must comply both procedurally and substantively with the IDEA. (*N.B. v. Hellgate Elementary School Dist., ex rel. Bd. Of Directors, Missoula County, Mont.* (2008) 541 F.3d 1202, 1208 [“procedural inadequacies that result in the loss of educational opportunity...or that caused a deprivation of educational benefits, clearly result in the denial of a FAPE”].)

the legal requirements of all IEPs, which includes monitoring the provision of all services by monitoring data using Welligent reports.¹⁰ To date, as shown below, Charter School has failed to develop and implement a system to ensure IEP compliance and maintain accurate and complete service provision records in Welligent.

On July 23, 2025, the District issued the NOAV to Charter School which identified continuing violations and concerns brought on by failed APS governance, specifically its failure to document the provision of special education services through Welligent. Among other things, the NOAV provided the facts and grounds to establish that Charter School continues to not address and fully resolve the Notice to Cure that was issued by the District on March 3, 2025. The NOAV requested that Charter School provide a plan to explain how it intended to update Welligent to accurately document the provision of special education service provided in the 2024-2025 academic year, and the steps Charter School would take to ensure that the provision of special education services, including IEP meetings and Welligent documentation, are performed within all required timelines.

In response to the NOAV, as noted above, Charter School submitted a plan to the District (that was adopted by Charter Schools' Governing Board in March 2025) purportedly intended to address how Charter School planned to maintain accurate and legally compliant assessment and IEP data collection in Welligent. However, based on the District's review of Welligent records in July 2025, Charter School failed (again) to enter the required data into Welligent, and as a result of such failure, the District was/is unable to verify whether Charter School was/is meeting its obligations to provide special education services to its Students with Disabilities. Thus, the historic and ongoing concerns in this area, and Charter School's actions or inactions may be resulting in the loss of educational opportunity for Students with Disabilities and/or depriving them of educational benefits; and the fact that over the last three years the Student with Disabilities student group has performed lower than the state on the California School Dashboard in both ELA and Math,¹¹ further provides evidence of APS's material implementation failure and significant deviations from an appropriate educational program.

Additionally, in January 2025, Charter School received a Notice of Noncompliance from the LAC Charter SELPA for failure to cure a prior notice, failure to notify the SELPA of owing compensatory time or a plan to make up services, and failure to register and attend required SELPA professional development trainings. As part of ongoing follow-up regarding the Notice of Noncompliance, CSD staff recently (September 9, 2025) reached out to LAC Charter SELPA to inquire about the status. At that time, LAC Charter SELPA staff confirmed that although Charter School has made some progress in some areas, the following salient issues remain:

¹⁰ See LAUSD Policy, pg. 68.

¹¹ <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/reports/19647330127936/2024>

- Two of the three student cases remain unresolved, and IEP meetings are still required for those students.
-
- Review of IEP dates and student records, identified discrepancies in the data maintained by Charter School, whereby incorrect IEP dates had been entered, which in turn affected compliance.
- Record keeping in SEIS is not up to date. SEIS Service Tracking data on September 9, 2025, indicated that Charter School entered services for only nine of twenty-nine students into SEIS.

2. Charter School Leadership Turnover has Disrupted the Delivery of its the Educational Program.

Charter School’s retention of faculty (such as school leadership and staff) has risen to the level of disrupting the delivery of its educational program. There has been inconsistency and frequent transition in the school’s leadership (specifically in the “Superintendent of Instruction” position). The leadership turnover included the following:

Superintendent

- 2023-2024: Superintendent of Instruction (employee A) (left position in October 2023)
- Fall 2023-June 2024: Interim Superintendent (employee B) (for the remainder of the school year)
- July 2024 to Present: Superintendent of Instruction (employee A) returned to position, after serving as Special Education Quality Reviewer and Developer from December 2023

Special Education Department

- Fall 2023: Special Education Resource Specialist Lead (employee C) left position.
- December 2023- June 2024: Superintendent of Instruction (employee A) returns as Special Education Quality Reviewer and Developer.
- August 2024 to Present: Special Education Resource Specialist Lead (employee C) returns to position.

Head of Schools

- 2018-2019: Head of School One (in position for one year)
- 2019-2024: Head of School Two (in position for five years)
- 2024-2025: Head of School Three (in position for nine months)

- 2025-Present: Interim Head of School (in position since April 2025 to present)

In addition to the above, recent key leadership changes have included the following:

Chief Executive Officer

- 2025-2026: As of September 2025, Chief Executive Officer was suspended during the first 90 days of school while Charter Renewal is in process.

Board of Directors

- 2025-2026: New Board Chair as of September 2025

The above noted concerns with staff turnover and instability underscores Charter School's failure to pursue pupil outcomes identified in the charter, and has significantly impacted student learning and outcomes, as articulated further in these findings below and represents substantial concerns in Charter School's capacity to successfully implement the instructional program.

B. Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Renewal Petition. (Ed. Code § 47605(c)(2).) (Criterion 1)

In evaluating whether a petitioner is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement¹² the program set forth in the renewal petition, the LAUSD Board assesses a variety of factors.¹³ Based on the grounds and analyses set forth below, the Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Renewal Petition. (Ed. Code, § 47605(c)(2).)

1. Annual Performance-Based Oversight Over the Course of the Charter Term, Highlights Concerns with Charter School's Capacity to Implement the Program.

a. Failure to Meet Academic Benchmarks During the Charter Term Raises Concerns about Charter School's Capacity for Implementation

Charter School's capacity for implementation is assessed through the past performance including any applicable benchmarks that have been established.¹⁴ Thus, Charter School's unmet benchmarks shown below raises concerns about Charter School's capacity for implementation. Charter School has three (3) benchmarks related to

¹² The policy for "demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program" includes factors and guidance promulgated by the State Board of Education. See Title 5 California Code of Regulations, section 11967.5.1.

¹³ See LAUSD policy, pgs. 12-13.

¹⁴ See LAUSD policy, pg. 29.

academics in its current term. The following summarizes the outcomes of each benchmark for each of the seven years (2018-2019 through 2024-2025) of the current charter term. (See Exhibit 4, RSM CAASPP data).

Note: Annual benchmark status updates are based on prior year(s) performance outcomes. For example, benchmarks that require performance level growth (as reported for the years in the tables below) are based on available data from the preceding two school years (e.g., 2019-2020 benchmark status is based on 2018 CA Dashboard data and 2019 CA Dashboard data). As CA Dashboard data is unavailable for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years due to statewide assessment disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, “No Update” is indicated for applicable benchmarks for 2020-2021 and 2021-2022.

Benchmark 1: *Demonstrate growth of at least one performance level per academic year, as reported on the California School Dashboard, for “English Learner” in ELA and Math as measured by CAASPP (SBAC) Assessment at a rate equal or greater than the Resident and Similar Schools, with the goal of achieving and maintaining the “Green” performance level or higher.*

Term Years	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
Benchmark 1 Demonstrate growth of at least one performance level per academic year, as reported on the California School Dashboard, for “English Learner” in ELA and Math as measured by CAASPP (SBAC) Assessment at a rate equal or greater than the Resident and Similar Schools, with the goal of achieving and maintaining the “Green” performance level or higher.							
“Demonstrate growth of at least one performance level per academic year, as reported on the California School Dashboard, for “English Learner” in ELA and Math”	No ELA (ELs) remained at Red Math (ELs) remained at Red	No ELA (ELs) remained at Red Math (ELs) remained at Red	Unable to assess due to suspension of 2020 CA Dashboard	Unable to assess due to no data available on 2021 CA Dashboard	Unable to assess due to no data on 2021 CA Dashboard Note: ELA (ELs) cell bar at Very Low Math (ELs) cell bar at Very Low	Yes ELA (ELs) moved from cell bar Very Low to Orange Math (ELs) moved from cell bar Very Low to Orange	No ELA (ELs) remained at Orange Math (ELs) remained at Orange
“at a rate equal or greater than the Resident and Similar Schools” (Based on Office of Data and Accountability)	Yes ELA Charter ELs = 4.5% RSM ELs = 1.0% Yes Math Charter ELs = 4.5% RSM ELs = 0.8%	Yes ELA Charter ELs = 3.1% RSM ELs = 1.5% No Math Charter ELs = 1.0% RSM ELs = 2.2%	Unable to assess due to suspension of CAASPP	Unable to assess due to suspension of CAASPP	Yes ELA Charter ELs = 2.4% RSM ELs = 1.1% No Math Charter ELs = 0.0% RSM ELs = 0.3%	Yes ELA Charter ELs = 7.2% RSM ELs = 0.0% No Math Charter ELs = 0.0% RSM ELs = 0.3%	Yes ELA Charter ELs = 3.6% RSM ELs = 1.4% No Math Charter ELs = 1.2% RSM ELs = 0.9%

Term Years	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
Outcome for Overall Benchmark	Not Met	Not Met	No Update	No Update	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met

Benchmark 1 was not met for five years, and no update for two years due to the lack of available data.

Benchmark 2: *Demonstrate growth of at least one performance level per academic year, as reported on the California School Dashboard, for “Students with Disabilities” in ELA and Math as measured by CAASPP (SBAC) Assessment at a rate equal or greater than the Resident and Similar Schools, with the goal of achieving and maintaining the “Green” performance level or higher.*

Term Years	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
Benchmark 2 Demonstrate growth of at least one performance level per academic year, as reported on the California School Dashboard, for “Students with Disabilities” in ELA and Math as measured by CAASPP (SBAC) Assessment at a rate equal or greater than the Resident and Similar Schools, with the goal of achieving and maintaining the “Green” performance level or higher.							
“Demonstrate growth of at least one performance level per academic year, as reported on the California School Dashboard, for “Students with Disabilities” in ELA and Math”	Unable to assess due to no performance color for SWD on the CA Dashboard	Unable to assess due to no performance color for SWD on the CA Dashboard	Unable to assess due to suspension of 2020 CA Dashboard	Unable to assess due to no data available on 2021 CA Dashboard	Unable to assess due to no data on 2021 CA Dashboard Note: ELA (SWD) cell bar at Very Low Math (SWD) cell bar at Very Low	Yes ELA (SWD) moved from cell bar at Very Low to Orange Math (SWD) moved from cell bar Very Low to Orange	No ELA (SWD) remained at Orange Math (SWD) declined to Red
“at a rate equal or greater than the Resident and Similar Schools” (Based on Office of Data and Accountability)	Yes ELA Charter SWD= 11.5% RSM SWD= 3.1% Yes Math Charter SWD= 7.7% RSM SWD= 2.4%	No ELA Charter SWD= 3.6% RSM SWD= 4.7% Yes Math Charter SWD= 3.6% RSM SWD= 3.1%	Unable to assess due to suspension of CAASPP	Unable to assess due to suspension of CAASPP	No ELA Charter SWD= 0.0% RSM SWD= 4.0% No Math Charter SWD= 0.0% RSM SWD= 2.3%	No ELA Charter SWD= 0.0% RSM SWD= 5.7% No Math Charter SWD= 0.0% RSM SWD= 2.5%	No ELA Charter SWD= 3.3% RSM SWD= 5.5% No Math Charter SWD= 0.0% RSM SWD= 4.4%
Outcome for Overall Benchmark	Met	Not Met	No Update	No Update	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met

Benchmark 2 was met in one year and was not met for four years. There was no update in 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 due to the lack of available data.

Benchmark 3: *Demonstrate growth of at least one performance level per academic year, as reported on the California School Dashboard, in Mathematics, school wide academic performance as measured by CAASPP (SBAC) Assessment at a rate equal or greater than the Resident and Similar Schools, with the goal of achieving and maintaining the “Green” performance level or higher.*

Term Years	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
Benchmark 3 Demonstrate growth of at least one performance level per academic year, as reported on the California School Dashboard, in Mathematics, school wide academic performance as measured by CAASPP (SBAC) Assessment at a rate equal or greater than the Resident and Similar Schools, with the goal of achieving and maintaining the “Green” performance level or higher.							
“Demonstrate growth of at least one performance level per academic year, as reported on the California School Dashboard, in Mathematics, school wide academic performance”	Yes Math (All Students) grew from Red to Orange	No Math (All Students) declined from Orange to Red	Unable to assess due to suspension of 2020 CA Dashboard	Unable to assess due to no data available on 2021 CA Dashboard	Unable to assess due to no data on 2021 CA Dashboard. Note: Math (All Students) cell bar at Very Low	Yes Math (All Students) moved from cell bar Very Low to Orange	No Math (All Students) remained at Orange
“at a rate equal or greater than the Resident and Similar Schools” (Based on Office of Data and Accountability)	No Math Charter (All Students) = 14.2% RSM = 18.6%	No Math Charter (All Students) = 9.3% RSM = 21.2%	Unable to assess due to suspension of CAASPP	Unable to assess due to suspension of CAASPP	No Math Charter (All Students) = 6.3% RSM = 16.0%	No Math Charter (All Students) = 5.9% RSM = 18.2%	No Math Charter (All Students) = 7.8% RSM = 20.2%
Outcome for Overall Benchmark	Not Met	Not Met	No Update	No Update	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met

Benchmark 3 was not met for five years, and there was no update for two years due to the lack of available data.

b. Annual Performance-Based Oversight Demonstrates Inadequate Performance

Pursuant to the District’s statutory oversight obligations, the District assesses a charter school’s performance across four categories: Governance; Student Achievement and Educational Performance; Organizational Management, Programs, and Operations; and Fiscal Operations. Each area is rated using a four-point rubric: (4) *Accomplished*, (3) *Proficient*, (2) *Developing*, and (1) *Unsatisfactory*, based on the evidence collected during the annual performance oversight visits.

As reflected below, Charter School’s Governance rating declined from 3 (*Proficient*) in 2023-2024 to 1 (*Unsatisfactory*) in 2024-2025. Charter School received the

Unsatisfactory rating in Governance due to unresolved concerns related to nonuse of Welligent, the lack of timely response to authorizer, and an unresolved Notice to Cure. Academic ratings have been consistently low with multiple years at 1 (*Unsatisfactory*) and 2 (*Developing*), with Charter School never reaching a strong level of academic performance. The low scores represent various factors, such as Low performing designation by the California Department of Education, the average of academic indicators (Charter School was lower than the state average for ELA and Math for All Students and for the majority of numerically significant student groups for the last three years). Additionally, Charter School's Chronic Absenteeism rate was higher than the state average for all years of the charter term.

Charter School's oversight record, especially in the area of academics, represents a historical pattern of inadequate student academic performance.

OVERSIGHT REPORT RATINGS FOR THE TERM

	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
Governance	2	3	3	3	3	3	1
Student Achievement and Educational Performance	3	1	1	No Rating	2	2	2

c. History of the District's Tiered Intervention with Charter School

Throughout the charter term, the District has engaged in multiple tiered intervention, such as issuing various compliance notices to Charter School including the NOAV, pursuant to applicable legal and District policy requirements. The noncompliance notices issued to Charter School were to address numerous areas of concern regarding its governance practices, fiscal issues, and operations as noted below. This record raises concerns.

- Communications to Charter School regarding areas of noncompliance:
 - o 01/28/20, Notice to Cure (NTC) re: Four Audit Findings
 - o 03/01/21, NTC re: Recurring Deficiencies in Cited in the Independent Auditor's Report
 - o 09/30/21, NOC re: Incomplete LCAP
 - o 02/25/22, NTC re: Expired Temporary Certificate of Occupancy
 - o 10/23/24, NTC re: California Statewide Assignment Accountability System (CALSAAS) Noncompliance in Responding to Undetermined Items within State's Deadline.
 - o 05/28/25, NOC re: Weak and Deteriorating Fiscal Condition
- Communications to Charter School regarding areas of ongoing noncompliance Charter School has yet to fully cure and/or address:
 - o 09/29/21, Notice of Concern (NOC), Required Use of Welligent (temporarily addressed)

- o 03/03/25, NTC re: Mandated Record Keeping in Welligent
- o 07/23/25, Notice of Alleged Violations (NOAV) re: Inaccurate Compliance Information Regarding Special Education (e.g., services, service tracking and use of Welligent)

The District has concerns regarding the demonstrated lack of capacity and accountability demonstrated by the Charter School Board and administration in ensuring compliance with all applicable authorities and requirements. For instance, APS has failed to monitor and adhere to such requirements over the course of this charter term as evidenced by the multiple notices issued by the District, addressing major compliance areas, including but not limited to, special education data compliance. In all, these facts amount to significant errors in judgment on the part of the Charter School Board and raise concerns about said members' effectiveness in governing a sound, legally compliant public school.

d. Low Academic Performance on the California School Dashboard as Compared to the State

Charter School's Distance from Standard (DFS) on the California School Dashboard has been lower than the state in both English Language Arts and Math for every reportable year of the charter term. (See Exhibit 5, DFS Data Set).

As indicated in the tables below, Charter School's data demonstrates that the instructional program, as implemented, has failed to yield the level of academic outcomes expected for pupils.

ELA California School Dashboard			
Year	PREPA TEC DFS	State DFS	School Compared to State
2018-2019	-65.9	-2.5	Lower
2019-2020 ¹⁵	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
2020-2021 ¹⁶	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
2021-2022	-87.0	-12.2	Lower
2022-2023	-61.3	-13.6	Lower
2023-2024	-58.7	-13.2	Lower

Math California School Dashboard			
Year	PREPA TEC DFS	State DFS	School Compared to State
2018-2019	-121.9	-33.5	Lower
2019-2020 ¹⁷	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
2020-2021 ¹⁸	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
2021-2022	-138.0	-51.7	Lower
2022-2023	-134.9	-49.1	Lower
2023-2024	-131.7	-47.6	Lower

¹⁵ No assessment data was available due to the statewide suspension of standardized testing during the COVID-19 pandemic.

¹⁶ (See Id.)

¹⁷ (See Id.)

¹⁸ (See Id.)

Taken together, the above (subparagraphs (a)-(d)) demonstrates a sustained pattern of educational deficiencies, compliance gaps, and operational weaknesses despite ongoing technical support and opportunities to remedy deficiencies. These findings support the conclusion that Charter School has not consistently demonstrated the educational, organizational and governance capacity to successfully fully implement its program.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing, District staff recommends that the LAUSD Board deny Charter School's Renewal Petition. The recommendation for denial is based on findings that Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Renewal Petition due to substantial governance factors; and the Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the educational program set forth in the Renewal Petition

In order to deny the Renewal Petition on the grounds set forth above, the LAUSD Board must make written findings setting forth specific facts to support the denial of the renewal petition. (Ed. Code, § 47605(c); and Ed. Code, § 47607(e).) Should the LAUSD Board decide to deny renewal of the Charter School's charter, District staff recommends that the Board adopt these *Findings of Fact in Support of Denial of the Renewal Charter Petition for PREPA TEC- Los Angeles* as the Board's written findings of fact in support of the denial.

Exhibits available for perusal at the following link:

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1OWLRGsrHGYaxxoQwivxRj4I3n1toP1Jp?usp=sharing>