

STATE BOARD ITEM COVER SHEET

(Please submit 1 original and 8 copies of complete agenda item)
 (Submit 1 original and 2 copies for revised agenda item)

349

BOARD ITEM INFORMATION

Month/Year:	December 2000	Action <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Public Hearing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Subject:	Request by the Oakland Military Institute Charter School Petitioners to Approve a Petition to Become a Charter School Under the Oversight of the State Board of Education.			
Prepared by:	Colin Miller	Phone: 327-5929		
Presented by:	Janet Sterling			

ATTACHMENT INFORMATION **Yes Attachments Included****Number of Attachments:** 4 **Yes We Will Be Providing more Information via Supplemental Mailing****SIGNATURES**

Unit Manager Vacant	Original Item <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Revised Item <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Division Director Janet Sterling	Original Item <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Revised Item <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Deputy Superintendent Susan Lange	Original Item <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Revised Item <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Coordinator	Original Item <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Revised Item <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:



December 2000 AGENDA

SUBJECT

Request by the Oakland Military Institute Charter School Petitioners to Approve a Petition to Become a Charter School Under the Oversight of the State Board of Education.

- ACTION
- INFORMATION
- PUBLIC HEARING

RECOMMENDATION:

The California Department of Education (CDE) recommends that the State Board of Education (SBE) take action to deny the charter petitioners' request to become a charter school under the oversight of the SBE.

Summary of Previous State Board of Education Discussion and Action

SBE Authority to Grant Charters: Pursuant to *Education Code* Section 47605(j), as of January 1, 1999, a charter school that has been denied approval by a local chartering entity may petition the SBE to approve the charter. This is the fifth such request that has been presented to the SBE.

Denial of Previous Request: To date, the SBE has reviewed four charter petitions that had been denied at the local level. The first one, Sunnyvale Intensive Learning Center Charter School, was denied based on the merits of the proposal at the July 1999 SBE meeting; the California Hope Charter Academy was withdrawn by the petitioner at the April 2000 meeting prior to SBE action. In September 2000, the board considered the Ridgecrest Charter School petition, which is scheduled for reconsideration at this meeting. The board took no action on the petition of the Blue Mountain Wilderness Charter School that was considered for approval in October and November 2000.

Oversight of Charter Schools by SBE:

At the request of the SBE, CDE staff presented an issue paper at its May 2000 meeting that outlined a comprehensive proposal for the review, approval and oversight of previously denied charters. The issue paper proposed that the SBE adopt regulations that define a two-step process for the approval of a charter petition. These regulations are currently being developed.

Summary of Key Issue(s)

On October 4, 2000, the California Department of Education (CDE) received a request from the petitioners of the Oakland Military Institute College Preparatory Academy Charter School (OMI) to authorize a charter school to be located in Oakland. The petition to establish the OMI was denied by the Oakland Unified School District on June 7, 2000 and by the Alameda County Office of Education on September 26, 2000.

Staff reviewed the complete OMI petition packet pursuant to a review team process that solicits input from various divisions in the CDE. Specific findings related to the charter petition are contained in Attachment 1 to this item. As a result of CDE's review of the OMI charter, staff is recommending that the charter petition be denied.

This item will provide for a public hearing on this charter proposal. According to *Education Code* Section 47605(b), at the public hearing, the board "shall consider the level of support for the petition

by teachers employed by the district, other employees of the district and parents”.

It should be noted that the petitioners have submitted the petition to the Eastside Union High School District in Santa Clara County which has expressed some interest in considering the charter, but the petitioner has requested the district hold the request pending the outcome of SBE action.

Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

None

Background Information Attached to this Agenda Item

Attachment 1: California Department of Education Findings Related to a Petition to Establish the Oakland Military Institute (OMI) Charter School

Attachment 2: Checklist for SBE Review of Charter Schools for OMI

Attachment 3: OMI Charter Petition

Attachment 4: Letters received from the public regarding this proposal

**California Department of Education Findings
Related to a Petition to Establish the
Oakland Military Institute
College Preparatory Academy Charter School**

Background

On October 4, 2000, the California Department of Education (CDE) received a request from the petitioners of the Oakland Military Institute College Preparatory Academy Charter School (OMI) to authorize a charter school to be located in Oakland. The petition to establish the OMI was denied by the Oakland Unified School District on June 7, 2000 and the Alameda County Office of Education on September 26, 2000.

Pursuant to *Education Code* Section 47605(j) if a governing board of a school district or county office of education denies a petition for the establishment of a charter school the petitioner may submit the petition directly to the State Board of Education (SBE). The SBE must evaluate the petition according to the criteria and procedures established in law and may only deny the petition if it provides written findings addressing the reasons for the denial. The reasons for denial are limited to the following:

- (1) The charter school presents an unsound educational program
- (2) The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program
- (3) The petition does not contain the required number of signatures
- (4) The petition does not contain an affirmation of specified assurances
- (5) The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of 15 required elements of a charter.

In addition to consideration of the above stated reasons for denial, a charter granting agency must hold a public hearing to consider the level of support for the petition by teachers, district employees and parents.

The CDE Charter School Review Team included representatives from the following divisions: School Fiscal Services, Special Education, Professional Development and Curriculum Support and the CDE Legal Office. The review team reviewed the charter petition according to the requirements of law, *California Administrative Code* regulations and CDE procedures for reviewing charter petitions that have been previously denied by a local agency. Attachment 2 contains a checklist with a brief summary of findings related to each of the required elements of the OMI charter petition.

Finding 1: The OMI charter may present an unsound educational program as it relates to students with special needs, including students who are English learners, students who need remedial services and students who may be eligible for special education services.

Generally, we find that the educational program, pupil outcomes, and methods to assess pupils proposed by the charter applicant are well organized and clear. The philosophy is powerfully stated and consistently echoed throughout the proposal. However, the descriptions of these

elements are general in nature; course objectives and descriptions, as well as instructional materials and assessment measures, need to be specified before the charter would begin operation. Although the proposal states that the program would be aligned to state content standards, the specific links to the standards are not clearly made. Likewise, the proposal states that the charter will provide students opportunities to meet University of California a-g requirements; however, specific analysis of the course offerings for each grade indicates that this may not be so. While the charter proposal has considerable merit, these are areas the applicant should address in future planning activities.

Of greater concern, we find that the description of the curriculum is general in nature and fails to provide an educational program for special education students or describe how they will be accommodated. It is unclear how the charter school will participate in state and federal funding for special education and how services will be provided to students with special needs. There is no written verification of SELPA participation as required by *Education Code* Section 47640 (c)(d). Tutors are mentioned as a strategy to help lower achieving students and the proposal indicates the employment of a resource specialist. However, the needs of students who may require special day class instruction or other specialized services are not addressed. Because this charter proposes to target an “at-risk” population, the lack of consideration for students with special needs is significant. Therefore, we conclude that the educational program may be unsound for these students.

Finding 2: The petitioners may be unlikely to successfully implement the program

While the charter proposal is generally well thought out in relation to the general education program, the proposal does not contain enough detail to establish whether the school will be operationally viable. We noted several areas where issues were not addressed, or were too vague to make a determination about the overall viability of the proposal. As a result, we cannot conclude that the petitioners would be likely to succeed in implementing the program. Some of these concerns are:

- The basis for the student enrollment projections is not provided. Because charter schools are schools of choice and no student can be required to attend a charter school, the basis for the enrollment projections should be clarified. Further, the charter should contain specific strategies for recruitment of students and to ensure parental and community involvement.
- The financial projections assume that the National Guard’s contribution will remain, at a minimum, of \$1.3 million annually. However, there is no evidence that this funding will be provided on an ongoing basis. This assumption should be clarified and documented.
- The petition indicates that the Institute will provide student transportation. However, the financial projections do not include any costs associated with this item or a description of how these services would be provided. Because the proposed school site is somewhat remote, responsibility for transportation should be clarified, and any cost should be included in the budget.
- The financial projections do not provide for potential supervisory oversight costs. Pursuant to *Education Code* Section 47613, depending on the oversight arrangement for an SBE

approved charter, the school may be charged up to 3 percent of the revenue of the charter school for oversight activities. The budget should reflect this cost.

- The projected budget identifies a cost for special education, but the assumptions that were used to calculate this cost were not included. It is unclear whether the petition contains reasonable costs for special education services. These assumptions should be clarified.
- The elements addressing governance, discipline, and employee retirement refer to policies or bylaws that had not been developed yet (or at least were not attached). While it is reasonable to expect that this detail be developed in the future, the content of these policies may impact the viability of the proposal. If the petition is approved, these policies should be completed and reviewed before the school may begin operation.

Finding 3: The OMI petition may not fully comply with *Education Code* Section 47605 which requires a reasonably comprehensive description of each of 15 elements required to be included in a charter. The review team noted specific concerns related to several elements under Sections 47605(b)(1)(A-O) which are discussed below. Due to these concerns, the charter could be deemed not reasonably comprehensive.

Element A: A description of the educational program of the school, designed, among other things, to identify those whom the school is attempting to educate, what it means to be an "educated person" in the 21st century, and how learning best occurs. The goals identified in that program shall include the objective of enabling pupils to become self-motivated, competent, and lifelong learners.

We find that in many respects, the educational program described in the charter is complete. The mission of the Oakland Military Institute, College Preparatory Academy is clear and consistent with the description of the philosophy and structure of the educational program. The involvement of the National Guard in operating the California Cadet Corps as a part of the charter is also consistent with the philosophy and adds to the organizational strength of the educational program. The proposal promotes many positive values, such as high academic standards, skill mastery, critical thinking, discipline, leadership and citizenship. The description of the educational program presented in the body of the proposal offers broad outlines of what will occur, and Appendix C, Sample Curricula, offers some detail about the educational program that students will receive.

However, although the areas of emphasis of the charter are clearly stated, the details of specific courses and subject areas are not entirely apparent. The proposal does not address how further curriculum and instructional planning will take place, nor does it address the leadership for such an effort.

Further, we find that the lack of any meaningful description related to services for students with special needs (see Finding 1) further suggests that this element is not reasonably comprehensive.

Element B: The measurable pupil outcomes identified for use by the charter school. "Pupil Outcomes," for purposes of this part, means the extent to which all pupils of the school demonstrate that they have attained the skills, knowledge, and attitudes specified as goals in the school's educational program.

The charter proposal outlines the areas in which students would be expected to demonstrate mastery. These areas include academic skills, life-long learning skills, social/interpersonal skills, and life skills. The academic skills address history/social studies, mathematics, language arts, science, world language, and military/team skills. The descriptions of the content and skills students would be expected to master are broad; they reflect what might be considered the goals of each of these areas of the program. As *measurable* outcomes these statements should be more specific and should be more clearly tied to the state content standards and to the assessments discussed in Element C. In Appendix C, additional goals and measures are specified. The measures, however, are either very broad ("by its fifth year of operation, the school will have an Academic Performance Index (API) score of 800") or are process measures ("all academic coursework will include a Harkness system element of roundtable discussion").

The proposal states that students will have the "opportunity to pursue a course of study at the institute that meets the "a-g" University of California requirements. In Appendix C the Academic Sketch outlines the course offerings at each of grades seven through twelve. However, as presented, these offerings do not appear to meet the "a-g" requirements in the areas of laboratory science, history/social science, and visual and performing arts. It is possible that the requirements could be addressed through listed electives, but such a mechanism is not described. For example, one semester each of biology, chemistry, and physics is proposed, whereas the University requirement is two years of laboratory science. Typically each of these courses would be taught over the course of a year. In grades seven and eight only one semester each of science and history-social science is proposed; most schools in the state require a full year of study of both of these subjects at these grades. The applicant should review university entrance requirements to ensure that the charter offerings are at least as rigorous as those offered by other schools in the state.

Interventions for students who are English learners or who qualify for special education are very briefly described in this section. There is no discussion, however, of curriculum, instructional materials, or strategies for students who are significantly below grade level in reading or mathematics. Instructional materials are not discussed for any pupils, nor is there discussion of the role of standards-aligned materials as determined by the State Board of Education (grades seven and eight) or as determined by the local board (grades nine through twelve). Further, criteria for student promotion do not speak to special education students.

Element C: The method by which pupil progress in meeting those pupil outcomes is to be measured

The applicant proposes to use "monitored testing, including standardized state tests...grades, academic credits and class attendance" to assess student progress. These methods are generally described.

Within this section the applicant addresses professional development for instructors. Two examples of areas of professional development include the "Harkness method of roundtable"

discussion and “Caught-in-the-Middle state training.” Both of these references suggest that the applicant may not be thoroughly familiar with current state frameworks and educational priorities. The Harkness System is described in footnote 4 on page 2 of the proposal; its emphasis is on student-centered learning and the teacher’s role as a guide for student discussion rather than a lecturer. Although active student discussion is promoted in both the *Reading/Language Arts* and *Mathematics Frameworks*, the important role of teacher-directed instruction is emphasized in each framework as well. The document, *Caught in the Middle*, dates back to 1987, and although helpful in conceptualizing middle school approaches, it is currently under revision. Standards, assessment, and accountability are easily the key priorities of California’s educational programs today. The proposal evidences clear understanding of the importance of the SAT9 and API; the High School Exit Exam is not addressed. Assessment and accountability are clearly valued in the proposal; reflecting more specific and deeper understanding of state content standards and their implementation would strengthen the charter proposal.

Element E: The qualifications to be met by individuals to be employed by the school

The application is unclear as to the employment of instructional staff for special interventions such as special education, remediation and English learners. Nor does the petition describe which courses would require a credentialed teacher and which would be taught by non-credentialed instructional personnel. Further, the charter does not contain any descriptions of qualifications for non-instructional personnel.

Element I: The manner in which an independent annual financial audit is to be conducted.

The charter proposal provides a general description of how an annual financial audit will be conducted. However, the petition does not provide a timeline in which the audit would be completed and any finding would be resolved.

Element J: The procedures by which pupils can be suspended or expelled

The application fails to describe the suspension or expulsion procedures to be used with special education students. The application states briefly on page 12 that it will comply with applicable federal law. The application also fails to demonstrate an understanding of special education students’ rights in this area. The application fails to follow federally required dispute resolution procedures for special education students.

Elements K and L: Retirement system coverage, and pupil attendance alternatives

These elements each contain references to “state” duties and responsibilities that appear to be the result of simply replacing the word “district” with “state” in revising the charter for SBE consideration. This is not appropriate in many instances. For instance, the charter requires the state to process STRS payments, and allows students to obtain an “inter-state” transfer if they choose not to attend the charter school. These references are either inappropriate or nonsensical. The charter needs to be reviewed thoroughly so it does not impose duties or make references to the state that do not make sense.

Review Team Recommendation

The CDE recognizes the considerable effort and strong commitment the petitioners have made to develop this charter proposal. However, we found several areas in the proposal that have not been addressed in a reasonably comprehensive manner. Based upon Findings 1, 2 and 3 above, we conclude that the SBE has sufficient justification to deny the petitioner's request to approve the OMI charter. Therefore, we recommend that the request to approve the OMI charter be denied.

Conclusion

The SBE has three options related to this charter:

- 1) Approve the charter petition. If the SBE approves the charter, the charter will be authorized to operate and the SBE will become the responsible oversight entity for the school unless the SBE, by mutual agreement, delegates that responsibility to another local educational agency in Alameda County.

If the SBE wishes to approve the charter, we recommend that it request that the petitioners revise the charter and supporting documents to address the findings, comments and recommendations identified in this report prior to SBE's approval. We further recommend that the school not be authorized to operate until those issues have been addressed and a memorandum of understanding has been agreed to between the petitioners and the SBE regarding specific operational and oversight issues. Finally, if the OMI charter is approved, we recommend that the SBE assign a charter number to OMI.

- 2) Deny the charter petition. If the SBE denies the petition, the petitioners are not authorized to operate. However, the petitioners would not be prohibited from revising the charter and resubmitting it to the original school district or another eligible LEA in the state. We note that the petitioners have submitted the petition to the Eastside Union High School District in Santa Clara County which has expressed some interest in considering the charter, but the petitioner has requested the district hold the request pending the outcome of SBE action.
- 3) Take no action on the charter petition. According to *Education Code* Section 47605(j), if the SBE does not act on the petition within 120 days, the decision of the governing board of the school district denying the petition shall be subject to judicial review.

CHECKLIST FOR SBE REVIEW OF CHARTER SCHOOLS

SCHOOL NAME: OAKLAND MILITARY INSTITUTE
 DISTRICT: OAKLAND USD

COUNTY: ALAMEDA

DATE RECEIVED: 10-4-00 SBE Hearing (90 day): December 00 SBE Action (Next Mtg)

GENERAL CONTENTS INCLUDED:	CDE Staff/Unit	Included Y/N	Summary/Comments
Evidence of local governing board denial Per Education Code (EC) Section 47605(j)(1) and 5 CCR 11967(a)(2)	School Fiscal Services Charter School Unit	Y	Denied By Oakland USD June 7, 2000 Denied By Alameda COE on September 26, 2000
Reasons for denial included (5 CCR 11967(a)(2))	School Fiscal Services Charter School Unit	Y	
Signatures of 50% of permanent status teachers (Conversion) or 50% of expected parents or teachers of startup. (EC 47605(a))	School Fiscal Services Charter School Unit	Y	Provided signatures of 15 teachers interested in teaching at the school. This exceeds one-half of the number needed to teach in the school's first year of operation. (The school plans to need six teachers in its first year.)
Full charter included (EC 47605 (b) (5))	School Fiscal Services Charter School Unit	Y	All required elements are addressed. (See specific comments for each element.)
Signed certification of Compliance with applicable law (5 CCR 11967 (b) (3))	School Fiscal Services Charter School Unit		Compliance is indicated in the charter
Written verification of SELPA participation or district delegation to accept charter in the LEA for Special Education (EC 47640 (c) and (d))		N	Does not specifically address this issue in the charter or supporting documents.

Attachment 2

Required Elements and Other Assurances	CDE Staff/Unit	Included Y/N	Acceptable Y/N	Summary/Comments
<p>REVIEW OF REQUIRED ELEMENTS: "REASONABLY COMPREHENSIVE DESCRIPTIONS" OF EACH REQUIRED ELEMENT (EC 47605(b)(5) :</p>				
<p>(A) A description of the educational program</p>	<p>Curric/ Special Ed</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Concerns Noted</p>	<p>The description of the educational program offers broad outlines and Appendix C, Sample Curricula, offers some detail about the educational program. The proposal promotes many positive values, including high academic standards, skill mastery, critical thinking, active learning, discipline, structure, leadership, ethics, citizenship. However, the details of specific courses and subject areas are not entirely apparent. The proposal does not address how further curriculum and instructional planning will take place and lacks a description of the instructional strategies for special education students.</p>

Attachment 2

<p>(B) The measurable pupil outcomes</p>	<p>Curriculum</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Concerns Noted</p>	<p>The charter proposal outlines the areas in which students would be expected to demonstrate mastery. However, the descriptions of the content and skills students would be expected to master are broad. As <i>measurable</i> outcomes these statements should be more specific and should be more clearly tied to the state content standards and to the assessments. Interventions for students with special needs are very briefly described in this section. There is no discussion of the role of standards-aligned materials as determined by the State Board of Education or strategies for these pupils.</p>
<p>(C) The method by which pupil progress is to be measured (compliance with statewide assessments and standards)</p>	<p>Curriculum / Charter schools</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Concerns Noted</p>	<p>These methods are generally described. References to "Harkness method of roundtable" and "Caught-in-the-Middle state training" suggest that the applicant may not be familiar with current state frameworks and educational priorities. The proposal evidences clear understanding of the importance of the SAT9 and API, but the High School Exit Exam is not addressed.</p>
<p>(D) Governance structure, including the process to insure parental involvement</p>	<p>SBE/ CDE Legal</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>CDE legal staff noted that this element referred to policies or bylaws that had not been developed yet (or at least they were not provided).</p>
<p>(E) Qualifications to be met by those employed</p>	<p>Curriculum / Charter Schools</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Concerns Noted</p>	<p>Does not address the qualifications of non-instructional staff. States that core teachers will have a credential, but does not address the qualifications of teachers for interventions or special education.</p>

Attachment 2

<p>(F) Procedures to ensure health and safety of pupils and staff, including criminal records summary (per EC Sect. 44237)</p>	<p>CDE/SBE legal/ Charter schools</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Concerns Noted</p>	<p>CDE legal staff noted that this element referred to policies or bylaws that had not been developed yet (or at least they were not provided).</p>
<p>(G) The means by which the school achieve racial and ethnic balance reflective of the district population</p>	<p>CDE/SBE legal</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Appears reasonably comprehensive. No specific concerns noted by CDE legal office.</p>
<p>(H) Admission requirements, if applicable (District priority or lottery per EC 47605(d)(2))</p>	<p>CDE/SBE legal</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Appears reasonably comprehensive. No specific concerns noted by CDE legal office.</p>
<p>(I) The manner in which an independent annual financial audit is to be conducted</p>	<p>School Fiscal Services</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>While fiscal staff noted this element was reasonably comprehensive, they noted that the timeline for the resolution of audit exceptions is not identified.</p>
<p>(J) The procedures by which pupils can be suspended or expelled</p>	<p>CDE/SBE legal</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p></p>	<p>CDE legal staff noted that this element referred to policies or bylaws that had not been developed yet (or at least they were not provided). There is no mention of procedures to be used with special education students.</p>
<p>(K) The manner by which staff will be covered by STRS, PERS or social security</p>	<p>CDE/SBE legal</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Appears reasonably comprehensive. No specific concerns noted by CDE legal office.</p>
<p>(L) The public school attendance alternatives for pupils residing in the school district who choose not to attend charter schools (No governing board of a school district shall require any pupil enrolled in the school district to attend a charter school.)</p>	<p>CDE/SBE legal</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Appears reasonably comprehensive. No specific concerns noted by CDE legal office.</p>

Attachment 2

<p>(M) A description of the rights of any employee of the district, upon leaving the employment of the district to work in the charter, and of any rights of return to the school district after employment at the charter school (No governing board of a school district shall require any employee of the school district to be employed in a charter school (EC 47605(e)))</p>	<p>CDE/SBE legal</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>CDE legal staff noted that this element referred to policies or bylaws that had not been developed yet (or at least they were not provided).</p>
<p>(N) Process for resolution of disputes with chartering entity</p>	<p>CDE/SBE legal</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Appears reasonably comprehensive. No specific concerns noted by CDE legal office.</p>
<p>(O) Declaration of whether the charter school is the public school employer of record for purposes of EERA.</p>	<p>Charter Schools</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Appears reasonably comprehensive. No specific concerns noted. The charter school will be the public employer of record for EERA.</p>
<p>OTHER GENERAL ASSURANCES:</p>				
<p>Potential effects of the school on the district including manner in which administrative services will be provided (EC 47605 (g))</p>	<p>School Fiscal Services (fiscal)</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Concerns Noted</p>	<p>The financial projections do not provide for potential supervisory oversight costs.</p>
<p>Financial statements, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First year operational budget, • Start-up costs • Cash flow, and • Financial projections for the first three years. <p>(EC 47605 (g)).</p>	<p>School Fiscal Services (fiscal)</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Concerns Noted</p>	<p>Based on the information provided, the budget appears generally viable. However, several areas would need further clarification and refinement to draw a definitive conclusion.</p>

Attachment 2

Liability Insurance (EC 47605 (g))	School Fiscal Services (fiscal)/ CDE, SBE legal	Y	Y	Liability insurance costs are included in the budget.
Facilities (EC 47605 (g)).	School Fiscal Services (Charter Unit)	Y	Y	Substantial facilities renovation costs are included in budget projections.
How the education program will accommodate special education students (EC 47605(b)(5)(A through C), EC 47605(d)(1 and 2(A)).	Special Ed/CDE SBE Legal	N	N	The description of the curriculum is general in nature and fails to provide an in depth educational program for special education students or how they will be accommodated. They need to be part of a SELPA and offer a full continuum of placement options for all kinds of disabilities. There is no written verification of SELPA participation.
Shall be nonsectarian (EC 47605(d))	Legal	Y	Y	Statement contained in Charter
Shall not charge tuition (EC 7605(d))	Legal	Y	Y	Statement contained in Charter
Shall not discriminate (EC 47605(d))	Legal	Y	Y	Statement contained in Charter