

Board Meeting – May 12, 2026

Item VII. Recommendation / Public Hearing

Adopt the Superintendent’s Recommendation to Grant the Appeal for *TEACH Preparatory Mildred S. Cunningham & Edith H. Morris Elementary School, Grades TK-5*: Renewal Petition Denied by the Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education with Attached Report

- a. Staff Findings on the Renewal Petition for *TEACH Preparatory Mildred S. Cunningham & Edith H. Morris Elementary School, Grades TK-5*, Pursuant to Education Code Sections 47605, 47607, 47607.2 and LACOE Board Policy

The *TEACH Preparatory Mildred S. Cunningham & Edith H. Morris Elementary School* (TEACH Prep) renewal petition is presented to the Los Angeles County Board of Education (County Board) pursuant to Education Code (EC) 47605, 47607, and 47607.2. The renewal process requires the authorizer to evaluate both the past performance of the charter school and whether the renewal petition meets the criteria for approval. TEACH Prep is currently authorized by the Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education.

Charter renewal is governed by EC 47605, 47607, and 47607.2 and the California Code of Regulations, Title 5 (5 CCR) 11966.4 and 11966.5. The California Department of Education has designated TEACH Prep as a middle performing school. As such, EC 47607(c)(2) and 47607.2(a) do not apply. Critical components of the applicable laws are as follows:

EC 47607(c)(1) sets an additional criterion for determining whether to grant a charter renewal, the charter authority shall consider the performance of the charter school on the state and local indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5.

EC 47607(e) Notwithstanding subdivisions (c) and subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 47607.2, the chartering authority may deny renewal of a charter school upon finding that the school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial fiscal or governance factors or it is not serving all pupils who wish to attend, as documented pursuant to subdivision (d).

EC 47607.2(b) and LACOE Board Policy state, in relevant part:

- (1) for all charter schools for which paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of Section 47607 and subdivision (a) of this section do not apply, the chartering authority shall consider the schoolwide performance and performance of all subgroups of pupils served by the charter school on the state indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5 and the performance of the charter school on the local indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5.
- (2) The chartering authority shall provide greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.
- (3) In addition to the state and local indicators, the chartering authority shall consider clear and convincing evidence showing either of the following:
 - (A) The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year’s progress for each year in school.
 - (B) Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.
- (4) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) shall be demonstrated by verified data, as defined in subdivision (c).

Verified data is defined as data derived from nationally recognized, valid, peer-reviewed, and reliable sources that are externally produced.

5 CCR 11966.5(c)(1-2) provides the considerations and criteria to be used by a county board for making a determination as to whether to renew a charter:

- (1) When considering a petition for renewal, the county board of education shall consider the past performance of the school’s academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement, if any.
- (2) The county board of education may deny a petition for renewal of a charter school only if [it] makes written factual findings, specific to the particular petition, setting forth facts to support one or more of the grounds for denial set forth, as applicable, in

EC 47605(c) or failure to meet one of the criteria set forth in EC section 47607. (Emphasis added)

EC 47607(a)(5)(b) states that renewals of charters are governed by the standards and criteria in EC 47605, and shall include, but not be limited to, a reasonably comprehensive description of any new requirement of charter schools enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.

EC 47605(c) requires a governing board to be guided by the intent of the legislature that charter schools should become an integral part of the education system and that a charter be granted if the governing board is satisfied that granting the charter is consistent with sound educational practice.

EC 47605(c) further states that a governing board may only deny a petition if it provides written factual findings specific to the petition that supports one or more of the following findings:

- (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.
(Not applicable to a renewal petition)
- (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.
- (6) The petition does not contain a declaration of whether or not the charter school shall be deemed the exclusive public employer of the employees of the charter school for purpose of Chapter 10.7.

The County Board shall 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.

A summary of key findings is presented through the table on the following page.

The complete report on the written findings of fact is incorporated here and follows below.

LACOE staff will present the report to the County Board.

| TEACH Prep Charter School Petition for Renewal | | | Meets Requirements |
|---|---|---|--------------------|
| EC 47607(c), EC 47607.2(a) and EC 47607.2(b): Renewal Criteria | | | |
| Finding 1 | A | The charter school provided evidence that it met one of the statutory criteria for renewal with greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance. | Yes |
| | B | There is clear and convincing evidence showing 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. | Yes |
| | C | The charter school is serving All Students without Fiscal or Governance concerns. | Yes |

- b. The Superintendent recommends that the Los Angeles County Board of Education (County Board) adopt the written findings of fact stated below and take action to grant the appeal for renewal of *TEACH Preparatory Mildred S. Cunningham & Edith H. Morris Elementary School, Grades TK-5*, for a term of five years commencing July 1, 2026, and ending June 30, 2031, subject to meeting the following conditions by the specified dates:

1. Budget and Financial Projections

By July 1, 2026, TEACH Preparatory shall submit to LACOE the following:

A revised 2026-27 budget and multi-year projections for fiscal years 2027-28 and 2028-29 based on reasonable assumptions and aligned with the school’s enrollment trend.

- a. Submit a consolidated budget along with the Adopted budget.
- b. A 2026-27 Position Control Budget, detailing all salaries and benefits to accompany the budget.
- c. General Ledgers covering the period from May 2026 through June 30, 2026.

- d. The charter shall provide the following financial documents to the BAS liaison monthly following the date approved by the County Board:
 - TEACH Preparatory’s bank statements with reconciliations.
 - Profit and Loss statements,
 - Balance Sheet statements

2. Charter Management Organization (Shared Cost)

During the term of the charter, the CMO/Shared fee shall not exceed 15 percent of the school’s revenue, defined as the amount received in the current fiscal year from the Local Control Funding Formula, as calculated pursuant to Education Code Section 42238.02 and implemented by Education Code Section 42238.03.

- a. TEACH Preparatory allocates an 18.44% percent CMO/Management fee to the school’s total LCFF revenues to cover the cost of services provided by TEACH Inc.
- b. The CMO/Management fee allocation shall be the lesser of 2 or 2(a) during the charter's authorization.
- c. Annual documentation submitted for the CMO/Management fee must be included:
 1. The TEACH Preparatory Home office Budget including the position control budget.
 2. An Excel File with calculations for the CMO/Management fee allocation and any written Shared plan or agreement.
 3. Details for total TEACH Preparatory Home Office Expenditure Allocation (CMO/Management fees) distributed across all TEACH charter schools.
 4. During the term of the charter if the percentage of the shared operational cost changes. TEACH Preparatory shall submit a revised Position Control Budget, including

salaries and health & wellness, other shared costs identifying the new allocated percentages.

3. Bank Account Segregation

By July 1, 2026, TEACH Preparatory Charter is required to maintain separate bank checking, saving and investment account(s) for all financial transactions to ensure proper fiscal controls and transparency.

4. Fiscal Policy Review and Revision

By September 30, 2026, TEACH Preparatory Charter shall review, update, and submit a revised board-approved Fiscal Policy that complies with applicable laws, LACOE policies and procedures, and addresses the following deficiencies:

- a. **Cost Allocation Plan:** The Fiscal Policy does not describe the methodology for allocating shared operational costs between TEACH school(s) and TEACH Inc. Update the policy to clearly define the manner and methods for charging salaries, health and wellness, and other shared expenses. The frequency of posting shared costs to the three charters and identifying the staff that are responsible for reviewing and approving the cost allocation plan.
- b. **Debt Management:** The Fiscal Policy does not include provisions governing the incurrence of debt, loans, or lines of credit.
- c. **Annual Financial Audit:** The policy cited fails to explicitly reference ED Code 47604.33, which is the primary statute governing charter school audit submission requirements.

Bidding for Auditor: The petition cites a named auditing firm in the petition. Comply with EC 41020 on requirements for the selection of an auditing firm.

- Include compliance with EC 41020(f)(2) - the mandatory auditor rotation for local educational agencies (LEAs).

- d. **Credit Cards:** Policy lacks the setting of limits for credit/debit cards.
- e. **Depreciation:** The policy tracks assets greater than \$2,000 but does not define useful life or depreciation methods.
- f. **Bank Reconciliation:** There is no documented review and approval of the completed bank reconciliation by internal management or the Board.
- g. **Inter-School Borrowing** (if applicable): Create a policy prohibiting inter-school borrowing, or outline parameters for short-term interfund borrowing that includes Board approval.

5. Changes to Shared Cost Allocations

During the charter term, if the percentage of shared operational costs changes, TEACH Preparatory shall submit a revised Position Control Budget, including salaries, health and wellness, and other shared costs, clearly identifying the updated allocation percentages.

6. STRS/PERS Contribution Reserve

By September 30, 2026, the School will pay an invoice equal to two months of estimated STRS contributions. These funds will be retained by LACOE to cover STRS obligations should the charter be unable to meet its contribution requirements. At the end of each fiscal year, LACOE will reconcile actual contributions and issue an invoice for any additional amount necessary to maintain the two-month reserve.

7. Revisions due to change in Authorizer

By July 1, 2026, TEACH Preparatory shall submit to LACOE a revised charter that includes:

MOU and Board Policy Compliance: changes necessary to align petition to the LACOE MOU, LACOE Board Policy, and standard practice, including those identified by LACOE staff.

- a. Revisions to cure all deficiencies noted in the Staff Report

8. Improvement Plan

By July 1, 2026, TEACH Preparatory shall submit an improvement plan that is satisfactory to the charter school office team and Superintendent, that should detail the increases in resources that will be committed to support growth in English Learner Progress and Chronic Absenteeism, including increases in funding for the educational program, increases in staffing / staff time commitments, rationales and any research-based strategies.

9. Conflict of Interest / Related Parties Review

By July 1, 2026, the school’s governing board shall review the conflict of interest and remote interest provisions, assess for any potential conflicts, and report any findings to LACOE.

If any part or sub-part of conditions one (1) through nine (9) is not met by the date specified, the Superintendent will notify the County Board at a regularly scheduled meeting. Failure to meet any of the conditions by the specified timeline is grounds for terminating authorization.

Terminating authorization of the charter is considered a denial.

The complete Report of the Findings of Fact on the renewal petition appeal for *TEACH Preparatory Mildred S. Cunningham & Edith H. Morris Elementary School, Grades TK-5*, is included below.

Los Angeles County Office of Education
Charter School Office
Date: May 12, 2026

Staff Findings on *TEACH Preparatory Mildred S. Cunningham & Edith H. Morris Elementary School*,
Grades TK-5 Appeal of a Renewal Petition Denied by the Los Angeles Unified School District School
District Board of Education

LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION RECOMMENDATION

The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Charter School Review Team (Review Team) finds that *TEACH Preparatory Mildred S. Cunningham & Edith H. Morris Elementary School (TEACH Prep)* meets the criteria for renewal. The Charter School has made sufficient progress toward meeting standards, presents a sound educational program, and is likely to successfully implement the educational program. In addition, the petition contains the required affirmations of Education Code section 47605(e), there is no evidence of problematic fiscal or governance factors or that the Charter School is failing to serve all pupils. Although the petition provides a reasonably comprehensive description with specific deficiencies of several elements, the Review Team concluded that the completion of technical adjustments can bring the petition into legal compliance.

Written factual findings specific to this petition along with supporting evidence are presented in the Finding of Facts section of this report. A *de novo* review of the petition for Finding 2 through 7 can be found in Appendix A.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The petition for *TEACH Prep* is to renew the charter for a grades TK-5 school. This petition was submitted on appeal to the Los Angeles County Board (County Board) on February 20, 2026. The school is located at 8505 South Western Ave. Los Angeles, California within the geographic boundaries of the Los Angeles Unified School District.

TEACH Prep was initially approved by the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) Board in 2018 and this is the first petition for charter renewal.

TEACH Prep is one of 3 schools currently operated by the 501(c)(3) nonprofit public benefit corporation TEACH Inc. dba Strategic Charter Solutions. This charter management organization (CMO) operates three schools in Los Angeles County:

1. TEACH Preparatory Mildred S. Cunningham & Edith H. Morris Elementary (Tk-5)
2. TEACH Academy of Technologies (5-8)
3. TEACH Tech Charter High (9-12)

Mission and Vision: The petition states the charter school’s mission is “to create a high quality, innovative teaching and learning environment that focuses on literacy; integrating state-of-the-art technologies across the core curriculum to achieve academic proficiency for all students”.

The school’s vision according to the petition is to “reach students of all backgrounds by teaching the entire child which includes the social, physical, emotional and intellectual needs of the student. Upon graduation, the knowledge and the experiences acquired at TEACH will be effectively applied to students’ daily lives. TEACH ES will create an educational environment that will foster success in the classroom as well as the community.”

Students Served by the School: Although the charter allows grades TK-5, TEACH Prep serves students in grades TK-4, and the petition states enrollment is drawn mainly from Westmont/Gramercy Park and its neighboring communities. The school may add grade 5 at a later date if needed.

The 2024-25 enrollment at TEACH Prep was approximately 271 students, with the following demographics: 54% Hispanic or Latino; 44% African American or Black; 1% Two or More Races; and 1% White; 99% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students (SED); 12.5% Students with Disabilities (SWD); 25% English Learners (ELs); and 1% Foster Youth (FY).

Table 1: TEACH PREP 2024-2025 Enrollment by Ethnicity

| Student Groups | Number Enrolled | Percent of Total Enrollment |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| All | 271 | 100.0% |
| AA/Black | 119 | 43.9% |
| American Indian | 0 | 0% |
| Asian | 0 | 0% |
| Filipino | 0 | 0% |
| Hispanic | 145 | 53.5% |
| Not Reported | 0 | 0% |
| Pac Islander | 0 | 0% |
| Two or more | 3 | 1.1% |
| White | 4 | 1.5% |

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp>
Retrieved 02-25-26

Table 2: TEACH PREP 2024-2025 Enrollment by Student Group

| Student Groups | Number Enrolled | Percent of Total Enrollment |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| EL | 68 | 25.1% |
| Foster | 3 | 1.1% |
| Homeless | 0 | 0% |
| SED | 269 | 99.3% |
| SWD | 34 | 12.5% |

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp>
Retrieved 02-25-26

Table 3: TEACH PREP Historic Enrollment by Grade Level

| Year | Grade TK | Grade K | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Total |
|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| 2018-19 | N/A | 47 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| 2019-20 | N/A | 59 | 51 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 145 |
| 2020-21 | N/A | 36 | 51 | 58 | 42 | 0 | 187 |
| 2021-22 | N/A | 47 | 53 | 52 | 58 | 49 | 259 |
| 2022-23 | N/A | 50 | 43 | 53 | 49 | 53 | 248 |
| 2023-24 | 20 | 51 | 43 | 54 | 52 | 52 | 272 |
| 2024-25 | 20 | 46 | 48 | 52 | 52 | 53 | 271 |

Since its authorization by the LAUSD Board, TEACH Prep has not received any written notices of concern.

REASON FOR DENIAL BY LOCAL DISTRICT

The LAUSD Board denied the renewal petition based on written findings of fact taking into account *Education Code (EC)* sections 47605, 47607, 47607.2 and 47607.5 and the *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5 (5 *CCR*) that govern charter renewal.

EC 47607.5(a) states if either a school district governing board or a county board of education, as a chartering authority, does not grant a renewal to a charter school pursuant to Section 47607 or 47607.2, the charter school may appeal the decision pursuant to the procedures pertaining to a denial of a petition for establishment of a charter school, as provided in subdivision (k) of Section 47605 for review in accordance with Section 47607.

EC 47607(c)(1) sets forth *as an additional criterion for determining whether to grant a charter renewal, the chartering authority shall consider the performance of the charter school on the state and local indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5.*

The District Board found that TEACH Prep had insufficient performance on state indicators (Dashboard).

5 CCR 11966.4(b)(2) permits a district governing board to deny a petition for renewal of a charter school only if it makes written factual findings as mandated by *EC* section 47605(b), the absence of written factual findings shall be deemed an approval of the petition for renewal.

The District Board made the following written factual findings through its action on February 17, 2026:

- As a Middle Performing charter school, TEACH Prep failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to pupils of Charter School. (Ed. Code § 47607.2(b).) (Criterion 2)
- Petitioners were demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition (Ed. Code § 476052(c)(2)) (Criterion 1)

EC 47605(c)(2): The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program:

The District Board found that TEACH Prep:

- Did not yield academic outcomes at a level equal to or higher than the state averages for All Students, and a majority of numerically significant student groups in ELA and math for a majority of the last three years
- Did not yield outcomes at a level equal to or higher than the state average in English Learner Progress for any of last three years
- Had a rate of chronic absenteeism that was higher than the state for All Students and for all numerically significant student groups for the last three years
- Did not demonstrate student performance for All Students and for a majority of numerically significant student groups that was higher than the Resident School Mean (RSM) for ELA, math or English Learner Progress for a majority of the last three years
- Did not meet the Student Achievement benchmark in any of the past three years

Any of the above findings may be cause for denial of a renewal petition.

Response from the Petitioner

The petitioner provided a written response to the findings of the local district board and submitted it as part of the petition package. The response was considered during the review process.

Appeal to the Los Angeles County Board of Education

TEACH Prep submitted a renewal petition to the County Board on February 20, 2026. The County Board held a Public Hearing to determine support for the petition on April 14, 2026. At the Public Hearing, nine people spoke in support of the school: two parents, two teachers and five other staff members. One spoke in opposition to the school: a representative from the LAUSD Charter School Division.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION REVIEW PROCESS

Review Criteria: The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Charter School Review Team (Review Team) considered the petition according to the requirements of the *Education Code (EC)* and other pertinent laws, guidance established in the *California Code of Regulations* Title 5, County Board Policy and the Superintendent’s Administrative Regulations.¹

LACOE has adopted the petition review criteria established in 5 CCR section 11967.5.1(a-g) except where LACOE determined that the regulations provide insufficient direction or where they are not applicable because the structure or responsibility of the County Board and LACOE differ from those of the State Board of Education (SBE) and the California Department of Education (CDE). In these instances, LACOE developed its own local review criteria or added criteria to those developed by CDE to reflect the needs of the County Board as the authorizer and LACOE as the monitoring and oversight agency. These local criteria do not conflict with statute.

A more detailed description of the LACOE petition renewal process can be found in Appendix B.

CHARTER RENEWAL ELIGIBILITY

Statutory Framework and Criteria for Renewal²

All charter schools requesting renewal must clearly show that they meet eligibility requirements set forth in the Charter Schools Act and further defined in AB 1505. Depending on the findings adopted by the County Board, a charter may be renewed or denied renewal based on these criteria found in *EC* 47605, 47607 and 47607.2:

1. Does the petition and the supporting documentation reflect a sound educational program for pupils? Are the petitioners likely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition? Does the petition contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements and affirm the conditions of *EC* 47605(e)?
2. Is the charter eligible for renewal under the High, Middle, or Low performing category and has the charter provided an argument with sufficient evidence that it has attained the criteria for renewal under that category? Has the charter attained measurable increases in academic achievement schoolwide and for numerically significant subgroups³ served by the charter school, and if applicable, does the school have strong postsecondary outcomes?

¹ Words in italics indicate a direct reference to the language in these documents.

² The full renewal criteria can be found in Appendix B.

³ Numerically significant subgroup (student group) for a charter school is defined as a student group with 30 or more students in the technical guide of the California Dashboard.

3. Does the charter school have discriminatory enrollment or dismissal practices? Does the charter have substantial fiscal or governance issues?

TEACH Prep is designated as Middle Performing under EC 47607.2(b) for evaluation purposes⁴

Middle Performing EC 47607.2(b)/LACOE Board Policy

The school was not found eligible for high performing under EC 47607(c) nor low performing under EC 47607.2(a); therefore, the chartering authority:

1. Shall consider schoolwide performance and performance of all subgroups on the Dashboard, while providing greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal
2. Shall also consider clear and convincing evidence with verified data showing either:
 1. The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in schoolOR
 2. Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.

Note: An Authorizer may only deny pursuant to EC 47607.2(b) upon making written findings that:

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

Written factual findings specific to this petition along with supporting facts are presented in the next section of this report.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION FINDINGS OF FACT

Finding 1: The charter school's academic performance criteria specified in EC 47607(b) has been determined to be sufficient for renewal for a school receiving a middle classification.

TEACH Prep received a Middle-Performing classification from the CDE. Verified data was utilized in this renewal consideration in alignment with the language previously set forth in EC 47607.2(c) and in current LACOE Board Policy. The charter school met the renewal criteria specified in EC 47607.2(b) and LACOE Board Policy.

In reviewing the schoolwide performance and the performance of all numerically significant student groups on the California School Dashboard and the verified data provided by the charter school, TEACH Prep has provided evidence that the school has made one year's progress through their iReady data as summarized on Table 6.

⁴ Source: CDE: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/performcategory.asp> Retrieved 3/26/26

As a grades TK-4 charter school, the California School Dashboard for TEACH Prep consists of the following indicators: academic performance on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics (Math); the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI); the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator; the Suspension Rate Indicator; and Local Indicators. Table C1 in Appendix C shows TEACH Prep Dashboard colors for the last three years.

The school has the following numerically significant student groups for one or more indicator: Hispanic, African American (AA), English Learners (EL), Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED), and Students with Disabilities (SWD).

TEACH Prep uses iReady assessments for grades K-4 to show one year’s progress. Extensive data tables for the California School Dashboard indicators and verified data from iReady is available in Appendix C. The following is a summary of the data used to determine renewal eligibility.

Academic Performance Indicators on the California School Dashboard Compared to State

Tables 4 and 5 show that TEACH Prep’s academic performance in ELA and Math has failed to meet the state averages in Distance from Standard (DFS) for a majority of the past three years for All Students and the majority of numerically significant student groups.

Table 4 shows that while the TEACH Prep Dashboard performance in English Language Arts over the last three years does not meet the standard for renewal, the English Learners student group in the 2024-2025 school year did have a better DFS than the statewide average.

Table 4: TEACH PREP Summary: ELA Distance from Standard Compared to the State

| | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--|-------|-------|----------|
| Indicator: ELA | | | |
| Status Metric: Distance from Standard | | | |
| All Students | Lower | Lower | Lower |
| Numerically Significant Student Groups | | | |
| African American or Black | Lower | Lower | Lower |
| Hispanic or Latino | Lower | Lower | Lower |
| English Learners | Lower | Lower | Higher |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Lower | Lower | Lower |
| Students with Disabilities | — | — | Higher** |
| Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or above the state’s DFS? | NO | NO | NO |
| <small>Source: Comprehensive ELA Dashboard data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C (Tables C2-C4) ** - Student groups must have at least 30 or more students to be included for accountability purposes</small> | | | |

Table 5 shows that while the TEACH Prep Dashboard performance in math over the last three years does not meet the standard for renewal, that in the 2024-2025 school year, TEACH Prep students outperformed the state both overall and for every numerically significant student group. In 2023-2024, the African American student group outperformed the state average, and in 2022-2023 the Hispanic student group outperformed the state average.

Table 5: TEACH PREP Summary: Math Distance from Standard Compared to the State

| | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|---|--------|--------|----------|
| Indicator: Math | | | |
| Status Metric: Distance from Standard | | | |
| All Students | Lower | Lower | Higher |
| Numerically Significant Student Groups | | | |
| African American or Black | Lower | Higher | Higher |
| Hispanic or Latino | Higher | Lower | Higher |
| English Learners | Lower | Lower | Higher |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Lower | Lower | Higher |
| Students with Disabilities | — | — | Higher** |
| Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or above the state's DFS? | NO | NO | YES |
| <small>Source: Comprehensive Math Dashboard data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C (Tables C5-C7) ** - Student groups must have at least 30 or more students to be included for accountability purposes</small> | | | |

Although the Students with Disabilities student group outperformed the state for both ELA and math in 2025, an insufficient amount of these students were tested in order to use this data for accountability purposes.

As the school did not show clear and convincing evidence of academic achievement through the California Dashboard in ELA and Math, the school's verified data, iReady Progress to Typical Growth (PTG), was reviewed.

To demonstrate one year's progress using iReady, the student group's Typical Annual Growth must be greater than or equal to 75% for Reading, and 80% for Math. The iReady data is disaggregated by grade level for all students tested and student groups. Student groups with 10 or more students per grade level were used for both Reading and Math.

In addition to reviewing iReady PTG data, student participation rates on these benchmark assessments were considered. The TEACH Prep Stability Count from DataQuest (<https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>) was used to determine an approximate participation rate for each assessment. Most of the participation rates of students taking iReady assessments for the last three years were above 95%, with those that were not being discarded and not used to establish renewal eligibility. Participation Rate data and a detailed methodology can be found in Appendix C, Tables C22-C23.

Table 6 below shows a three-year summary of TEACH Prep verified data results for Reading and Math. It shows that with the exception of 2022-2023 in Math, performance met the renewal criteria. Specifically, that of a majority of grade levels both for All Students and for a majority of student groups for a majority of the last three years met the publisher's cut points for a year of growth for both Reading and Math.

TEACH Prep - Verified Data

| Legend For iReady Tables |
|---|
| Green cell indicates student group has met the minimum requirement for one year's growth |
| Red cell indicates student group has not met the minimum requirement for one year's growth |
| Dark Grey indicates data not used for accountability due to less than 10 students tested |
| Light grey indicates data not used for accountability due to a participation rate less than 95% |
| N/A indicates student group data was not made available by the school |

Table 6: TEACH Prep Summary- iREADY Reading and Math Student Groups Meeting Annual Growth

| | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 |
|--|--|---------|---------|--|-------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | iReady Reading | | | | iReady Math | | |
| | Grade Levels Meeting Criteria | | | | Grade Levels Meeting Criteria | | |
| All Students | 2 of 4 | 4 of 5 | 4 of 5 | | 2 of 4 | 1 of 5 | 4 of 5 |
| | Numerically Significant Student Groups | | | | | | |
| African American or Black | 4 of 5 | 4 of 5 | 4 of 5 | | 4 of 5 | 1 of 5 | 3 of 5 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4 of 5 | 3 of 5 | 4 of 5 | | 4 of 5 | 2 of 5 | 4 of 5 |
| English Learners | N/A | 4 of 5 | 4 of 5 | | N/A | 2 of 5 | 2 of 5 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | N/A | 4 of 5 | 3 of 5 | | N/A | 1 of 5 | 2 of 4* |
| Participation Rate Met | YES | YES | YES | | YES | YES | YES |
| Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or above the publisher's metric? | | | | | | | |
| All Students | YES | YES | YES | | YES | NO | YES |
| Student Groups | YES | YES | YES | | YES | NO | YES* |
| Both | YES | YES | YES | | YES | NO | YES* |
| Source: Comprehensive verified data tables including Participation Rates are available in Appendix C (Tables C15-C23) | | | | | | | |
| * - In 2024-2025 TEACH Prep had 99.3% SED therefore All Students group could be used as a proxy | | | | | | | |

The remaining Academic Indicators on the Dashboard for elementary schools is the ELPI (English Learner Progress Indicator). Table 7 summarizes ELPI data and shows that TEACH Prep has not outperformed the state in any of the past three years. This is an area of concern that would need to be prioritized if the school is renewed on appeal.

Table 7: TEACH PREP Summary: ELPI Percent Compared to the State

| | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| Indicator: English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) | | | |
| Status Metric: Percent Making Progress | | | |
| English Learners | Lower | Lower | Lower |
| Source: Comprehensive ELPI data tables including state comparison are available in Appendix C (Table C8) | | | |

For the three Academic Indicators which are to receive additional weight pursuant to 47607(b)(2) in renewal decisions: ELA, Math and ELPI, the results for the three most recent years indicate that a majority of the indicators are met for a majority of the years, as shown in Table 8:

Table 8: Summary of TEACH Prep Academic Indicators

| Academic Indicator | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|
| ELA (Verified Data) | Met | Met | Met |
| Math (Verified Data) | Met | Not Met | Met |
| ELPI | Not Met | Not Met | Not Met |
| Source: Comprehensive data tables including state comparisons are available in Appendix C (Tables C2-C8, C16-C21) | | | |

Academic Engagement, School Conditions and School Climate Indicators on the California Dashboard Compared to State

The remaining Dashboard indicators for elementary schools include Chronic Absenteeism Rate, Suspension Rate, and Local Indicators.

To demonstrate measurable increases for renewal in the areas of chronic absenteeism and suspension rate, both all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups must be the same or lower than the state.

Table 9 below shows that for Chronic Absenteeism, TEACH Prep has not outperformed the state for All Students or for any student groups in the three past years. High Chronic Absenteeism rates are a concern that would need to be prioritized if the school is renewed on appeal.

Table 9: TEACH PREP Summary: Chronic Absenteeism Percent Compared to the State

| | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--|----------|--------|--------|
| Indicator: Chronic Absenteeism | | | |
| Status Metric: Percent Chronically Absent | | | |
| All Students | Higher | Higher | Higher |
| Numerically Significant Student Groups | | | |
| African American or Black | Higher | Higher | Higher |
| Hispanic or Latino | Higher | Higher | Higher |
| English Learners | Higher | Higher | Higher |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Higher | Higher | Higher |
| Students with Disabilities | Higher** | Higher | Higher |
| Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or below the state average? | NO | NO | NO |
| Source: Comprehensive Chronic Absenteeism data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C (Tables C12-C14) | | | |
| ** - Student groups must have at least 30 or more students to be included for accountability purposes | | | |

Table 10 below shows that TEACH Prep outperformed the state for both All Students and all student groups in the area of Suspension Rate in all of the past three years.

Table 10: TEACH PREP Summary: Suspension Rate Percent Compared to the State

| | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--|---------|-------|-------|
| Indicator: Suspension Rate | | | |
| Status Metric: Percent of Students Suspended at Least One Day | | | |
| All Students | Lower | Lower | Lower |
| Numerically Significant Student Groups | | | |
| African American or Black | Lower | Lower | Lower |
| Hispanic or Latino | Lower | Lower | Lower |
| English Learners | Lower | Lower | Lower |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Lower | Lower | Lower |
| Students with Disabilities | Lower** | Lower | Lower |
| Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or below the state average? | YES | YES | YES |
| Source: Comprehensive Suspension data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C (Tables C9-C11) | | | |
| ** - Student groups must have at least 30 or more students to be included for accountability purposes | | | |

Table 11 below shows that TEACH Prep met all Dashboard Local Indicators⁵ in two of the last three years.

Table 11: TEACH PREP Summary of Local Indicators

| | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|---|----------------------|------|------|
| Local Indicators | Criteria Met? | | |
| Basics: teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilities | Not Met | Met | Met |
| Implementation of Academic Standards | Not Met | Met | Met |
| Parent & Family Engagement | Not Met | Met | Met |
| Local Climate Survey | Not Met | Met | Met |
| Access to a Broad Course of Study | Not Met | Met | Met |
| Source: CDE Local Indicators https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/localindidatafiles.asp Retrieved 02-25-26 | | | |

Other Considerations

Analysis of enrollment data obtained from the California Department of Education (CDE), as required by EC 47607(d), did not reveal any evidence that the school failed to serve students seeking enrollment.

Determination

Based on a comprehensive review, the school has demonstrated measurable progress in key areas required by EC 47607.2(b), with greater weight provided to measurements of academic performance. *The charter school has demonstrated sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to pupils of the school.*

⁵ Per EC 52064.5, local indicators are self-assessed and self-reported by LEAs.

Appendix A

DE NOVO REVIEW OF FINDINGS 2 -7

Finding 2: The petition provides a sound educational program for students to be enrolled in the school. [EC 47605(c)(1)]

Based on the guidance established in 5 CCR section 11967.5.1(a), the charter petition is *consistent with sound educational practice* based on evidence that *it is likely to be of educational benefit to pupils who attend. A charter school need not be designed or intended to meet the educational needs of every student who might possibly seek to enroll in order for the charter to be granted.*

Finding 3: The petitioners are demonstrably likely to successfully implement the proposed educational program. [EC 47605(c)(2)]

While there have been connections between staff at TEACH Inc. and the unsuccessful charter schools TEACH Las Vegas and Public Policy Charter School, the Review Team did not determine that they were sufficient to find that the petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to implement the program at TEACH Prep.

Fiscal analysis is contained in Appendix D.

Finding 4: The petition contains an affirmation of all specified assurances. [EC 47605(c)(4); EC 47605(e)]

Finding 5: The petition does contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements. [EC 47605(c)(5)(A)-(O)]

Based on the guidance established in *Education Code*, California Code of Regulations, the requirements set forth in the Superintendent's Administrative Regulations (AR) and other requirements of law, all of the 15 required elements are reasonably comprehensive. The findings of the Review Team are as follows:

Element 1: Description of the Educational Program. *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

The petition fails to provide an adequate description of *how the charter school will meet the needs of students with disabilities, English learners, students achieving substantially above or below grade level expectations, and other special student populations [5 CCR 11967.5.1(f)(1)(G)]*

Petition language regarding meeting the needs of English Learners inadequately describes how the school will use staff knowledgeable in language acquisition to support English Learners.

Element 2: Measurable Pupil Outcomes. *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

The petition does not adequately specify the *skills, knowledge, and attitudes that reflect the school's educational objectives and can be assessed at a minimum, by objective means that are frequent and sufficiently detailed enough to determine whether pupils are making satisfactory progress. It is intended that the frequency of objective means of measuring pupil outcomes vary according to such factors as grade level, subject matter, the outcome of previous objective measurements, and information that may be collected from anecdotal sources. To be sufficiently detailed, objective means of measuring pupil outcomes must be capable of being used readily to evaluate the effectiveness of and to modify instruction for individual students and for groups of students.*

The outcomes must be based on verifiable data. The stated past performance on Measurable Pupil Outcomes (MPOs) does not align with available data.

Appeal petition states that the outcome related to 100% credentialed teachers was met every year of current term, but California State Assignment Accountability System (CALSAAS) reports for the last three years show that for:

- 24-25: There were 3 teachers that were misassigned
- 23-24: There were 2 vacancies that needed to be covered by substitutes
- 22-23: There was 1 misassignment and 1 vacancy

Teacher Assignment and Monitoring Outcomes data available at the DataQuest website shows that the percentage of teachers at TEACH Prep with clear, preliminary or intern credentials was:

- 22-23: 89%
- 21-22: 41%
- 20-21: 83%

Also, some stated goals and projected outcomes do not align. The petition has language stating the goal of the school is to “Close the achievement gap for student subgroups” but annual improvement targets for several outcomes are the same amount for each student group, regardless of their differing baselines, resulting in the maintenance of achievement gaps.

Element 3: Method for Measuring Pupil Progress. *Reasonably comprehensive*

Element 4: Governance Structure. *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

Charter petition language does not reflect the following new laws passed since the charter was last approved:

- AB 640 and SB 827, in effect as of 1/1/26, regarding finance training

Element 5: Employee Qualifications. *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

Qualifications for CMO-level EL Coordinator mentioned during Capacity Interview on 4/16/26 is not described in petition.

Charter petition language does not reflect the following new law passed since the charter was last approved:

- AB 2345, in effect as of 1/1/25, regarding new CPR requirement for teachers

Element 6: Health and Safety Procedures. *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

Charter petition language does not reflect the following new law passed since the charter was last approved:

- AB 230, in effect as of 1/1/24, regarding stocking of menstrual products

Element 7: Means to Achieve a Reflective Racial, Ethnic Balance, Special Education and English Learner Student Population. *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

Recognizing the limitations on admissions to charter schools imposed by *EC 47605(d)*, the petition contains *specific information* indicating the racial, ethnic, and Special Education and EL composition of the general population residing within the territorial jurisdiction of the school district in which the charter will be located is attained by the charter school.

Table 12: Racial and Ethnic Composition of TEACH PREP and Local District (LAUSD)

| Student Groups | Percent of Total Enrollment of School 2024-2025 | District is LAUSD |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | Percent in District |
| African American or Black | 43.9% | 7.1% |
| American Indian | 0% | 0.1% |
| Asian | 0% | 3.3% |
| Filipino | 0% | 1.6% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 53.5% | 73.6% |
| Not Reported | 0% | 2.2% |
| Pacific Islander | 0% | 0.2% |
| Two or more Races | 1.1% | 2.1% |
| White | 1.5% | 9.7% |

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp> Retrieved 02-25-26

Table 13: Racial and Ethnic Composition of TEACH PREP and Local Community (Zip Code 90047)

| Student Groups | Percent of Total Enrollment of School 2024-2025 | Community* Zip code 90047 |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| | | Percent of Total Community |
| African American or Black | 43.9% | 50.7% |
| American Indian | 0% | 0.1% |
| Asian | 0% | 1.1% |
| Filipino | 0% | 0.8% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 53.5% | 40.3% |
| Pacific Islander | 0% | 0.8% |
| Two or more Races | 1.1% | 3.7% |
| White | 1.5% | 2.4% |

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp> Retrieved 02-25-26
 *Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020-2024 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates <https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDP5Y2024.DP05?q=860XX00US90047>

Table 14 shows that homeless students may have been under-identified. Not only were zero students identified as homeless in 2024-2025, no students have ever been identified as homeless at TEACH Prep. If school is approved, this will be an area of focus during oversight.

Table 14 TEACH PREP 2024-2025 Enrollment by Student Program

| Student Groups | Percent of Total Enrollment of School 2024-2025 | District is LAUSD |
|----------------|---|---------------------|
| | | Percent in District |
| EL | 25.1% | 18.6% |
| Foster | 1.1% | 0.5% |
| Homeless | 0% | 2.7% |
| SED | 99.3% | 82.4% |
| SWD | 12.5% | 15.6% |

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp> Retrieved 02-25-26

Element 8: Admission Requirements. *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

The admission requirements are not in keeping with EC section 47605(c)(5)(H) and EC section 47605(e). Admission policies do not include a public random drawing or the process for conducting the lottery is not clearly defined and/or observable.

Lottery process is unclear in regards to handling of siblings of current students and children of current staff.

Element 9: Annual Independent Financial Audits. *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

The charter language does not specify a timeline for addressing audit exceptions in alignment with 5 CCR 11967.5.1 (f)(9)(C).

The charter petition language states that “The annual audit shall be conducted by CliftonLarsonAllen LLP” which may conflict with EC 41020(f)(2) and the competitive bidding process contained in the TEACH Inc. Fiscal Policies and Procedures.

Element 10: Suspension and Expulsion Procedures. *Reasonably comprehensive*

Element 11: STRS, PERS, and Social Security. *Reasonably comprehensive*

Element 12: Public School Attendance Alternatives. *Reasonably comprehensive*

Element 13: Post-Employment Rights of Employees. *Reasonably comprehensive*

Element 14: Dispute Resolution Procedures. *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

Element 15: Closure Procedures. *Reasonably comprehensive*

Finding 6: *The petitioners are not demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial fiscal or governance factors or is not serving all pupils who wish to attend, as documented pursuant to EC 47607(e).*

Staff reviewed the data from the CDE and did not note any concerns regarding TEACH Prep not serving all students.

Finding 7: The petition does satisfy all of the Required Assurances of *Education Code* section 47605(d), (f) through (i), (l) through (n) as follows:

Standards, Assessments and Parent Consultation. [EC 47605(d)] *Meets the condition*

Employment is Voluntary. [EC 47605(f)] *Not applicable*

Pupil Attendance is Voluntary. [EC 47605(g)] *Not applicable*

Effect on the Authorizer and Financial Projections. [EC 47605(h)] *Provides the necessary evidence*

Preference to Academically Low Performing Students. [EC 47605(i)] *Qualifies*

Teacher Credentialing Requirement. [EC 47605(l)] *Meets the condition*

Transmission of Audit Report. [EC 47605(m)] *Meets the condition*

Parent Involvement is Voluntary [EC 47605(n)] *Meets the condition*

Appendix B

LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION RENEWAL CRITERIA AND REVIEW PROCESS

The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Charter School Review Team (Review Team) reviews a renewal petition according to the renewal criteria found in *EC 47605*, *47607* and *47607.2* and conducts a *de novo* review of the entire petition submission.

Statutory Framework and Criteria for Renewal

All charter schools requesting renewal must clearly show that they meet eligibility requirements set forth in Charter Schools Act and further defined in AB 1505. Depending on the findings adopted by the County Board, a charter may be renewed or denied renewal based on these criteria found in *EC 47605*, *47607* and *47607.2*:

1. Do the petition and supporting documentation reflect a sound educational program for pupils? Are the petitioners likely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition? Does the petition contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements and affirm the conditions of *EC 47605(e)*?
2. Is the charter eligible for renewal under the High, Middle, or Low performing category and has the charter provided an argument with sufficient evidence that it has attained the criteria for renewal under that category? Has the charter attained measurable increases in academic achievement schoolwide and for numerically significant subgroups served by the charter school, and if applicable, does the school have strong postsecondary outcomes?
3. Does the charter school have discriminatory enrollment or dismissal practices? Does the charter have substantial fiscal or governance issues?

High Performing *EC 47607(c)*

A charter school that for two (2) consecutive years immediately preceding renewal:

1. Received the two highest performance levels [green or blue] schoolwide on all state indicators on the Dashboard
OR
2. For all measurements of academic performance, the school received levels schoolwide that are the same or higher than the state average, and for a majority of subgroups performing statewide below the state average in each respective year, received levels that are higher than the state average.

Middle Performing *EC 47607.2(b)*/LACOE Board Policy

For charter schools not designated under either the High or Low Performing criteria, the chartering authority:

1. Shall consider schoolwide performance and performance of all subgroups on the Dashboard, while providing greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal
 2. Shall also consider clear and convincing evidence with verified data showing either:
 - A. The 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.

Note: Charter Authority MAY DENY ONLY upon making written findings that:

- 1. The charter school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to pupils of the school;

AND

- 2. Closure is in the best interest of the pupils;

AND

- 3. The decision provided greater weight to the performance on measurements of academic performance.

Low Performing EC 47607.2(a)

A charter school that for two consecutive years immediately preceding renewal:

- 1. Received the two (2) lowest performance levels [red or orange] schoolwide on all state indicators on the Dashboard

OR

- 2. For all measures of academic performance, the school received performance levels schoolwide that are the same or lower than the state average, and for a majority of subgroups performing statewide below the state average in each respective year, received levels that are lower than the state average.

Note: Renewal for a 2-year term may occur only if the following written factual findings are both made:

- 1. The charter school is taking meaningful steps to address the underlying causes of low performance, and those steps are/will be reflected in a written plan adopted by the school's governing body

AND

- 2. There is a clear and convincing evidence, demonstrated by verified data showing either:

- A. The 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

Review Criteria: The LACOE Review Team considered the petition according to the requirements of the *Education Code* and other pertinent laws, guidance established in the *California Code of Regulations (5 CCR)*, Title 5, County Board Policy and Superintendent's Administrative Regulations.⁶

LACOE has adopted the petition review criteria established in 5 CCR section 11967.5.1(a-g) except where LACOE determined that the regulations provide insufficient direction or where they are not applicable because the structure or responsibility of the County Board and LACOE differ from those of the State Board of Education (SBE) and the CDE. In these instances, LACOE developed its own local review criteria or added criteria to those developed by CDE to reflect the needs of the County Board as the authorizer and LACOE as the monitoring and oversight agency. These local criteria do not conflict with statute.

⁶ Words in italics indicate a direct reference to the language in these documents.

Reasonably Comprehensive: In addition to the regulatory guidance that specifies the components of each required element, 5 CCR section 11967.5.1(g) states a “reasonably comprehensive” description of the required petition elements shall include, but not be limited to, information that:

- (1) *Is substantive and is not, for example, a listing of topics with little elaboration.*
- (2) *For elements that have multiple aspects, addresses essentially all aspects the elements, not just selected aspects.*
- (3) *Is specific to the charter petition being proposed, not to charter schools or charter petitions generally.*
- (4) *Describes, as applicable among the different elements, how the charter school will:*
 - (A) *Improve pupil learning*
 - (B) *Increase learning opportunities for its pupils, particularly pupils who have been identified as academically low achieving.*
 - (C) *Provide parents, guardians, and pupils with expanded educational opportunities.*
 - (D) *Hold itself accountable for measurable, performance-based pupil outcomes.*
 - (E) *Provide vigorous competition with other public school options available to parents, guardians, and students.*

Reasonably Comprehensive with Deficiencies: An element may be reasonably comprehensive but lacks specific critical information or contain an error important enough to warrant correction. These elements are described as “reasonably comprehensive” with a specific “deficiency” or “deficiencies.” Correcting the deficiency or deficiencies would not be a material revision (as defined in statute and County Board Policy) to the charter.

Technical Adjustments: Three circumstances may require a “technical adjustment” to the petition:

- Adjustments necessary to reflect the County Board as the authorizer as required by statute. These adjustments are necessary because the petition was initially submitted to a local district and contains specific references to and/or language required by that district and/or the petition does not reflect the structure of the County Office.
- Adjustments needed to bring the petition current with changes made to law since the petition was submitted to the district as required by statute.
- Adjustments necessary to address clerical errors or inconsistencies where making the adjustment would not be a material revision (as defined in statute and County Board Policy) to the charter.

Affirmations and Assurances: The petition shall contain a clear, unequivocal affirmation of each requirement, not a general statement of intention to comply. Neither the charter nor any of the supporting documents shall include any evidence that the charter will fail to comply with the conditions described in EC section 47605(c)(4).

Reviewers: The Review Team included staff from Business Advisory Services, Facilities and Construction, Risk Management, Curriculum and Instruction, Special Education, Student Support Services, Human Resources, Office of General Counsel, the Division of Accountability, Support and Monitoring, and the Charter School Office.

Scope of Review: Findings are based on a review of the same petition and supporting documents considered by the local district, information obtained through the Capacity Interview and other communications with the petitioner(s) and representatives of the school, and other publicly available information.

Legislative Intent

The Review Team considered whether the petition complies with *EC* section 47601 of the *Charter Schools Act*, which states:

It is the intent of the Legislature, in enacting this part, to provide opportunities for teachers, parents, pupils, and community members to establish and maintain schools that operate independently from the existing school district structure, as a method to accomplish all of the following:

- (a) Improve pupil learning.*
- (b) Increase learning opportunities for all pupils, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for pupils who are identified as academically low achieving.*
- (c) Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods.*
- (d) Create new professional opportunities for teachers, including the opportunity to be responsible for the learning program at the school site.*
- (e) Provide parents and pupils with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system.*
- (f) Hold the schools established under this part accountable for meeting measurable pupil outcomes, and provide the schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance-based accountability systems.*
- (g) Provide vigorous competition within the public school system to stimulate continual improvements in all public schools.*

Additional Review Criteria Specific to a Renewal Petition

The renewal of a charter authorized by the County Board is governed by *EC* sections 47607 and 47605 or 47605.6 and 5 *CCR* section 11966.5, which provides the requirements for a renewal submission to a county board of education.

EC 47607(b) states that renewals *are governed by the standards and criteria in section 47605* (the requirements to establish a charter), and shall include, but not be limited to, *a reasonably comprehensive description of any new requirement of charter schools enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.*

This language varies slightly from the requirement under 5 *CCR* 11966.4(a)(2), which requires the district to determine whether the renewal petition includes *a reasonably comprehensive description of how the charter school has met all new charter school requirements enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.* (Emphasis added)

The Review Team determined whether each required element complies with current legal requirements and whether the petitioners showed they are familiar with current legal requirements through the Capacity Interview. If the petition did not comply or the petitioners were unfamiliar with current law, the Review Team noted the deficiency through the applicable finding.

EC 47607(e) Notwithstanding subdivision (c) and subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 47607.2, the chartering authority may deny renewal of a charter school upon finding that the school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial fiscal or governance factors, or it not serving all pupils who wish to attend.

5 CCR 11966.5(b) provides the timelines, process and requirements for reviewing a renewal petition:

A petition for renewal, whether submitted to the county board of education as the chartering authority or on appeal from denial of the renewal petition by the local governing board, shall be considered by the county board of education upon receipt of the petition with all of the requirements set forth in this subdivision.

- (1) Documentation that the charter school meets at least one of the criteria specified in Education Code section 47607(b).*
- (2) A copy of the renewal charter petition, as denied by the local board, including a reasonably comprehensive description of how the charter school has met all new charter school requirements enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.
 - (A) The signature requirement set forth in Education Code section 47605(a) is not applicable to a petition for renewal.**
- (3) When applicable, a copy of the governing board's denial and supporting written factual findings, if available.*
- (4) A description of any changes to the renewal petition necessary to reflect the county board of education as the chartering entity.*

County staff may provide a description of whether the petitioner met submission requirements.

5 CCR 11966.5(c) provides the areas to be considered to make a determination as to whether a charter should be renewed and provides the conditions under which a county board may deny a renewal petition:

- (1) When considering a petition for renewal, the county board of education shall consider the past performance of the school's academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement, if any.*

Any concerns regarding the past performance of the school are addressed under **Finding 3 (Demonstrably Unlikely to successfully implement the proposed educational program)**. Plans for future improvement, if provided, would be addressed as applicable under the appropriate petition requirement.

- (2) The county board of education may deny a petition for renewal of a charter school only if [it] makes written factual findings, specific to the particular petition, setting forth facts to support one or more of the grounds for denial set forth, as applicable, in Education Code 47605(c) or failure to meet one of the criteria set forth in Education Code section 47607(b).*

Appendix C

TEACH PREP - CALIFORNIA DASHBOARD INDICATORS AND VERIFIED DATA

California Dashboard Tables

| Legend for all California Dashboard Tables | |
|--|---|
| "**" | - The student group has fewer than 11 students and is not reported for privacy reasons |
| "***" | - Student groups must have at least 30 or more students in both the current and prior year status denominator of the state indicator to receive a Performance Level (color) |
| "—" | - No data available |
| "NPL" | - No Performance Level available |
| "NPC" | - No Performance Color available |
| "N/A" | - Non-Applicable |

Table C1: TEACH PREP Charter School California Dashboard

| Year | ELA | Math | ELPI | | CCI | Graduation Rate | Chronic Absenteeism | Suspension |
|------|--------|--------|--------|------|-----|-----------------|---------------------|------------|
| | | | EL | LTEL | | | | |
| 2023 | Red | Orange | Orange | — | — | — | Red | Blue |
| 2024 | Red | Orange | Orange | — | — | — | Yellow | Blue |
| 2025 | Yellow | Yellow | Red | — | — | — | Red | Blue |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/>

Table C2: TEACH PREP 2023 ELA Indicator

| Student Groups | Dashboard Color | Participation Rate | Number of Students | Distance From Standard | Change | State Distance From Standard | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All | Red | 98 | 97 | -81.7 | 0.5 | -13.6 | -68.1 | Lower |
| AA/Black | Red | 98 | 37 | -84.7 | 0.2 | -59.6 | -25.1 | Lower |
| Hispanic or Latino | Orange | 98 | 58 | -78.1 | 3.6 | -40.2 | -37.9 | Lower |
| Two or More | — | — | 0 | — | — | 24.3 | — | — |
| White | NPC* | 100 | 2 | * | — | 20.8 | — | — |
| English Learners | Red | 100 | 42 | -101.7 | -3.5 | -67.7 | -34.0 | Lower |
| Foster Youth | NPC* | 100 | 3 | * | — | -89.2 | — | — |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Red | 98 | 95 | -82.3 | -0.2 | -42.6 | -39.7 | Lower |
| Students With Disabilities | NPC* | 100 | 6 | * | — | -96.3 | — | — |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average? | | | | | NO | All Students | | NO |
| | | | | | | Student Groups | | NO 0 of 4 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Staff Findings on the Renewal for TEACH Prep

Table C3: TEACH PREP 2024 ELA Indicator

| Student Groups | Dashboard Color | Participation Rate | Number of Students | Distance From Standard | Change | State Distance From Standard | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All | Red | 100 | 97 | -105.5 | -23.8 | -13.2 | -92.3 | Lower |
| AA/Black | Red | 100 | 40 | -127.1 | -42.3 | -58.9 | -68.2 | Lower |
| Hispanic or Latino | Red | 100 | 56 | -91.1 | -13.0 | -39.3 | -51.8 | Lower |
| Two or More | — | — | 0 | — | — | 24.3 | — | — |
| White | NPC* | 100 | 1 | * | — | 19.2 | — | — |
| English Learners | Orange | 100 | 37 | -95.4 | +6.4 | -67.6 | -27.8 | Lower |
| Foster Youth | NPC* | 100 | 1 | * | — | -87.3 | — | — |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Red | 100 | 95 | -106.0 | -23.6 | -40.9 | -65.1 | Lower |
| Students With Disabilities | NPC* | 100 | 9 | * | — | -95.6 | — | — |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average? | | | | | NO | All Students | NO | |
| | | | | | | Student Groups | NO 0 of 4 | |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Table C4: TEACH PREP 2025 ELA Indicator

| Student Groups | Dashboard Color | Participation Rate | Number of Students | Distance From Standard | Change | State Distance From Standard | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All | Yellow | 100 | 100 | -51.3 | +54.2 | -8.1 | -43.2 | Lower |
| AA/Black | Yellow | 100 | 41 | -55.7 | +71.3 | -51.3 | -4.4 | Lower |
| Hispanic or Latino | Yellow | 100 | 57 | -47.7 | +43.4 | -33.7 | -14.0 | Lower |
| Two or More | — | — | 0 | — | — | 29.4 | — | — |
| White | NPC* | 100 | 2 | * | — | 23.8 | — | — |
| English Learners | Yellow | 100 | 36 | -58.0 | +37.4 | -59.9 | 1.9 | Higher |
| Foster Youth | — | — | 0 | — | — | -79.8 | — | — |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Yellow | 100 | 99 | -52.1 | +53.9 | -35.3 | -16.8 | Lower |
| Students With Disabilities | NPC** | 100 | 14 | -84.9 | — | -89.4 | 4.5 | Higher** |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average? | | | | | NO | All Students | NO | |
| | | | | | | Student Groups | NO 1 of 4 | |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Staff Findings on the Renewal for TEACH Prep

Table C5: TEACH PREP 2023 Math Indicator

| Student Groups | Dashboard Color | Participation Rate | Number of Students | Distance From Standard | Change | State Distance From Standard | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All | Orange | 100 | 99 | -91.5 | -5.4 | -49.1 | -42.4 | Lower |
| AA/Black | Red | 100 | 38 | -105.2 | -5.4 | -104.5 | -0.7 | Lower |
| Hispanic or Latino | Orange | 100 | 59 | -80.5 | -7.6 | -80.8 | 0.3 | Higher |
| Two or More | — | — | 0 | — | — | -7.4 | — | — |
| White | NPC* | 100 | 2 | * | — | -11.1 | — | — |
| English Learners | Orange | 100 | 42 | -94.6 | -7.1 | -93.4 | -1.2 | Lower |
| Foster Youth | NPC* | 100 | 3 | * | — | -127.4 | — | — |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Orange | 100 | 97 | -91.5 | -5.4 | -80.8 | -10.7 | Lower |
| Students With Disabilities | NPC* | 100 | 6 | * | — | -127.3 | — | — |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average? | | | | | NO | All Students | NO | |
| | | | | | | Student Groups | NO 1 of 4 | |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Table C6: TEACH PREP 2024 Math Indicator

| Student Groups | Dashboard Color | Participation Rate | Number of Students | Distance From Standard | Change | State Distance From Standard | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All | Orange | 100 | 98 | -89.5 | +2.0 | -47.6 | -41.9 | Lower |
| AA/Black | Yellow | 100 | 40 | -87.0 | +18.1 | -102.2 | 15.2 | Higher |
| Hispanic or Latino | Orange | 100 | 57 | -92.9 | -12.4 | -79.2 | -13.7 | Lower |
| Two or More | — | — | 0 | — | — | -5.3 | — | — |
| White | NPC* | 100 | 1 | * | — | -10.3 | — | — |
| English Learners | Red | 100 | 38 | -97.5 | -2.9 | -93.4 | -4.1 | Lower |
| Foster Youth | NPC* | 100 | 1 | * | — | -125.1 | — | — |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Orange | 100 | 96 | -90.2 | +1.3 | -78.2 | -12.0 | Lower |
| Students With Disabilities | NPC* | 100 | 9 | * | — | -124.3 | — | — |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average? | | | | | NO | All Students | NO | |
| | | | | | | Student Groups | NO 1 of 4 | |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Staff Findings on the Renewal for TEACH Prep

Table C7: TEACH PREP 2025 Math Indicator

| Student Groups | Dashboard Color | Participation Rate | Number of Students | Distance From Standard | Change | State Distance From Standard | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All | Yellow | 100 | 100 | -38.5 | +51.1 | -42.4 | 3.9 | Higher |
| AA/Black | Yellow | 100 | 41 | -46.5 | +40.5 | -95.8 | 49.3 | Higher |
| Hispanic or Latino | Yellow | 100 | 57 | -33.3 | +59.6 | -73.6 | 40.3 | Higher |
| Two or More | — | — | 0 | — | — | -0.7 | — | — |
| White | NPC* | 100 | 2 | * | — | -6.2 | — | — |
| English Learners | Green | 100 | 36 | -24.5 | +73.0 | -86.1 | 61.6 | Higher |
| Foster Youth | — | — | 0 | — | — | -121.9 | — | — |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Yellow | 100 | 99 | -39.1 | +51.1 | -72.9 | 33.8 | Higher |
| Students With Disabilities | NPC** | 100 | 14 | -69.2 | — | -120.7 | 51.5 | Higher** |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average? | | | | | YES | All Students | YES | |
| | | | | | | Student Groups | YES 4 of 4 | |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Table C8: TEACH PREP English Learner Progress Indicator

| Year/ Student Group | Dashboard Color | Participation Rate | Number of Students | School Percent | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| 2022 | | | | | | | |
| English Learners | High | 100 | 74 | 64.9 | 50.3 | 14.6 | Higher |
| 2023 | | | | | | | |
| English Learners | Orange | 98.9 | 64 | 45.3 | 48.7 | -3.4 | Lower |
| 2024 | | | | | | | |
| English Learners | Orange | 100 | 55 | 36.4 | 45.7 | -9.3 | Lower |
| 2025 | | | | | | | |
| English Learners | Red | 100 | 49 | 24.5 | 46.4 | -21.9 | Lower |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Staff Findings on the Renewal for TEACH Prep

Table C9: TEACH PREP 2023 Suspension

| Student Groups | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All | Blue | 286 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 3.5 | -3.5 | Lower |
| AA/Black | Blue | 117 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 8.8 | -8.8 | Lower |
| Hispanic or Latino | Blue | 161 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 3.8 | -3.8 | Lower |
| Two or More | — | 0 | — | — | 3.3 | — | — |
| White | NPC* | 8 | * | — | 2.9 | — | — |
| English Learners | Blue | 97 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 3.7 | -3.7 | Lower |
| Foster Youth | NPC** | 11 | 0.0 | — | 13.6 | — | — |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Blue | 267 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 4.5 | -4.5 | Lower |
| Students With Disabilities | NPC** | 12 | 0.0 | +0.0** | 5.9 | -5.9 | Lower** |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? | | | | YES | All Students | | YES |
| | | | | | Student Groups | | YES 4 of 4 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Table C10: TEACH PREP 2024 Suspension

| Student Groups | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All | Blue | 303 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 3.2 | -3.2 | Lower |
| AA/Black | Blue | 129 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 8.4 | -8.4 | Lower |
| Hispanic or Latino | Blue | 170 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 3.4 | -3.4 | Lower |
| Two or More | — | 0 | — | — | 3.0 | — | — |
| White | NPC* | 4 | * | — | 2.6 | — | — |
| English Learners | Blue | 93 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 3.4 | -3.4 | Lower |
| Foster Youth | NPC* | 6 | * | — | 13.2 | — | — |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Blue | 297 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 4.0 | -4.0 | Lower |
| Students With Disabilities | NPC | 31 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 5.4 | -5.4 | Lower |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? | | | | YES | All Students | | YES |
| | | | | | Student Groups | | YES 5 of 5 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Staff Findings on the Renewal for TEACH Prep

Table C11: TEACH PREP 2025 Suspension

| Student Groups | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All | Blue | 292 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 2.9 | -2.9 | Lower |
| AA/Black | Blue | 129 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 7.7 | -7.7 | Lower |
| Hispanic or Latino | Blue | 156 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 3.0 | -3.0 | Lower |
| Two or More | NPC* | 3 | * | — | 2.8 | — | — |
| White | NPC* | 4 | * | — | 2.4 | — | — |
| English Learners | Blue | 74 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 3.2 | -3.2 | Lower |
| Foster Youth | NPC* | 6 | * | — | 13.0 | — | — |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Blue | 286 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 3.6 | -3.6 | Lower |
| Students With Disabilities | Blue | 34 | 0.0 | +0.0 | 5.0 | -5.0 | Lower |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? | | | | YES | All Students | | YES |
| | | | | | Student Groups | | YES 5 of 5 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Table C12: TEACH PREP 2023 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

| Student Groups | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|---------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All | Red | 277 | 56.0 | 2.4 | 24.3 | 31.7 | Higher |
| AA/Black | Red | 114 | 64.0 | 8.4 | 36.4 | 27.6 | Higher |
| Hispanic or Latino | Red | 155 | 50.3 | 1.3 | 28.4 | 21.9 | Higher |
| Two or More | — | 0 | — | — | 21.6 | — | — |
| White | NPC* | 8 | * | — | 18.5 | — | — |
| English Learners | Red | 93 | 54.8 | 8.4 | 26.3 | 28.5 | Higher |
| Foster Youth | NPC** | 11 | 45.5 | — | 33.6 | — | — |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Red | 265 | 56.2 | 3.2 | 29.9 | 26.3 | Higher |
| Students With Disabilities | NPC** | 12 | 58.3 | -11.7** | 33.1 | 25.2 | Higher** |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? | | | | NO | All Students | | NO |
| | | | | | Student Groups | | NO 0 of 4 |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Staff Findings on the Renewal for TEACH Prep

Table C13: TEACH PREP 2024 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

| Student Groups | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All | Yellow | 294 | 50.0 | -6.0 | 18.6 | 31.4 | Higher |
| AA/Black | Orange | 123 | 56.9 | -7.1 | 31.3 | 25.6 | Higher |
| Hispanic or Latino | Yellow | 167 | 44.3 | -6.0 | 21.7 | 22.6 | Higher |
| Two or More | — | 0 | — | — | 16.2 | — | — |
| White | NPC* | 4 | * | — | 13.5 | — | — |
| English Learners | Orange | 92 | 44.6 | -10.3 | 20.1 | 24.5 | Higher |
| Foster Youth | NPC* | 5 | * | — | 30.5 | — | — |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Yellow | 288 | 50.0 | -6.2 | 23.4 | 26.6 | Higher |
| Students With Disabilities | NPC | 30 | 60.0 | +1.7 | 26.3 | 33.7 | Higher |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? | | | | NO | All Students | NO | |
| | | | | | Student Groups | NO 0 of 5 | |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Table C14: TEACH PREP 2025 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

| Student Groups | Dashboard Color | Number of Students | School Percent | Change | State Percent | Difference from State Average | Higher or Lower |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| All | Red | 285 | 55.1 | +5.1 | 17.1 | 38.0 | Higher |
| AA/Black | Red | 124 | 62.1 | +5.2 | 29.8 | 32.3 | Higher |
| Hispanic or Latino | Red | 154 | 49.4 | +5.0 | 20.1 | 29.3 | Higher |
| Two or More | NPC* | 3 | * | — | 14.9 | — | — |
| White | NPC* | 4 | * | — | 12.2 | — | — |
| English Learners | Red | 73 | 49.3 | +4.7 | 18.1 | 31.2 | Higher |
| Foster Youth | NPC* | 6 | * | — | 30.6 | — | — |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | Red | 280 | 55.7 | +5.7 | 21.7 | 34.0 | Higher |
| Students With Disabilities | Red | 34 | 64.7 | +4.7 | 24.9 | 39.8 | Higher |
| Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average? | | | | NO | All Students | NO | |
| | | | | | Student Groups | NO 0 of 5 | |

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 02-25-26

Staff Findings on the Renewal for TEACH Prep

TEACH PREP - Verified Data

| Legend For iReady Tables | |
|---|--|
| Green cell indicates student group has met the minimum requirement for one year's growth | |
| Red cell indicates student group has not met the minimum requirement for one year's growth | |
| Dark Grey indicates data not used for accountability due to less than 10 students tested | |
| Light grey indicates data not used for accountability due to a participation rate less than 90% | |
| N/A indicates student group data was not made available by the school | |

Table C15: TEACH Prep Summary- iREADY Reading and Math Student Groups Meeting Annual Growth

| | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 |
|--|--|---------|---------|--|-------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | iReady Reading | | | | iReady Math | | |
| | Grade Levels Meeting Criteria | | | | Grade Levels Meeting Criteria | | |
| All Students | 2 of 4 | 4 of 5 | 4 of 5 | | 2 of 4 | 1 of 5 | 4 of 5 |
| | Numerically Significant Student Groups | | | | | | |
| African American or Black | 4 of 5 | 4 of 5 | 4 of 5 | | 4 of 5 | 1 of 5 | 3 of 5 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4 of 5 | 3 of 5 | 4 of 5 | | 4 of 5 | 2 of 5 | 4 of 5 |
| English Learners | N/A | 4 of 5 | 4 of 5 | | N/A | 2 of 5 | 2 of 5 |
| Socioeconomically Disadvantaged | N/A | 4 of 5 | 3 of 5 | | N/A | 1 of 5 | 2 of 4 |
| Participation Rate Met | YES | YES | YES | | YES | YES | YES |
| Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or above the publisher's metric? | | | | | | | |
| All Students | YES | YES | YES | | YES | NO | YES |
| Student Groups | YES | YES | YES | | YES | NO | YES |
| Both | YES | YES | YES | | YES | NO | YES |

Table C16: TEACH iReady Reading and Math (All Students)

| | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|
| Grade Level | iReady Reading | | | | iReady Math | | | |
| | Cut Point | Annual Typical Growth | | | Cut Point | Annual Typical Growth | | |
| K | 75% | 105% | 78% | 145% | 80% | 106% | 84% | 149% |
| 1 | 75% | 104% | 88% | 91% | 80% | 121% | 69% | 88% |
| 2 | 75% | 116% | 86% | 54% | 80% | 98% | 69% | 76% |
| 3 | 75% | 71% | 55% | 93% | 80% | 69% | 74% | 100% |
| 4 | 75% | 64% | 75% | 102% | 80% | 78% | 67% | 81% |

Staff Findings on the Renewal for TEACH Prep

Table C17: TEACH iReady Reading and Math (Hispanic)

| | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade Level | iReady Reading | | | | iReady Math | | | | |
| | Cut Point | Annual Typical Growth | | | Cut Point | Annual Typical Growth | | | |
| | K | 75% | 118% | 84% | 141% | 80% | 116% | 84% | 169% |
| 1 | 75% | 121% | 88% | 78% | 80% | 121% | 78% | 99% | |
| 2 | 75% | 128% | 88% | 54% | 80% | 87% | 73% | 86% | |
| 3 | 75% | 58% | 58% | 91% | 80% | 48% | 78% | 92% | |
| 4 | 75% | 82% | 70% | 85% | 80% | 96% | 87% | 70% | |

Table C18: TEACH iReady Reading and Math (AA)

| | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade Level | iReady Reading | | | | iReady Math | | | | |
| | Cut Point | Annual Typical Growth | | | Cut Point | Annual Typical Growth | | | |
| | K | 75% | 78% | 77% | 148% | 80% | 106% | 85% | 136% |
| 1 | 75% | 93% | 87% | 98% | 80% | 121% | 67% | 72% | |
| 2 | 75% | 104% | 75% | 54% | 80% | 123% | 69% | 71% | |
| 3 | 75% | 82% | 46% | 94% | 80% | 82% | 63% | 103% | |
| 4 | 75% | 41% | 102% | 118% | 80% | 63% | 66% | 92% | |

Table C19: TEACH iReady Reading and Math (EL)

| | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade Level | iReady Reading | | | | iReady Math | | | | |
| | Cut Point | Annual Typical Growth | | | Cut Point | Annual Typical Growth | | | |
| | K | 75% | N/A | 84% | 137% | 80% | N/A | 91% | 149% |
| 1 | 75% | N/A | 80% | 74% | 80% | N/A | 92% | 107% | |
| 2 | 75% | N/A | 91% | 82% | 80% | N/A | 79% | 76% | |
| 3 | 75% | N/A | 58% | 121% | 80% | N/A | 74% | 78% | |
| 4 | 75% | N/A | 84% | 104% | 80% | N/A | 77% | 61% | |

Table C20: TEACH iReady Reading and Math (SED)

| | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade Level | iReady Reading | | | | iReady Math | | | | |
| | Cut Point | Annual Typical Growth | | | Cut Point | Annual Typical Growth | | | |
| | K | 75% | N/A | 78% | 141% | 80% | N/A | 84% | 205% |
| 1 | 75% | N/A | 88% | 98% | 80% | N/A | 69% | 88% | |
| 2 | 75% | N/A | 87% | 57% | 80% | N/A | 71% | 75% | |
| 3 | 75% | N/A | 52% | 100% | 80% | N/A | 74% | 100% | |
| 4 | 75% | N/A | 75% | 95% | 80% | N/A | 67% | 74% | |

Table C21: TEACH iReady Reading and Math (SWD)

| | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | | | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade Level | iReady Reading | | | | iReady Math | | | | |
| | Cut Point | Annual Typical Growth | | | Cut Point | Annual Typical Growth | | | |
| | K | 75% | N/A | 84% | 90% | 80% | N/A | 284% | 188% |
| 1 | 75% | N/A | 100% | 20% | 80% | N/A | 79% | 106% | |
| 2 | 75% | N/A | 115% | 55% | 80% | N/A | 124% | 72% | |
| 3 | 75% | N/A | 36% | 104% | 80% | N/A | 85% | 58% | |
| 4 | 75% | N/A | 81% | 6% | 80% | N/A | 27% | 78% | |

Staff Findings on the Renewal for TEACH Prep

iReady Participation Rate Calculations

Participation Rate Methodology

The Stability Count for a school is the number of students in a particular year that had stable enrollment, defined by a minimum of 245 consecutive calendar days at the same school. This count by both grade level and by student group is publicly available for all California schools at the DataQuest website (<https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>). Participation rates for verified data assessments were calculated by dividing the number of students who had verified data results (took assessment both in the fall and the spring) by the Stability Count rather than by the Census Day enrollment count, to better account for any transiency among the student population between the fall and spring administrations of the test. This serves to not penalize schools for having students enrolled late or disenrolled prior to taking the second assessment. Since some students can take both assessments without being enrolled for the full 245 consecutive days, it is possible that more students will have verified data results than the stability count of the school. When this occurs participation rates are capped at 100%.

Table C22: TEACH iReady Reading and Math Participation Rate for All Students by Grade Level

| Grade Level | 2022-23 | | | 2023-24 | | | 2024-25 | | | | | |
|-------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| | iReady Reading | | | | | | iReady Math | | | | | |
| | Cut Point | # Students Tested / Stability Count | | Cut Point | # Students Tested / Stability Count | | | | | | | |
| K | 95% | 40 / 49 = 82% | 51 / 50 = 100% | 49 / 43 = 100% | 95% | 40 / 49 = 82% | 51 / 50 = 100% | 48 / 43 = 100% | | | | |
| 1 | 95% | 49 / 46 = 100% | 46 / 41 = 100% | 46 / 43 = 100% | 95% | 49 / 46 = 100% | 46 / 41 = 100% | 46 / 43 = 100% | | | | |
| 2 | 95% | 54 / 51 = 100% | 53 / 51 = 100% | 47 / 46 = 100% | 95% | 54 / 51 = 100% | 53 / 51 = 100% | 47 / 46 = 100% | | | | |
| 3 | 95% | 50 / 47 = 100% | 52 / 50 = 100% | 50 / 49 = 100% | 95% | 50 / 47 = 100% | 52 / 50 = 100% | 50 / 49 = 100% | | | | |
| 4 | 95% | 54 / 52 = 100% | 47 / 48 = 98% | 52 / 52 = 100% | 95% | 54 / 52 = 100% | 47 / 48 = 98% | 52 / 52 = 100% | | | | |

Table C23: TEACH iReady Reading and Math Participation Rate by Student Group

| Grade Level | 2022-23 | | | 2023-24 | | | 2024-25 | | | | | |
|-------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | iReady Reading | | | | | | iReady Math | | | | | |
| | Cut Point | # Students Tested / Stability Count | | Cut Point | # Students Tested / Stability Count | | | | | | | |
| EL | 95% | N/A | 75 / 77 = 97% | 64 / 63 = 100% | 95% | N/A | 75 / 77 = 97% | 64 / 63 = 100% | | | | |
| SWD | 95% | N/A | 19 / 27 = 70% | 24 / 33 = 72% | 95% | N/A | 19 / 27 = 70% | 24 / 33 = 72% | | | | |
| SED | 95% | N/A | 243 / 253 = 96% | 166 / 250 = 66% | 95% | N/A | 243 / 253 = 96% | 166 / 250 = 66% | | | | |
| AA | 95% | 103 / 98 = 100% | 109 / 106 = 100% | 117 / 111 = 100% | 95% | 103 / 98 = 100% | 109 / 106 = 100% | 117 / 111 = 100% | | | | |
| Hispanic | 95% | 143 / 141 = 100% | 140 / 146 = 96% | 131 / 134 = 98% | 95% | 143 / 141 = 100% | 140 / 146 = 96% | 130 / 134 = 97% | | | | |

Appendix D

Finance and Operations Overview

TEACH, Inc. (the “Organization”) comprises TEACH Public Schools, Inc. (its charter management organization or CMO), which operates TEACH Academy of Technologies, TEACH Tech Charter High School, and **TEACH Preparatory Mildred S. Cunningham & Edith H. Morris Elementary** (also known as “**TEACH Preparatory**,” the subject of this appeal), along with its affiliated entities - TEACH Inc. Foundation, Cunningham and Morris, LLC, and Wooten Avila, LLC - all of which are included in the Organization’s consolidated financial reporting. The Foundation exists solely to support the Organization’s mission, and the LLCs own and lease facilities to the schools and fund capital improvements.

The table below summarizes the Organization’s consolidated financial data, including *Operating Results, Net Cash Flow, Cash Balance, Liabilities, Net Assets, and the certified Second Principal Apportionments (P-2) Average Daily Attendance (ADA)* for the past three fiscal years from 2022-23 to 2024-25. These figures provide insights into the Organization’s consolidated financial condition and operational trends during the specified period.

Table D1 – TEACH, Inc. (Organization) Consolidated Financial Data

| TEACH, Inc and Affiliated Entities | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Fiscal Year | Operating Results | Net Cash Flow | Cash Balance as of June 30 | Liabilities as of June 30 | Net Assets as of June 30 | P-2 ADA |
| 2022-23 | \$1,733,980 | \$7,571,622 | \$19,603,041 | \$42,291,090 | \$15,166,442 | 968.91 |
| 2023-24 | \$422,546 | (\$93,484) | \$19,697,097 | \$41,393,187 | \$15,588,988 | 1,003.94 |
| 2024-25 | (\$653,301) | (\$913,507) | \$18,783,590 | \$39,066,219 | \$14,935,687 | 969.77 |

Source: TEACH, Inc. Consolidated Audit Reports (FY 2022-23 to FY 2024-25)

The Organization incurred an operating deficit of approximately (\$653,000) and a negative net cash flow of (\$914,000) in 2024-25. As of June 30, 2025, the Organization has cash balance of \$18.8 million and net assets of \$14.9 million.

Table D2 and D3 below highlight separately the audited financials of TEACH Preparatory and the Organization’s affiliated entities for fiscal year 2022-23 through 2024-25.

Table D2 – TEACH Preparatory Audited Financial Performance

| Fiscal Year | Operating Results | Cash Balance as of June 30 | Liabilities as of June 30 | Net Assets as of June 30 | P-2 ADA |
|-------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| 2022-23 | \$257,570 | \$3,201,462 | \$14,970,028 | \$2,657,195 | 222.67 |
| 2023-24 | \$427,149 | \$4,054,417 | \$15,911,416 | \$3,084,344 | 237.65 |
| 2024-25 | \$148,561 | \$5,105,558 | \$14,279,473 | \$3,232,905 | 233.74 |

Staff Findings on the Renewal for TEACH Prep

TEACH Prep has generated operating surpluses in each of the past three fiscal years—\$258,000 in 2022–23, \$427,000 in 2023–24, and \$148,000 in 2024–25—for a cumulative total of \$833,000. As of June 30, 2025, TEACH Prep reported cash balance of \$5.1 million and net asset (fund) balance of \$3.2 million.

Table D3 – CMO and Affiliated Entities Audited Financial Performance

| Fiscal Year | Operating Results | Cash Balance as of June 30 | Liabilities as of June 30 | Net Assets as of June 30 | P-2 ADA |
|---|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| <i>TEACH Public Schools, Inc. (CMO)</i> | | | | | |
| 2022-23 | (\$298,303) | \$1,985,163 | \$1,917,693 | \$242,868 | N/A |
| 2023-24 | (\$269,027) | \$1,174,739 | \$6,031,141 | (\$2,934,649) | N/A |
| 2024-25 | (\$98,248) | \$1,465,898 | \$4,774,600 | (\$3,032,897) | N/A |
| <i>TEACH Academy of Technologies</i> | | | | | |
| 2022-23 | \$1,026,952 | \$6,186,625 | \$21,319,245 | \$6,872,278 | 376.85 |
| 2023-24 | \$244,251 | \$5,749,444 | \$21,591,972 | \$7,116,529 | 410.28 |
| 2024-25 | (\$126,525) | \$6,059,320 | \$19,591,868 | \$6,990,004 | 411.60 |
| <i>TEACH Tech Charter High School</i> | | | | | |
| 2022-23 | \$1,368,377 | \$7,889,627 | \$17,168,867 | \$8,322,978 | 369.39 |
| 2023-24 | \$35,446 | \$8,267,444 | \$17,700,342 | \$8,358,424 | 356.01 |
| 2024-25 | (\$560,921) | \$6,132,075 | \$15,466,674 | \$7,797,503 | 324.43 |
| <i>Cunningham and Morris LLC</i> | | | | | |
| 2022-23 | (\$145,117) | \$57,417 | \$11,619,928 | (\$1,059,512) | N/A |
| 2023-24 | (\$263,549) | \$89,505 | \$12,311,221 | (\$1,323,061) | N/A |
| 2024-25 | (\$99,710) | \$10,066 | \$12,150,489 | (\$1,422,771) | N/A |
| <i>Wooten Avila LLC</i> | | | | | |
| 2022-23 | (\$452,775) | \$282,747 | \$23,489,976 | (\$1,848,978) | N/A |
| 2023-24 | (\$376,215) | \$361,548 | \$23,271,098 | (\$2,225,193) | N/A |
| 2024-25 | (\$287,780) | \$10,673 | \$22,975,295 | (\$2,512,973) | N/A |
| <i>TEACH Foundation</i> | | | | | |
| 2022-23 | \$-0- | \$-0- | \$-0- | \$2,337 | N/A |
| 2023-24 | \$-0- | \$-0- | \$-0- | \$2,337 | N/A |
| 2024-25 | \$-0- | \$-0- | \$-0- | \$2,337 | N/A |
| Source: TEACH, Inc. <i>Consolidated Audit Reports (FY 2022-23 to FY 2024-25)</i> | | | | | |

In contrast, the Organization’s affiliated entities—TEACH Public Schools, Inc. (CMO), Cunningham and Morris, LLC, and Wooten Avila, LLC—have incurred ongoing operating deficits and continue to report growing negative net asset balances. Over the same period, combined operating deficits totaled (\$666,000), (\$508,000), and (\$1.1 million), respectively. At the capacity interview, TEACH, Inc. management indicated the causes of deficit spending and negative net

Staff Findings on the Renewal for TEACH Prep

assets were due to bond repayments. As of June 30, 2025, cash balances reflected \$1.5 million for the CMO, \$10,000, for Cunningham and Morris, LLC, and \$11,000 for Wooten Avila, LLC. These three affiliated entities reported negative net assets of (\$3.0 million), (\$1.4 million), and (\$2.5 million), respectively. Although TEACH, Inc. reported total net assets of \$14.9 million as of June 30, 2025, the sustained deficits and increasing negative balances at the affiliated entities present potential risks to its charter schools, including TEACH Preparatory.

Table D4 below summarizes the results of the Organization’s annual audits for three fiscal years 2022-23 to 2024-25.

Table D4 – Annual Audit Reports

| Summary of TEACH, Inc. (ORGANIZATION) Annual Audit Reports | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Entity | Fiscal Year | Auditing Firm | Opinion | Findings |
| TEACH, Inc | 2022-23 | Clifton Larson Allen LLP | Unmodified | None |
| TEACH, Inc | 2023-24 | Clifton Larson Allen LLP | Unmodified | None |
| TEACH, Inc | 2024-25 | Clifton Larson Allen LLP | Unmodified | None |

The Independent Auditors’ Reports for these periods reflected an unmodified opinion, which indicated that the financial statements fairly represent the Organization's financial position in all material respects. These financial statements incorporated various audit adjustments, as discussed below.

Recurring Significant Audit Adjustments to Financial Statements

TEACH, Inc. has recorded significant audit adjustments to the financial reports of all three of its charter schools in each of the past three fiscal years. The table below shows the effect of these adjustments on TEACH Preparatory Mildred S. Cunningham & Edith H. Morris Elementary (“TEACH Preparatory”) by comparing its Unaudited Actuals to audited results, with a focus on changes to ending fund balances (net assets) over that period.

Table D5 – Significant Audit Adjustments

| Significant Audit Adjustments to Fund Balances - TEACH Preparatory | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 |
| June 30 - Unaudited Actuals Fund Balances (Net Assets) | \$3,063,263 | \$3,407,636 | \$3,227,704 |
| Net Audit Adjustments | (\$406,068) | (\$323,292) | \$5,201 |
| Adjustment % to Fund Balances | -13.6% | -9.5% | 0.2% |
| June 30 - Audited Fund Balances (Net Assets) | \$2,657,195 | \$3,084,344 | \$3,232,905 |

TEACH Preparatory recorded net audit adjustments to its Unaudited Actuals fund balances of (\$406,068) in 2022–23, (\$323,292) in 2023–24, and \$5,201 in 2024–25, representing

Staff Findings on the Renewal for TEACH Prep

(13.6 percent), (9.5 percent), and 0.2 percent, respectively. The recurrence of significant adjustments across three consecutive fiscal years indicates deficiencies in internal controls over financial reporting and insufficient review and oversight of financial statements prepared by the back-office provider. This pattern raises concerns regarding the reliability of the Organization’s and the school’s financial reporting and the adequacy of ongoing fiscal oversight.

Table D6 – TEACH Preparatory’s 2024-25 Audited Actuals and Multi-Year Financial Projections

| Projections | 2024-25 Audited Actuals | 2025-26 | 2026-27 | 2027-28 | 2028-29 |
|---|-------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Enrollment | 271 | 271 | 380 | 380 | 380 |
| ADA | 233.74 | 238.48 | 342.00 | 342.00 | 342.00 |
| Total Revenues | \$6,273,662 | \$6,153,933 | \$7,840,519 | \$8,390,443 | \$8,601,897 |
| Total Expenses | \$6,125,101 | \$6,102,338 | \$7,793,010 | \$7,986,619 | \$8,184,370 |
| Net Income | \$148,561 | \$51,595 | \$47,509 | \$403,824 | \$417,528 |
| Beginning Net Assets | \$3,084,344 | *\$3,258,181 | \$3,309,776 | \$3,357,285 | \$3,761,109 |
| Ending Net Assets | \$3,232,905 | \$3,309,776 | \$3,357,285 | \$3,761,109 | \$4,178,637 |
| <i>*TEACH Preparatory’s beginning 2025-26 Net Assets (Fund Balance) reflects \$3,258,181, which is \$25,276 higher than its 2024-25 audited ending balance of \$3,232,905. Thus, the projected 2025-26 and subsequent fiscal year’s beginning and ending net assets are overstated by \$25,276.</i> | | | | | |

Table D6 summarizes TEACH Preparatory 2024-25 audited actuals and its financial projections for fiscal years 2025–26 through 2028–29. The projections assume substantial enrollment increase from 271 in 2024-25 to 380 in 2026-27 (up 109 students or 40.2 percent). ADA is projected to increase from 233.74 in 2024–25 to 342 in 2026–27 (up 108.26 ADA or 46.3 percent). Both enrollment and ADA remain flat thereafter. Annual net income is projected to range from \$47,509 to \$417,528, driving growth in net assets from \$3.3 million in 2024-25 to \$4.2 million in 2028-29.

Table D7 – TEACH Preparatory’s Enrollment and Average Daily Attendance (ADA) History

| Actual | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | 2025-26 P-1 | Change / % 2024-25 to 2025-26 P-1 |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| Enrollment | 248 | 272 | 271 | 256 | -15 / (5.5%) |
| ADA | 222.67 | 237.65 | 233.74 | 226.37 | -7.37 / (3.2%) |

Table 7 presents TEACH Preparatory’s historical P-2 enrollment and ADA for 2022–23 through 2024–25, and 2025–26 P-1 data.

Although enrollment and ADA increased modestly over the historical period, 2025–26 P-1 data reflect declines to 256 enrollment (down 15 students, or 5.5 percent) and 226.37 ADA (down 7.37, or 3.2 percent) from the prior year.

Table D8 – TEACH Preparatory’s 2025-26 P-1 data versus Enrollment and Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Projections

| | 2025-26 P-1 Actual | 2025-26 | 2026-27 | 2027-28 | 2028-29 | Change 2025-26 P-1 to 2026-27 | % Change 2025-26 P-1 to 2026-27 |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|--|
| Enrollment | 256 | 271 | 380 | 380 | 380 | 124 | 48.4% |
| ADA | 226.37 | 238.48 | 342.00 | 342.00 | 342.00 | 115.63 | 51.1% |

Table 8 compares current year certified First Principal Apportionment (P-1) data to projected enrollment and ADA. The projections rely on a substantial enrollment increase of 124 (up 48.4 percent) in 2026-27 and ADA increase by 115.63 (up 51.1 percent) from 2025-26 P-1. The projected immediate increase in enrollment and ADA beginning in 2026–27 is not supported by current enrollment and attendance trends and considering current declining enrollment in Los Angeles County. As a result, the projected revenues, net income, and net assets may be overstated, creating fiscal risk if enrollment/ADA growth does not materialize as assumed.

Summary Analysis

The key concerns center on TEACH Preparatory’s overly optimistic enrollment and ADA projections that are not aligned with current trends and a lack of oversight over financial reporting are evident through recurring audit adjustments, raising questions about the reliability of TEACH Preparatory’s and the Organization’s financial data. In addition, the CMO’s structural operating deficits and growing negative net asset balances raise questions about the CMO’s long-term fiscal viability. If the CMO’s operating deficit and negative net assets are not sufficiently addressed, it could pose significant risk to its operations and ongoing management and support of its charter schools, including TEACH Preparatory.

To address these concerns, the Organization should reassess TEACH Preparatory’s enrollment and ADA projections using more conservative and data-driven assumptions, and the budget along with multi-year projections should be updated accordingly. The Organization should develop and implement internal controls to ensure reliable financial reporting. In addition, it is also critical for the CMO to develop and implement a recovery plan to address its structural deficits and mitigate the negative net assets balance.