Introduction and Overview

District History
The New Jerusalem Elementary School District (NJESD) was established in 1865 with the donation of two acres of land for one school. On its website, the district describes its school and the district being “country,” both geographically and culturally, adhering to traditional values of student responsibility and resourcefulness, treating one another with dignity and respect, involving and communicating with parents, and maintaining high academic standards within a caring and thoughtful environment. Today, the district operates seven dependent charter schools, and six charter schools operated independently by non-profit organizations and overseen by the district.

Charter School Vision, Mission, and Portfolio
On its website the district clearly provides it vision for charter authorizing and oversight is to ensure that “all students to have access to high-quality, publicly-funded school options. To achieve this vision, NJESD is guided by this mission statement:

   To improve student achievement by supporting New Jerusalem Elementary School District’s authorized charter schools, positively reshaping the public school landscape, and advancing opportunities for innovation and expanded high-quality public school choice.

Although NJESD does not recruit charter developers, in accordance with its mission, NJESD approves petitions and oversees charter schools that are likely to be high quality charter schools that meet the California Legislature’s intent in the Charter Schools Act, stated in Education code section 47601:

   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.

As a district authorizer, NJESD has the ability to approve charter schools that intend to operate facilities within its district boundaries and, if facilities are not available – which they are not due to the two-acre geographic area – in adjacent districts provided certain notification procedures are followed. As a result, NJESD currently oversees seven dependent charters operated by the district, three of which are classroom based and four of which are non-classroom based and one of which operates outside the district’s boundaries. The furthest charter facility is located 26.4 miles from the district office, which does not impede the district’s ability to conduct its oversight responsibilities, including semi-annual site visits.

In addition, NJESD authorizes six independent charter schools - three that are site based and three that are non-classroom based. Two operate facilities that are located outside the district boundaries in Stockton Unified School District, and one operates in a facility that is located outside the district boundaries in Lincoln Unified School District. Again the distance of all of these schools does not impede the district’s ability to conduct its oversight responsibilities, including semi-annual site visits.

**Evaluation Scope**
To ensure that it is providing effective program and fiscal authorization and oversight for its independent charter schools and for any future charters approved by the district’s governing board, NJESD implemented a self-study of its practices and procedures in the summer of 2016, and invited a panel of charter school experts in the fields of charter authorization and oversight to review it, validate its findings, and make recommendations for improvements to its current and new practices, policies, and protocols. NJESD convened this panel on September 30, 2016 (see Attachments 1 and 2).

**Initial Panel Meeting**
The district’s self study/evaluation provided the panel with the district’s assessment of its intent and practices in detail, and portions of it were discussed during this meeting.

Four independent charter school operators of charter schools approved by NJESD provided the panel with descriptions of their assessment of interactions with the district during the approval process and with ongoing oversight. All charter school representatives reported satisfaction with and appreciation for the district’s approachability, communication clarity, accountability requirements, and approval/renewal processes:

- April Warren, California Virtual Academy @ San Joaquin
- Dr. Matthew George, Humphrey’s College ABLE
- April Warren, Insight @ San Joaquin
- Dr. Paul Keefer, Valley View Charter Prep
Because the panel was not provided with evidence for the district’s self-study/evaluation findings, the panel requested the opportunity to review the evidence and to develop commendations and recommendations based on them. The district agreed, and Carol Barkley and Cathi Vogel reviewed source documents on March 22, 2017 and interviewed Dr. Tilton regarding current practices based on newly improved processes.

Ms. Barkley and Ms. Vogel noted the evidence they reviewed to verify statements made by the district in its self-study. This report expands on the self-study and evidence, and provides commendations and recommendations based on findings, evidence, and district responses to panel questions.
New Jerusalem Elementary School District (NJESD)
Findings, Commendations, Recommendations

1. District Organizational Structure and Capacity related to Charter School Authorizing of Dependent and Independent, In District and Out of District, Classroom based and Non classroom based Charter Schools

The District currently provides services to and for 13 dependent and independent charter schools under its Educational Services’ Department, led by Jeff Tilton, Deputy Superintendent (see Attachment 3). Under the Deputy Superintendent’s leadership, NJESD evaluates charter petitions and provides oversight for approved charter schools in the areas of curriculum/instruction, assessment and data, fiscal management, student information systems, and human resources.

NJESD implements the National Association of Charter School Authorizers principles to guide its oversight. These principles are contained in five overarching categories and the district’s self study tool uses indicators that implement/address these principles:

- Agency Commitment and Capacity
- Application Process and Decision Making
- Performance Contracting with charter schools to clarify expectations for results
- Ongoing Oversight and Evaluation
- Revocation and Renewal Decision Making

Further, NJESD is a member of and uses resources developed by the following charter organizations to ensure that it remains current in charter law and best practice:

- California Charter School Development Center
- CARSNet: California Charter Authorizers Regional Support Network
- National Association of Charter School Authorizers
- Epicenter

Structure and Capacity Commendations:

- NJESD is actively engaged in providing educational options for families in accordance with the intent of the California legislature through the authorization and operation of ‘dependent’ charter schools and through the authorization and oversight of ‘independent’ charter schools.
- Current NJESD leadership possesses the knowledge and experience to identify program, governance, and fiscal irregularities prior to and upon conducting formal oversight, and has acted quickly in the past to address issues when they arise.
- NJESD has been significantly engaged in seeking and adopting best practices for the authorization and oversight of charter schools, and documenting all procedures in writing.
- NJESD has made significant improvements in posting its charter authorizing and oversight practices on its website.
Structure and Capacity Recommendations:
- NJESD, impacted developers/charter operators, and the public would benefit from written descriptions of expectations during capacity interviews.
- NJESD operates its oversight of charter schools through lean staffing and should consider creating a succession plan for key charter school oversight staff. A new employee was recently hired who may begin to fill this role, but a clear plan would be beneficial to guide the appropriate level of resources given the number of charter schools the district has authorized to date.
- NJESD may benefit from regular planning meetings among all key staff involved in the oversight of charter schools to ensure that program and fiscal oversight is coordinated.
- NJESD charter oversight activities may benefit from prioritizing training in fiscal and programmatic nuances of charter schools. Beneficial training might include CASBO, School Services, CCSA annual conference, FCMAT training, etc.
- NJESD should ensure that all parties (NJESD board and staff, and charter schools) understand the meaning of "support" in the District mission statement for charter schools.

2. Authorizing Practices

Petition submission
NJESD has developed a new Independent Charter School Petition Application Guide for 2016-2017. This is a comprehensive guide and is posted on the district’s website. It details the required items of a petition and clearly communicates the rubric by which petitions will be evaluated.

The Deputy Superintendent for Educational Services conducts an initial meeting with petitioners, at which time he describes the district’s petition submission and review process. During the meeting, petitioners are provided with technical submission requirements and an overview of the approval process that include:
- Timelines and board meeting dates for public hearing and board action
- Procedures for evaluating capacity that may exceed petition review
- Communication channels during petition review process
- Notification requirements to other districts, if required

During the course of this meeting, District leadership begins an assessment of capacity to operate a successful and sustainable charter school by inquiring about past records of performance in the areas of educational leadership, charter experience, public education finance, governance, and plans for the future (including number of petitions under consideration in other districts). Based on experience and issues that have previously plagued some charter schools, petitioners are asked to describe relationships among board members and staff, other conflicts of interest, facilities plans and funding, admissions priorities, etc.
NJESD has established an ‘incubation’ option that if offers to charter school developers who appear to have the qualifications to operate a successful charter school, but who may not have a track record that the district staff is fully ready to recommend as ‘likely to implement a successful school.’ On two occasions, the district and charter developer have agreed to establish the charter school as a school of the district (dependent charter school) for one year. Both then became independent charters.

**Charter Petition Review**
NJESD accepts charter petitions throughout the year, and per the Education Code, the NJESD board makes a decision to approve or deny charter petitions within 60 days of receipt by the district office. This deadline has been extended by mutual agreement only one time. In this case, the petitioner eventually withdrew its petition.

The petition review process is more than a paper screening. In addition to the petition, NJESD evaluates the capacity of the petitioner to operate a successful charter school that is sustainable. This requires a capacity interview of key stakeholders in the charter school (governance and staff positions), a thorough review of budget projections at the time of submission and through the actual opening of the charter.

NJESD has recently created a written petition review checklist to capture these elements, and has instituted a due diligence questionnaire as well. Some concern has been generated by others about the district’s early oversight as a result of the district’s action to revoke the charters of two different entities. While the district has taken steps to increase its oversight prior to opening a school, including procedures documented in a pre opening checklist, it appears to have at all times been in compliance with its responsibilities as an authorizer. While the due diligence questionnaire appears to be a step in the right direction, it is worthwhile to point out that the useful information in this document still requires the truthful and complete statements of a petitioner.

Attachment 6 is modeled upon that used by the California State Board of Education and from the FCMAT District Authorizer Matrix as well. The current form has been updated to reflect changes in the law, and is used for both classroom based and non-classroom based schools, as well as for schools proposing to locate in the district or outside of it. It guides the review of program, governance, leadership, fiscal, and operations. The form provides guidance to reviewers and requires staff to provide references to the petition narrative to justify ratings given but does not contain space for narrative to justify rating.

During the review process, the district may request additional information about program and finances, which the petitioner may provide to the district up to two weeks prior to board action. This deadline provides time for staff review and inclusion of all information in the board packet so that board members are fully informed when making their decisions.

In cases where a petition proposes to operate a facility outside of district boundaries, NJESD notifies the affected district of the petition and the dates of the public hearing and board action. Although the petitioner is required to make such notification by law, NJESD
ensures that any affected district is fully aware of its consideration of a petition for location in the other district.

**Public Hearing**
Notice of public hearing for all petitions submitted to NJESD is provided to the following entities in addition to being posted on the district website. Public hearings are held during regular board meetings in most cases, and are posted as part of the agenda of a regular meeting. All notices state the purpose of the public hearing is to ‘consider the level of support for the petition by teachers employed by the school district, other employees of the school district, and parents,’ as stated in Education Code section 47605(b).

**Final review and staff recommendation for board action**
After the public hearing, district staff completes the written review of the petition using the district’s established review form and makes a written recommendation to the board. Petitioners are provided with a staff report of findings as soon as it is completed. If the recommendation is for approval, district staff provides language for a motion to approve the school, and provides the board with any suggested conditions to be placed on the school’s opening. If staff intends to recommend denial of a petition, petitioners will be afforded the opportunity to withdraw the petition. If the petitioner chooses to proceed with formal board action, staff will prepare a suggested motion that contains written factual findings for denial that are in alignment with at least one of the five reasons the legislature stated are required for denial:

1. The charter school presents an unsound educational program for the pupils to be enrolled in the charter school.
2. The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.
3. The petition does not contain the number of signatures required by subdivision (a).
4. The petition does not contain an affirmation of each of the conditions described in subdivision (d).
5. The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all of the following… *(petition elements)*

**Board Action to Approve or Deny a Charter**
NJESD board agendas provide evidence that full and timely public notice is given for intended action during its meetings. Petitions are included in board agenda packets and posted on the NJESD website. Appendices and other supplemental documents to the petition are not posted but are available in hard copy for public review.

Although the district has not denied a charter that was appealed to the county office of education, staff states that the district will defend its findings and decision if appealed.

**Authorizing Practices Commendations:**

**Overall:**
NJESD provides comprehensive review of charter petitions and developer capacity to ensure that it approves only those petitions that are likely to result in the operation of high
quality charter schools that are fiscally stable. Evidence to support this commendation includes, but is not limited to:

Submission procedures
- Face to face meeting with potential petitioners
- Clarity to developers regarding requirements and approval processes

Charter petition review
- Modeled on California State Board of Education review matrix
- Capacity interview(s)
- Requests for additional information where needed

Public Hearing
- Board minutes capture public comment
- Public comment informs review and staff recommendation

Board Action
- Board action is based on factual findings in the petition

Authorizing Practices Recommendations:
Overall:
To ensure clarity, transparency, and accountability, NJESD should consider establishing a deadline by which time it will have written procedures documenting all of its charter authorizing and oversight processes.

Charter petition review:
- Conduct a formal capacity interview and document findings in writing as part of the evidence to support staff recommendations for petition approval or denial.
- As part of the findings in the petition review, document that the budget is adequate to support the petition narrative/proposed activities, staffing.
- Modify review form for narrative evaluation in addition to strict code compliance notations.

Public hearing:
- Create written procedures to verify that appropriate entities have received notice of public hearing.

Board action:
- Incorporate public testimony into findings and recommendations for board action.
- Denial action should reference findings of fact, usually per the staff report.
3. Oversight Practices

Pre Opening Oversight
NJESD has developed a preopening checklist that is posted to its website and provides notice to new charter schools of all requirements that must be met prior to opening. This information is also contained in each new school’s MOU.

Although the education code does not prescribe specific procedures for charter authorizers to follow, it does identify specific areas of oversight responsibility. Based on the documents reviewed, it appears that NJESD consistently adheres to these requirements:

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
NJESD negotiates an MOU with each of its approved charter schools. On November 2016, the NJESD board approved a formal MOU template that will be used for all new charters and will be required of all existing charters a renewal. The MOU is modeled on the detailed and comprehensive format used by Los Angeles County Office of Education (see Attachment 6).

NJESD requires that MOU’s will be completed prior to the receipt of any public funding and prior to the school opening and at the time of charter renewal.

Until the establishment of the MOU modeled after the one used by LACOE, NJESD has relied upon informal agreements and reports that a charter school is prepared to open in accordance with its charter. The district admits that a more formal approach is required, and has developed a new MOU template for all future charters, which identifies pre opening conditions that include:
- Receipt of all documents (non-profit status, required policies, board meeting agendas and minutes, facilities lease/cost documentation, etc.
- Student recruitment reports
- Enrollment verification on specified preopening dates and on site verification during first two weeks of school
- Master agreements for students in non classroom based schools
- Amended budgets based on actual enrollment due on specific date
- Facilities inspection

Pre Opening Fiscal Reports
Beginning in 2017, NJESD established procedures to increase its pre opening fiscal oversight of a new charter school. The district has previously relied on submitted budgets, including amendments provided by the charter operator based on changes in facilities, enrollment, and any other changes the charter the developer identified. Because a small number of schools have not provided accurate fiscal or fiscal related information prior to opening, which eventually led to their demise, NJESD has now requires the completion of a Due Diligence questionnaire, and it reviews enrollment vs. projections, requiring changes to the budget that ensure sustainability.
Ongoing Oversight

Site visits
NJESD visits the administrative office and school sites of all its approved charters at least twice per year, although only one visit per year is required by law. The site visit is conducted by a team of NJESD administrators that follows the District Oversight Review Matrix to guide its review. This review template is posted on the NJESD website and provides a checklist of all items that will be reviewed during the site visits. The panel was told that the team interviews several different sources for the same information to ensure that descriptions of activities are actually being implemented (example: administrator reports that fire drills are conducted regularly. Teachers and students will be asked to corroborate that information). Completed review forms contain commendations and recommendations and a summary of the visit is provided to the school, and presented to the district board. (See Attachment 9).

Academic Progress
NJESD reviews the academic progress of each of its charter schools on an annual basis, using CAASPP and the LCAP to guide its evaluation and will begin using the School Dashboard as it comes online. NJESD recognizes charter school autonomy and flexibility over program and is that it is accountable for student results. Within that autonomy and accountability, NJESD discusses any concerns with schools that appear to be not meeting academic goals based on standardized test performance reported by the CDE and on the LCAP. NJESD has not identified academic concerns for any of its approved charter schools.

Fiscal Condition
The fiscal oversight a charter school involves more than a review of required state and federal reports. Effective oversight aimed at ensuring schools are preventing problems requires extensive time and expertise.

There are two – and possibly three – separate and distinct time periods for fiscal review: a) from the time the petition is approved until the school opens, and b) ongoing oversight of an operating charter. A third distinct time period is when extensive fiscal oversight is required to correct material weaknesses, and if necessary initiate and carry out revocation.

The New Jerusalem Elementary School District (NJESD) uses numerous highly effective tools to perform its petition review and charter school fiscal oversight responsibilities: the Petition Application Guide and the Oversight Quality Review.

Throughout the school year, NJESD receives the following reports by the listed due dates.
- September 15: Final Un-audited Financial Report Previous Year
- December 15: First Interim Un-audited Report Current Year
- December 15: Final Independent Audited Report Previous Year
- March 15: Second Interim Un-Audited Report Current Year
- July 1: Preliminary Budget for upcoming year

Upon identification of irregularities, the district has a track record of immediate investigation to seek resolution.
Material Revisions
NJESD uses the same procedures to review and approve/deny a material revision as it does for new and renewal petitions.

Annual Audit
All charter schools have submitted annual audits in accordance with the requirements of law. The district reports that it tracks the resolution of any deficiencies.

Renewal
NJESD renews all charters for five year terms, using the review and approval process for new charters described above. District staff states that it uses the criteria for academic achievement as the main criteria for renewal in accordance with Education code section 47607(b) and the new School Dashboard will be used as a major tool to assess progress toward achieving the charter goals and state priorities. The panel did not review/evaluate the academic performance of the independent charter schools authorized by NJESD.

Revocation
NJESD follows the revocation process outlined Education Code section 47607. These procedures are not documented in writing because of the individual circumstances that lead to revocation, which is the same practice used by the County Office of Education. However, in the two cases (one charter operator) where revocation was initiated, the process identified in Education code section 47607 was followed and included: Notice to Cure, Letter of Intent to Revoke, and board action.

Closure procedures
NJESD implements the closure procedures outlined in the education code, and described in each school’s charter. Evidence reviewed indicates that procedures were appropriately followed regarding notification, audits, and records retention as stated in the charter and described in law.

Oversight Practices Commendations
- NJESD has authorized a majority of fiscally strong charter schools.
- NJESD identifies fiscal irregularities quickly and takes appropriate action up to and including revocation.
- NJESD makes continuous improvements in it policies and procedures by seeking and implementing best practices used by other districts/county offices of education and professional organizations, including the implementation of pre opening oversight, which includes:
  o Recruitment and enrollment
  o Fiscal strength and internal controls

Oversight Commendations Recommendations
- Modify fiscal components of the new MOU template to include:
  o Second tier fiscal oversight procedures for schools with identified fiscal weaknesses
Conclusion

State and federal law describe an appropriate relationship between a charter school and its authorizer to be one that provides autonomy for the charter school. This means that the authorizer must have comprehensive authorization and oversight procedures that ensure that a charter developer has the capacity to operate and sustain a high quality charter school, a charter petition that meets the spirit and letter of the law and that is ‘owned’ by a broad base of school stakeholders. The authorizing board and staff must be knowledgeable of the law and able to document the reasons for findings of approval or denial, and they must be vigilant to communicate with all community and regulatory stakeholders regarding the authorizing process.

The oversight function of a charter authorizer is vast, and must be accomplished through thorough reviews by experienced and knowledgeable staff who are fair and balanced in their evaluations.

Based on the Panel’s review of the evidence NJESD possesses all of these attributes and meets the spirit of the Charter Schools Act 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, and (g) Provide vigorous competition within the public school system to stimulate continual improvements in all public schools. (Education Code section 47601.)
To meet this legislative intent, NJESD has researched and implemented best authorizer practices, hired experienced staff, and demonstrated diligence in reviewing petitions and seeking and obtaining corrective action when problems are identified in approved schools, even though these tasks are not fully funded under the law. NJESD’s protocols and activities reflect a commitment to high quality authorizing. During the course of the Panel’s review, NJESD added new documents and activities to its oversight protocol, which provides evidence of the district’s focus on continuous improvement for itself and the schools its authorizes and oversees.

The Panel’s overwhelmingly positive evaluation is contained in the commendations and recommendations above.

**Attachments**

(URLs provided in lieu of some attachments)

1. Panel Member Roster
2. Panel Meeting Agenda
3. NJESD Organization Chart
4. NJESD Self Study (with panel notes on evidence used to verify district evaluation)
5. Due Diligence Questionnaire
6. Petition Review Form
7. NJESD MOU Template
8. Pre Opening Checklist
9. Semi-annual Oversight Checklist
10. Evidence List
11. Epicenter
Attachment 1

PANEL MEMBER ROSTER

Carol Barkley, retired Director of Charter Schools, California Department of Education

Dr. Mick Founts, retired San Joaquin County Superintendent of Schools

Cathi Vogel, retired San Francisco Unified School District Chief Business Officer

Dr. Ting Sun did not participate in the Third Party Evaluation to avoid appearance of conflict of interest due to her membership on the California State Board of Education.

Megan Macy did not participate in the Third Party Evaluation after the introductory meeting due to her role as counsel to the district.
## Panel Meeting Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SEGMENT</th>
<th>INVITED PARTICIPANT(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Mr. David Thoming, Superintendent; NJESD Cabinet; Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 a.m.</td>
<td>History of NJESD and Charter Schools</td>
<td>NJESD Cabinet; Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Interview Board of Trustees</td>
<td>NJESD Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Interview NJESD Cabinet</td>
<td>Mr. David Thoming, Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20 a.m.</td>
<td>Interview NJESD Cabinet</td>
<td>Mr. Steve Payne, Deputy Superintendent, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40 a.m.</td>
<td>Interview NJESD Cabinet</td>
<td>Ms. Lisa McHugh, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Interview NJESD Cabinet</td>
<td>Dr. Jeff Tilton, Deputy Superintendent, Educational Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20 a.m.</td>
<td>Interview Charter Operators</td>
<td>Dr. Eldon Rosenow, Great Valley Academies (invited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Matthew George, Humphreys College ABLE (confirmed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Paul Keefer, Pacific Charter Institute (confirmed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Jason Jones, Innovative Education Management (confirmed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Katrina Abston, California Virtual Academies (invited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch @ Mikasa, Lathrop</td>
<td>Panel; NJESD Board of Trustees and Cabinet; Charter Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Panel analysis, prepares initial report</td>
<td>Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Panel shares initial report</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Mr. David Thoming, Superintendent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 3

NJESD Organizational Chart

New Jerusalem Elementary School District

Board of Trustees
William Koster, President; Stephen Bogetti, Clerk; Michael Petz, Trustee

Student Services
Steve Payne, Deputy Superintendent
Denise Volbrecht, Assistant

Business Services
Lisa McHugh, Assistant Superintendent

Educational Services
Jeff Tilton, Deputy Superintendent

Legal Operations
IT

Superintendent
David Thoming
Lorena Talley, Assistant

New Jerusalem Elementary School
Delta Charter School
Delta Home Charter School

Special Education
Health Services
Transportation Services
Business Services
Nutrition Services
Dependent Charters
Delta Bridges
Delta Charter Online
DCO No. 2
Delta Keys
Delta Keys No. 2
Delta Launch
New School (pending)

Independent Charters
Acacia Elementary
Acacia Middle
CAVA San Joaquin
Humphreys Able
Insight San Joaquin
Valley View Prep

Personnel Services
Charter School Authorizer Oversight Quality Review
New Jerusalem Elementary School District
September 30, 2016

Review Team
Carol Barkley, M.A.
Charter School Consultant and Strategist

Mick Founts, Ed.D.
San Joaquin County Superintendent of Schools, retired

Megan Macy, J.D.
Attorney, Lozano Smith

Ting Sun, Ph.D.
California State Board of Education

Cathi Vogel, M.P.A.
# The Panel Review Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SEGMENT</th>
<th>INVITED PARTICIPANT(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Opening -- Mr. David Thoming, Superintendent</td>
<td>NJESD Cabinet; Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 a.m.</td>
<td>History of NJESD and Charter Schools</td>
<td>NJESD Cabinet; Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Interview Board of Trustees</td>
<td>NJESD Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Interview NJESD Cabinet</td>
<td>Mr. David Thoming, Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20 a.m.</td>
<td>Interview NJESD Cabinet</td>
<td>Mr. Steve Payne, Deputy Superintendent, Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40 a.m.</td>
<td>Interview NJESD Cabinet</td>
<td>Ms. Lisa McHugh, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Interview NJESD Cabinet</td>
<td>Dr. Jeff Tilton, Deputy Superintendent, Educational Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20 a.m.</td>
<td>Interview Charter Operators</td>
<td>Dr. Eldon Rosenow, Great Valley Academies (invited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Matthew George, Humphreys College ABLE (confirmed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Paul Keefer, Pacific Charter Institute (confirmed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch @ Mikasa, Lathrop</td>
<td>Panel; NJESD Board of Trustees and Cabinet; Charter Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Panel analysis, prepares initial report</td>
<td>Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Panel shares initial report</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Conclusion -- Mr. David Thoming, Superintendent</td>
<td>Mr. David Thoming, Superintendent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About New Jerusalem Elementary School District
The Ebe Family came across the plains in covered wagons and settled near here about 1865. In 1874, Mr. Henry Ebe, newly settled, donated two acres of land to San Joaquin County for a school in this area. In exchange for this, he required that the school be given the name “New Jerusalem.”

Mr. and Mrs. Ebe were Dunkards. They raised 11 children who went to New Jerusalem School. Mr. Ebe also served as Trustee for the school.

Mrs. Reynolds was New Jerusalem’s first teacher. She had a five-year tenure in 1879, at which time there were 21 boys and 17 girls registered at the school, for a total of 38. Average daily attendance was 84 percent. At that time there were 14 children in the school district under the age of 5.

New Jerusalem School has had a long tradition of quality education. The school reflects the area’s strong sense of community. Many of the grandparents, and even great-grandparents, of today’s students attended NJS. Both parents and the community as a whole strongly support the teachers, administration, Board and staff.

New Jerusalem is a “country” school, both geographically and culturally. This means that it adheres to traditional values including emphasizing student responsibility and resourcefulness, treating one another with dignity and respect, involving and communicating with parents, and maintaining high academic standards within a caring and thoughtful environment.

Superintendent David Thoming comes from a multi-generational NJS family. Entering his 11th year as superintendent with the district, David attended NJS for nine years (K-8). Following college graduation David returned to the area to farm and eventually started coaching at NJS. He caught the teaching fever and soon started teaching at NJS and eventually became the school's principal prior to being appointed as district superintendent.

Thoming was teamed with current Assistant Superintendent, Business Services, Lisa McHugh, who started in the district in 2003. Lisa began her career as the business manager at the now defunct Delta Island Elementary School District. She then worked at Tracy Unified for four years before joining NJESD.

Steve Payne, Deputy Superintendent, Student Services, joined the district in 2007 to replace Thoming at NJS principal. Payne was promoted to his current position in 2012. Payne worked in Linden and Tracy school districts prior to joining NJESD.

Jeff Tilton, Deputy Superintendent, Educational Services, joined the district in 2012. He has a diverse background working in both the public and private sectors and spent over a decade as a California county office of education senior administrator. He has authored and founded several California charter schools, including five dependent charter schools authorized by the district.
Application and Decision-Making

“Does the authorizer approve applications based on an applicant’s demonstrated preparation and capacity to open and operate a quality charter school?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION AND DECISION-MAKING</th>
<th>DISTRICT’S RESPONSE</th>
<th>EVIDENCE VERIFIED BY PANEL REPRESENTATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision and Mission</strong></td>
<td>As part of the district’s petition review process, aligned with the California Education Code requirements for charter school petitions, the district review team acknowledges the existence of vision and mission statements. The district ensures a comprehensive vision, mission and goal statements are clearly outlined in the charter petition.</td>
<td>Green: Satisfactory evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Program</strong></td>
<td>As part of the district’s petition review process, aligned with the California Education Code requirements for charter school petitions, the district review team ensures that the educational philosophy, curriculum and instruction, teaching skills and experience, calendar and daily schedule, target population, enrollment, and plans for educating students with special needs meet the minimum requirements.</td>
<td>Yellow: Items for district consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Plan</strong></td>
<td>As part of the district’s petition review process, aligned with the California Education Code requirements for charter school petitions, the district review team researches the organizational plan submitted by the petitioner. In fact, NJESD staff has recommended denial due to the lack of a clear organization plan by a petitioner (Inspire @ San Joaquin, Spring 2016). The district’s evaluation rubric utilizes a structure and process to guide reflection, planning, and actions to make improvements that lead to equitable and improved student outcomes. The district evaluates the strengths, weaknesses, and areas that require improvement.</td>
<td>Green: Satisfactory evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Charter School Petition Application Guide
Verification: completed petition review form
Business/Financial Plan
The authorizer has thorough requirements and rigorous evaluation criteria for the proposed business plan including financial viability of the plan demonstrated through budget projections that are aligned with the proposed educational program.

As part of the district’s petition review process, aligned with the California Education Code requirements for charter school petitions, the district’s superintendent and assistant superintendent reviews the petitioner’s business and financial plan and where appropriate advises the petitioner on necessary changes while in the review processes. Budget projections and evidence of aligned enrollment and growth projections are taken into strong consideration prior to making a staff recommendation to the board for approval or denial.

For example, financial reports (i.e., unaudited and audited financial reports for first and second interim and prior year, along with preliminary budget for the upcoming year); and, attendance accounting and reporting (including compliance with independent study requirements if non-classroom based charters as well as instructional minutes and days for classroom based sites).

There is a review of required fiscal reports:
- September 15: Final Un-audited Financial Report Previous Year
- December 15: First Interim Un-audited Report Current Year
- December 15: Final Independent Audited Report Previous Year
- March 15: Second Interim Un-Audited Report Current Year
- July 1: Preliminary Budget for upcoming year

- Review Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and annual updates
- Review annual year-end independent audit report.

- Review Criteria:
  1. Maintains a positive fund balance and prudent reserve as reflected in their financial reports.
  2. Governing board regularly reviews and monitors school’s revenues, expenditures and cash flow, modifying the budget to ensure financial stability.
  3. Implements effective systems and practices to manage revenues, expenditures, payroll, and equipment inventories.
  4. Governing board adopts policies and procedures to ensure implementation of sound fiscal systems.
5. Implements board-adopted internal controls as recommended under general audit standards to ensure integrity of all fiscal systems and avoid actions of board members or school staff that result in the appearance or actual conflicts of interest or nepotism.

6. Annual audits are free of significant audit findings/exceptions; if findings occurred, the school promptly addressed the findings and took appropriate action to resolve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION AND DECISION-MAKING continued</th>
<th>DISTRICT’S RESPONSE</th>
<th>EVIDENCE VERIFIED BY PANEL REPRESENTATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Capacity</strong></td>
<td>As part of the district’s petition review process, aligned with the California Education Code requirements for charter school petitions, the district interviews the petitioner and stakeholders prior to submitting a recommendation to the board for approval or denial. Many variables are considered and those variables are contingent upon if the petitioner proposes a site-based or independent study program.</td>
<td>Independent Charter School Petition Application Guide Containing petition requirements aligned with the Education Code. Capacity interview is a best practice, but there are no records available to verify components of the capacity interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New School Priorities</strong></td>
<td>As part of the district’s petition review process, aligned with the California Education Code requirements for charter school petitions, the district’s definition of New School Priorities is aligned with the Local Control Funding Formula’s (LCFF) Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) that each public school in California must provide annually. The district receives LCAPs annually in June and reviews the LCAPs and posts publicly on the NJESD website.</td>
<td>New school priorities are an element of the district’s LCAP. See recommendations under strategic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application Responsiveness</strong></td>
<td>Regardless of the different types of “proposals,” the petitioner must address all aspects listed for charter school petitions in the California Education Code. The district does not adapt or veer from what is required by law.</td>
<td>Independent Charter School Petition Application Guide Independent Charter School Petition Application Intake Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application Process Timeline</strong></td>
<td>As part of the district’s petition review process, aligned with the California Education Code requirements for charter school petitions, the district meets the timelines required by law when a charter petition (new and/or renewal) is submitted to the district.</td>
<td>Independent Charter School Petition Application Guide Board meeting agendas and minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Application Format
The authorizer provides clear guidance and requirements regarding application format and submission requirements.

In all cases thus far, all petitioners have met with the district prior to submitting a petition and requirements and timelines are discussed and determined at that meeting. The application format must follow at minimum what is required by the California Education Code and the petitioners are aware of that, as well.

See Applicant Capacity above.

[Independent Charter School Petition Application Guide posted on line]

### Interview
The authorizer conducts a substantive in-person capacity interview with the applicant group.

Similar to what is stated above, all petitioners meet with the Superintendent and his cabinet prior to formal submission and often during the petition review process, as well.

No document available to verify pre submission meeting.

[Independent Charter School Petition Application Guide posted on line]

### Transparency
The authorizer has transparent processes for both application evaluation and application decision-making.

The district review team provides to the petitioners, and it is posted on the district website, the review tool used for submitted petitions. The tool has been adapted on occasion to meet changes in the law.

[Independent Charter School Petition Application Guide posted on line]

Out of District Notification letter
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>APPLICATION AND DECISION-MAKING continued</strong></th>
<th><strong>DISTRICT’S RESPONSE</strong></th>
<th><strong>EVIDENCE VERIFIED BY PANEL REPRESENTATIVES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Analysis</strong></td>
<td>As part of the district’s petition review process, aligned with the California Education Code requirements for charter school petitions, the district review triangulates data provided in making its recommendation to the board of trustees for approval or denial.</td>
<td>Did not see evidence of triangulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorizer decision-making is informed by documented evidence and analyses of the extent to which the plan satisfies approval criteria and the extent to which applicants demonstrate strong preparation and capacity to establish and operate a quality charter school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Verified several sources that are part of petition review: Independent Charter School Petition Application Guide, Application Intake Checklist, Due Diligence form, completed petition review form, and pre opening checklist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant Pool Development</strong></td>
<td>The district does not recruit petitioners. Petitioners are generally referred to the district from charter school law firms and charter school advocacy organizations.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The authorizer takes affirmative steps to increase the likelihood of receiving viable applications that meet identified needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application Materials and Process</strong></td>
<td>The district operates under the guidelines of the California Education Code requirements for charter school petitions.</td>
<td>New Application Checklist and Guide posted on line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The authorizer provides clear guidance and requirements regarding application materials and submission requirements, and runs a clear and well-structured application process with realistic timelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priorities and Application Adaptations</strong></td>
<td>The district operates under the guidelines of the California Education Code requirements for charter school petitions and it does not adapt the application regardless of program type.</td>
<td>New Application Checklist and Guide posted on line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The authorizer adapts the ‘basic’ application as necessary based on identified needs, including specialized applicant types that are commonly received and/or desired program types.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring Operations
Does the authorizer have effective systems for establishing and monitoring school performance expectations and holding schools accountable as necessary to protect student and public interest?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONITORING OPERATIONS</th>
<th>DISTRICT’S RESPONSE</th>
<th>EVIDENCE VERIFIED BY PANEL REPRESENTATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **School Existence**   | District staff monitors all aspects of the school’s existence through semi-annual team reviews, monthly attendance/ADA submissions from each charter school, and the legally required budget and audit submissions. | Completed annual site visit reports  
Charter file containing monthly attendance report  
Budget  
Audit  
Fiscal reports |
| The authorizer defines and monitors the material terms for the school’s existence including legal status of the school, location, authority of signatories, length of the charter term, and governing body restrictions or requirements and verifies compliance at least annually. | | |
| **Educational Program** | The district operates under the guidelines of the California Education Code requirements for charter school petitions and it does not define the terms of the educational program; however, through the district’s monitoring of the educational program, it does monitor all legal obligations the charter schools are responsible to uphold. | CAASSP  
Affirmation of School Dashboard in future  
LCAP  
CDE, county, district reports |
| The authorizer defines and monitors material terms of the educational program consistent with the school’s mission and legal obligations. | | |
| **Organizational Requirements** | The district has had and/or has representation on nearly all of its external charter schools’ governing boards. The internal charter schools are governed by the district’s publicly elected board of trustees. | Not reviewed |
| The authorizer defines and monitors organizational terms consistent with the school’s governance and compliance obligations. | | |
| **Financial Requirements** | District staff monitors all aspects of the school’s existence through semi-annual team reviews, monthly attendance/ADA submissions from each charter school, and the legally required budget and audit submissions. | Completed semi annual site visit reports  
Correspondence regarding school reports  
Complete, comprehensive school file (digital format)  
Recommendation: add second level fiscal oversight functions at first sign of potential financial challenge |
| The authorizer defines and monitors financial operations consistent with the school’s legal obligations and established professional standards. | | |
| **Special Populations** | As part of the district’s petition review, special population services are critically scrutinized. Furthermore, in most cases, the district contracts with its charter schools to provide special education services. Nearly all charters are in the El Dorado County Charter Special Education Local Plan Area, in fact, and they are monitored by that entity, as well. | Completed site visit checklists  
MOU template |
| The authorizer establishes clear expectations for and ensures compliance with school obligations to special populations. | | |
| **Monitoring Authority** | District staff monitors all aspects of the school’s existence through semi-annual team reviews, monthly attendance/ADA submissions from each charter school, and the legally required budget and audit submissions. | Completed site visit checklist and cover letter provided to charter operator.  
Audit submission  
School Budgets  
Enrollment/ADA reports  
Empowering Schools data tracking system (new) |
<p>| The authorizer exercises adequate Monitoring Authority that includes regular performance feedback. | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONITORING OPERATIONS continued</th>
<th>DISTRICT’S RESPONSE</th>
<th>EVIDENCE VERIFIED BY PANEL REPRESENTATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Operation</strong>&lt;br&gt;The parties have clarity regarding how the contract will operate with clear provisions for notice, waiver, severability, assignment, amendment, merger, indemnification, survival, and contract dispute resolution. The authorizer executes a charter contract for each school that clearly articulates the rights and responsibilities of each party.</td>
<td>The district operates under the guidelines of the California Education Code requirements for charter school petitions. Additionally, there are memoranda of understanding with nearly all of the district’s external charter schools.</td>
<td>Existing MOUs&lt;br&gt;New MOU template to be used for new charter schools and at renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency</strong>&lt;br&gt;The authorizer communicates to schools and the public clearly and consistently regarding expectations for and status of school operations.</td>
<td>The district has had and/or has representation on nearly all of its external charter schools’ governing boards. Additionally, the district requires monthly attendance/ADA reports that are included in the monthly NJESD Board of Trustees meetings.</td>
<td>Posted LCAP&lt;br&gt;Board Agenda&lt;br&gt;Board Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Monitoring</strong>&lt;br&gt;The authorizer has an effective process for monitoring educational, financial, and organizational performance of the schools it authorizes.</td>
<td>District staff monitors all aspects of the school’s existence through semi-annual team reviews, monthly attendance/ADA submissions from each charter school, and the legally required budget and audit submissions.</td>
<td>See above re: site visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance-Based Accountability

Does the authorizer have rigorous appropriate standards by which it holds schools accountable for results? Are decisions made with the intent to maintain high standards and protect the students’ and the public’s interests?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE-BASED ACCOUNTABILITY</th>
<th>DISTRICT’S RESPONSE</th>
<th>EVIDENCE VERIFIED BY PANEL REPRESENTATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Opening</strong></td>
<td>The authorizer ensures that approved schools are prepared adequately for opening.</td>
<td>As part of the district’s initial review of a submitted petition, a team visits the site of the (site-based) charter school’s facility. Past facilities include operating churches and a university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Performance</strong></td>
<td>The authorizer holds schools accountable for academic performance using objective and verifiable measures of student achievement as the primary measure of school quality.</td>
<td>The district primarily utilizes assessment data borne from the state’s mandated assessments. Charter operators, however, are encouraged to share interim assessment data throughout the school year, especially during the semi-annual district team reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational/Organizational Performance</strong></td>
<td>The authorizer holds schools accountable for compliance with organizational performance requirements established in the charter contract or the performance framework, including educational program requirements, governance and reporting, financial management and oversight, and operational requirements related to students, employees, and the school environment.</td>
<td>A team comprised primarily of district administrators makes site visits at least twice annually and it uses the FCMAT district authorizer matrix to address all items listed in this criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Performance</strong></td>
<td>The authorizer holds schools accountable for being financially responsible and viable.</td>
<td>Charter operators, like all local education agencies, are required to submit financial information to the district on or before state-mandated deadlines. If/when there are concerns, the district immediately notifies and/or meets with the charter operator in an attempt to rectify any financial issue. If no improvements are made, a notice of concern, a notice of violation, or, if necessary, the revocation process is commenced. Correspondence regarding fiscal reports Notice of Concern Notice to Cure Intent to Revoke Revocation action (school files, Board Agenda, Board Minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Intervention</strong></td>
<td>The authorizer conducts merit-based interventions in response to clearly identified deficiencies in the school’s record of educational, organizational and/or financial performance.</td>
<td>The district immediately notifies the charter operator if/when deficiencies are discovered. Oral and written notices requiring corrective action are the first step in rectifying any deficiencies in all aspects of the educational and operational program. Notice of Concern Notice to Cure Intent to Revoke Revocation action (school files, Board Agenda, Board Minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charter Revocation</strong></td>
<td>The authorizer makes merit based revocation decisions based on the school’s record in relation to established expectations for educational, organizational and financial performance.</td>
<td>The district has and will continue to follow the California Education Code as it relates to the revocation processes, as recently demonstrated with the two Acacia charter schools, managed by the Tri-Valley Learning Corporation. Notice of Concern Notice to Cure Intent to Revoke Revocation action (school files, Board Agenda, Board Minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE-BASED ACCOUNTABILITY continued</td>
<td>DISTRICT’S RESPONSE</td>
<td>EVIDENCE VERIFIED BY PANEL REPRESENTATIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewal</strong></td>
<td>The district, in its review of renewal petitions, follows the identified charter petition renewal criteria in the California Education Code.</td>
<td>Did not review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The authorizer makes merit based renewal decisions based on the school’s record in relation to established expectations for educational, organizational and financial performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closure</strong></td>
<td>Since 2012, the district has processed three charter school closures. All three were voluntarily, with one closing because it was moving out of the district jurisdiction and into a neighboring county. All closure processes, as described in each charter petition and the California Education Code, were followed, including the calling of audits on the two charters that closed entirely.</td>
<td>Did not review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following non-renewal, revocation or voluntary return of the charter, the authorizer ensures orderly closure of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparency</strong></td>
<td>The district demands that each charter school follow the Ralph Brown Act with its respective public meetings and each charter, under California Education Code, must annually provide to the district a Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP) that is review by the district. Both the LCAP and its district review are posted to the district’s website.</td>
<td>Evidence of LCAP on charter school websites and the district website. Board agendas contain clear statements of items under consideration by the board and the level of action (discussion or action) to be taken. Board minutes document action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The authorizer makes high stakes accountability decisions in a way that is transparent to schools and the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Alignment</strong></td>
<td>The district takes a triangulation approach to this criterion, as utilizes data from the state-mandated assessments, the annual Local Control Account Plan (LCAP), and the semi-annual reviews utilizing the FCMAT matrix, which provide both qualitative and quantitative data analyses opportunities.</td>
<td>Semi annual staff visit CAASPP (School Dashboard going forward) Staff renewal report and recommendation Board agenda Board minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorizer makes accountability decisions that are informed by and align with documented evidence and analysis of the extent to which the school satisfies performance expectations. The analysis presented to decision makers is of high quality, and the merits of the decisions themselves show decision-making is based on thoughtful analysis, ensuring that only the charter schools that meet or exceed expectations are in operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**School Autonomy**
Do schools have the autonomy to which they are entitled?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL AUTONOMY</th>
<th>DISTRICT’S RESPONSE</th>
<th>EVIDENCE VERIFIED BY PANEL REPRESENTATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Autonomy</td>
<td>The district believes it walks a delicate balance of affording autonomy and active and legally allowed authorizer oversight.</td>
<td>Not reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Process/Program</td>
<td>The district’s definition of school autonomy resides in the language of California Education Code 47604.32 and recommendations set forth by FCMAT.</td>
<td>Not reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>The district’s definition of school autonomy resides in the language of California Education Code 47604.32 and recommendations set forth by FCMAT; however, when it comes to financial management, the district remains steadfast in monitoring all aspects for the school’s financial management.</td>
<td>Not reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts of Interest</td>
<td>The district operates on the laws written in the Government Code as it relates to conflict of interest(s). Any district employee who is a member of a charter school’s governing board recuses her/himself if/when a potential conflict of interest agenda item is agendized for action.</td>
<td>Recommendation: District should consider appointing a representative to charter boards who is not an employee of the district to avoid reducing charter school autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-regulation</td>
<td>The district’s oversight of its authorized charter schools is the same across all authorized charter schools, unless there is a need to heighten oversight to reduce autonomy, to which the district implements corrective action(s) directive(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Oversight</td>
<td>The district’s oversight of its authorized charter schools is the same across all authorized charter schools, unless there is a need to heighten oversight to reduce autonomy, to which the district implements corrective action(s) directive(s).</td>
<td>Recommendation: District should consider increased oversight and possible revocation, rather than reduced autonomy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Organizational Capacity
To what extent do the organizational structure and systems support quality authorizing practices and forward the authorizer’s mission?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY</th>
<th>DISTRICT’S RESPONSE</th>
<th>EVIDENCE VERIFIED BY PANEL REPRESENTATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Planning</strong></td>
<td>The district, since 2012, believes it has aligned with NACSA principles and standards and, with this initial self-review, has established it as a leader, trailblazer, and pioneer as it relates to effective charter school authorizer oversight.</td>
<td>District self study is evidence of continuous improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure</strong></td>
<td>The district proudly runs a lean office with very talented cabinet level administrators working in dual capacities of running the school district and providing quality oversight. Each of the four members of the cabinet take specific areas of oversight and are constantly communicating areas of district charter oversight.</td>
<td>Not reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Capital Processes and Systems</strong></td>
<td>The district has responded to its recent growth of both internal and external charter schools by staffing accordingly in all aspects of the district, especially in Special Education services. This unorthodox approach has been the target of the local county office of education with its claim that the district has too many administrators; however, the county entity continues to operate, the district believes, on a dated administrative staffing paradigm.</td>
<td>Not reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Budget</strong></td>
<td>The district’s budget has remained robust in light of recent expenditures on litigation involving the Tri-Valley Learning Corporation (TVLC) and its two revoked (on appeal) charter schools, Acacia Elementary and Acacia Middle. The district, responding to AB 1200, is in solid shape for at least the next three years with promising growth years to follow.</td>
<td>Not reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership and Decision-making Body</strong></td>
<td>The district’s Board of Trustees direct staff to operate, at a minimum, with three criteria: 1) Is it good for kids?; 2) Is it legal?; and, 3) Will we not lose money? The three-person Board collectively has several decades of experience due to multiple re-elections to their respective positions. Along with approving charter petitions set before it, the Board has also denied petitions and voted to revoke charter schools.</td>
<td>Not reviewed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### California Education Code 47604.32

Each chartering authority, in addition to any other duties imposed by this part, shall do all of the following with respect to each charter school under its authority:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALIFORNIA EDUCATION CODE 47604.32</th>
<th>DISTRICT’S RESPONSE</th>
<th>EVIDENCE VERIFIED BY PANEL REPRESENTATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Identify at least one staff member as a contact person for the charter school.</td>
<td>Dr. Jeff Tilton, Deputy Superintendent, Educational Services, is the main contact for the district. He has authored several successful charter school petitions/schools since 2001, been a charter school board member, and a volunteer for California Network of Education Charters (CANECA) and the California Charter Schools Association (CCSA). Dr. Tilton is also involved with CARSNet, a resource for high quality charter school authorizing and oversight. See recommendation above related to succession planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Visit each charter school at least annually.</td>
<td>The district sends a team, mostly comprised of administrators, to each authorized charter school at least twice per year to verify the various quality indicators as listed on the FCMAT matrix.</td>
<td>Semi annual site visits checklist and completed reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Ensure that each charter school under its authority complies with all reports required of charter schools by law, including the annual update required pursuant to Section 47606.5.</td>
<td>The district enforces all accountability requirements of its authorized charter schools as mandated in the California Education Code.</td>
<td>Not reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Monitor the fiscal condition of each charter school under its authority.</td>
<td>The district enforces all fiscal accountability requirements of its authorized charter schools as mandated in the California Education Code.</td>
<td>Fiscal records, indicate school reports are reviewed and correspondence is initiated when problems are identified, followed by evidence of compliance or steps toward revocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Provide timely notification to the department if any of the following circumstances occur or will occur with regard to a charter school for which it is the chartering authority: (1) A renewal of the charter is granted or denied. (2) The charter is revoked. (3) The charter school will cease operation for any reason.</td>
<td>The district has complied with all requirements regarding petition approval/denial, revocation, and/or closure.</td>
<td>Not reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) The cost of performing the duties required by this section shall be funded with supervisory oversight fees collected pursuant to Section 47613.</td>
<td>Oversight fees collected by the district from its authorized charter schools clearly does not match the supervisory oversight expenditure the district has encumbered since fiscal year 2012-2013, due to increasing legal fees the district has paid attempting to implement the responsibilities of an authorizer as described in the California Education Code and the recommendations from FCMAT.</td>
<td>Not reviewed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 5
Due Diligence Questionnaire


Attachment 6
Petition Review Form


Attachment 7
NJESD MOU Template


Attachment 8
Pre-Opening Checklist


Attachment 9
Semi-annual Oversight Checklist


Attachment 10
Evidence List

- Independent Charter School Petition Application Guide
- Independent Charter School Petition Application Intake Checklist
- Completed petition review forms for charter schools
- Out of district location notification letters
- Board agendas for public hearing and decision of charter school decisions
- Board minutes reflecting board information, discussion, and action regarding charter schools
- Completed Semi-annual School Site Visit Checklists for charter schools
- Notice to Cure letters
- Intent to Revoke letters
- Completed staff report to NJESD Board for school revocations