

HUMBOLDT COUNTY CHARTER SCHOOLS

SUMMARY

The 2013 – 2014 Grand Jury’s investigation into charter schools in Humboldt County is in two parts. The **Discussion, Part I** includes a brief summary of the 2004-05 Grand Jury Report on charter schools.¹ **Part I** of this investigation will address all charter schools with the exception of Mattole Valley Charter School, which will be addressed separately in the **Discussion - Part II** section of this report.

This year’s Grand Jury investigation of charter schools found the concerns of the 2005 report have been addressed, either through legislation since 2005 or by the charter schools’ own initiatives. The Grand Jury offers its congratulations to the county’s charter schools for addressing the issues illuminated by the 2004-2005 report.

The Grand Jury also found that the academic health of our county’s charter schools is very good to superior based on the Academic Progress Index reports.

What the Grand Jury did discover is that there are two issues needing to be improved, both of which are addressed in Part I of this report. They are:

- The correction of informational inconsistencies between the schools’ websites and the information published on the California Department of Education’s data websites (which is provided to the state by the individual schools);
- The inclusion of a clear, direct, and easy access on the schools’ websites to the School Accountability Report Card.

BACKGROUND

Humboldt County has 15 charter school networks.² Oversight authority and responsibility for those charter schools rests primarily in the Local Educational Agencies to which the charter schools are attached. A Local Educational Agency is a local, “regular” public school or district which sponsors a charter school and which is responsible for general oversight duties such as assuring the public that the teachers of the charter schools they sponsor hold the proper credentials, that the curriculum complies with the California Curriculum Standards, and that the charter schools comply with Education Code, part of which deals with transparency and easy accessibility of information given to the public about the schools.

All charter schools, just like “traditional” schools, are statutorily mandated to ensure that the public has access to certain information useful for parents in choosing which charter school they may wish to send their children. Therefore, the California Department of Education publishes the School Accountability Report Card³ for all to see. School Accountability Report Cards contain

¹ <http://co.humboldt.ca.us/grandjury/reports/2004-2005/2004-05finalreport.pdf>

² <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/si/cs/ap1/countyresults.aspx?id=12>

³ <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/>

the schools' test results of all students in publicly financed schools as well as some general financial and demographic information about the schools, including the credentials held by a school's teaching staff, teacher and administrator salaries, ethnicity of students, and school test rankings in comparison to other schools. The information contained in the School Accountability Report Card is intended to offer the public a clear, transparent overview of a school. It is important for the schools to provide that information in a clear, easily-accessible format. Because charter schools are *public schools*, they are subject to the laws covered in the California Education Code, and it is statutorily mandated that the charter schools' administration to make all relevant information about the schools easy and convenient for the public to access.

Financial and academic misconduct by a few charter schools in the state triggered the passage of Assembly Bill 1994 (October, 2003) which calls for increased oversight of charter schools by county offices of education and those "traditional" public schools or districts that sponsor charter schools. Assembly Bill 1994 also mandates increased transparency and accountability of charter schools by requiring increased visitation and inspection of sites by county superintendents and/or sponsoring Local Educational Agency administrators to assure compliance with state law and the state educational standards.

Additionally, Assembly Bill 1994 requires that charter schools demonstrate and report to the public a certain level of academic achievement in order to receive funds and/or have their charters renewed. Charter schools are now required to test 95% of all students attending those schools. The results of the various state-mandated tests are compiled into what is known as the schools' Academic Progress Index, a 1000 point Index that reflects how well students respond to questions focusing on English, Math, Science, and History (see chart this page). It is the goal of the state that as instruction improves with the implementation of the California Common Core Curriculum; schools will reach and/or exceed the score of 800 on their Academic Performance Index.

As of the school year beginning in 2005, all new and existing charter

State Assessment Tools Used in Creating the 1000 point API Score

California Standards Tests (CSTs)

- English-language arts, mathematics, history-social science, and science
- Grades two through eleven

California Modified Assessment (CMA)

- English-language arts, mathematics, and science
- Grades three through eleven

California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA)

- English-language arts and mathematics
- Grades two through eleven

California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE)

- English-language arts and mathematics
- Grade ten (and eleven and twelve if the student passed)
- Passed = score of 350 or above

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/documents/apiexcsu>

schools must comply with state-established academic performance requirements by giving the various Annual Performance Indices. The intent of the legislation is to assure the communities' citizens that charter schools are as academically sound as traditional public schools, and that the testing to prove such academic soundness is identical to that of traditional public schools.

APPROACH

The Humboldt County Grand Jury decided to review the 2004-05 Grand Jury Report to discover if the charter schools have maintained compliance with the issues raised in that report. In addition to the charter school topics studied by the 2004-05 Grand Jury, an additional focus of this year's Grand Jury investigation is on the transparency and ease of access to information that ought to appear on all school websites:

- The School Accountability Report Card , focusing on:
 - the 2007, 2010, and 2013 school years, which will include students' academic progress (with a specific focus on English, Math, Science and History),
 - credentials of teachers in core courses,
 - teacher / administrator salaries,
 - the amount of funding expended per student (see Appendix, Table 3);
- Transparency in student admission policies;
- Access to the school's testing and demographic information (School Accountability Report Card).

The Grand Jury of Humboldt County used four methods in determining its findings of facts for this investigation:

- Research of the charter schools' public information web sites, which are supposed to contain easy access to the School Accountability Report Card;
- Interviews with various employees of the Humboldt County Office of Education and the charter schools of Humboldt County;
- Questionnaires given to all of the charter schools, requesting all relevant information discussed in this investigation for the years 2007, 2010, and 2013;
- Review of schools' financial data provided online and on actual audits and financial documents requested by the Grand Jury.

DISCUSSION – Part I: All Humboldt County Charter Schools with the exception of Mattole Valley Charter School

The 2004-2005 Grand Jury made specific recommendations, addressing all charter schools generally:

- Establish clear and consistent methods of conducting annual oversight checks of all of the county's charter schools.
- Assure that sponsoring agencies of charter schools, the Local Educational Agencies, exercise vigilant oversight regarding the credentials held by teachers assigned to be the primary teachers of core high school courses (English, Math, History, and Science).
- Make application and admission policies transparent.

- Develop stricter guidelines for the maintenance of student records.
- Pay all employees directly, deducting appropriate taxes and retirement benefits, and pay premiums for state unemployment compensation and state workers' compensation.
- Check with the Federal and State tax agencies and the Federal and State Departments of Labor to verify the legal definition of "employee" and "independent contractor."
- Consult with authorities to determine the legitimacy of using a pass-through account to pay anyone who is already retired and receiving retirement system benefits.
- Confirm the legitimacy and legality of transforming a private school to a public school.
- Encourage participation with state-recommended testing in order to achieve the 95 percent student testing rate desired to track school accountability.

The 2013-14 Grand Jury discovered that all of the nine recommendations of the 2004-05 Grand Jury for the charter schools of Humboldt County were addressed. According to the data available for this year's report, teachers in charter schools addressed in Part I of this report are all properly credentialed and assigned appropriately according to the School Accountability Report Cards and the California Department of Education's data websites. All charter schools are properly allied to Local Education Agencies for oversight. Moreover, all charter schools, except the Montessori Del Mar Learning Center, now participate in the state's testing program at the mandated 95% level according to the California State Department's records. The Montessori Del Mar Learning Center, which is attached to the Mattole Valley Charter School, will be discussed Part II of this report.

The following schools are to be commended for meeting or exceeding state averages on the Annual Performance Index (API):

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ▪ Alder Grove Charter | ▪ Northcoast Preparatory Charter |
| ▪ Coastal Grove Charter | ▪ Redwood Preparatory Charter |
| ▪ Freshwater Charter | ▪ Six Rivers Charter High |
| ▪ Fuente Nueva Charter | ▪ South Bay Charter |
| ▪ Jacoby Creek Charter | ▪ Union Street Charter |
| ▪ Laurel Tree Charter | |

The goal of the state is that the Academic Performance Index of all schools in California reach or exceed the score of 800 on the API Index. Seven of the charter school mentioned in this report rank in the top 10% of all charter schools in the state; two of these schools occupy the top rank of all charter schools in the nation: Jacoby Creek Charter and Northcoast Preparatory and Performing Arts Charter.

Twelve of the 14 charter schools in Humboldt county (86%), noted in Part I of this report are serving the needs of students' education very well according to state API guidelines. Only one of the 15 charter schools reviewed in Part I of this report did not exceed average state API scores (Pacific View Charter), meaning 93% of Humboldt County's charter schools exceed the average state API scores for the school year ending in 2013. (See Appendix, Table 1 – API Scores for Humboldt County's Charter Schools.)

The Grand Jury has two concerns, however. California Education Code, section 33126(d) states that all schools, including charter schools, must provide the public with clear and consistent

accountability information. This should be *easily and clearly* available. Specifically, Education Code, Section 33126(d) states:

It is the intent of the Legislature that schools make a concerted effort to notify parents of the purpose of the school accountability report cards, as described in this section, and ensure that all parents receive a copy of the report card; to ensure that the School Accountability Report Cards are easy to read and understandable by parents; to ensure that local educational agencies with access to the Internet make available current copies of the report cards through the Internet; and to ensure that administrators and teachers are available to answer any questions regarding the report cards.(Emphasis added.)

In addition to being “easy to read,” the Jury’s focus also turned to the phrase, “to **ensure** that local educational agencies with access to the Internet make available current copies of the School Accountability Report Card through the Internet.” The School Accountability Report Card is the vehicle by which schools are to deliver such information to the public. The law states the School Accountability Report Card is to be given to all parents of children attending a charter school as well as be posted on the schools’ websites. It is in the spirit of the law that such internet information be **easily accessed**. Such a law seems to us to be reasonable, and the law’s recommendations seem to be easily achievable, since all of the county’s charter schools have websites. However, members of the Grand Jury found accessing School Accountability Report Cards could be very difficult or even impossible for the average citizen who has but a modicum of ability with internet navigation. That difficulty minimizes the clarity and transparency required by Ed Code 33126 for parents to access information critical to parental concerns when they are choosing which school their children might attend. The transparency and ease of access required by Education Code, section 33126 was far from adequate in several cases.

As of December 14, 2013, the Grand Jury discovered that there were three distinct groups of schools:

- Those that had an easily-accessed, direct link to the School Accountability Report Cards;
- Those that had a secondary link to the School Accountability Report Cards, sometimes buried in another category;
- Those that had no direct link to the School Accountability Report Cards.

The following charter schools *did* have an easily-accessible link to the School Accountability Report Card: Coastal Grove Charter School; Freshwater Middle Charter School; Redwood Preparatory Charter School; and Union Street Charter School.

The websites of the following charter schools *did* have a **secondary** link that lead to the School Accountability Report Card under various titles: Alder Grove Charter School; Fuente Nueva Charter School; Laurel Tree Charter School; Pacific View Charter School; and Trillium Charter School. A “secondary link” refers to an additional “connecting link” that the reader must first access in order to access what a “direct link” to the School Accountability Report Card could do in the first place. For instance, a school’s website might have a link called “resources,” in which

the School Accountability Report Card is embedded. A person with limited computer skills might not understand how to access the School Accountability Report Card report through a secondary link. Additionally, a school website's categories under which its School Accountability Report Card is embedded might not be obvious for someone wishing merely to access the School Accountability Report Card.

The websites of the following charter schools did not contain a link to the School Accountability Report Card: Jacoby Creek Charter School; Mattole Valley Charter School (addressed in "Discussion – Part II" of this report); Northcoast Preparatory and Performing Arts; Redwood Coast Montessori Charter School; Six Rivers Charter High School; and South Bay Charter School.

Part of a school's complete report that is available to the public contains the salaries of the teachers and administrators. The Grand Jury found that Freshwater Elementary Charter School's Director/Principal's self-reported salary differs from the published California Department of Education information about that administrator's salary. Not only was the Grand-Jury-requested "self-reported" administrator's salary well below the state average for administrators' salaries, but it was also significantly lower than that of the school's average teacher salary,⁴ as reported on the California Department of Education information. In fact, the salary given in the "self-reported" information was well below the poverty level. Whether it is a clerical error or an irregularity in expenditure accounting, the Grand Jury believes that the self-reported administrator salary of the Freshwater Elementary Charter School is questionable. (See Table 2 in the Appendix.)

FINDINGS for Part I

- F1. As of November 13, 2013, there was no clear and **easily accessible access** to the School Accountability Report Cards on the first page of the following charter schools' websites: Northcoast Preparatory and Performing Arts; Six Rivers Charter High School; and Trillium Charter School.
- F2. California Department of Education published website data and self-reported, hard-copy data often appear to be inconsistent and / or contradictory, especially in the case of Freshwater Charter School's administrative salary / salaries.

RECOMMENDATIONS for Part I

- R1. The Northcoast Preparatory and Performing Arts, Six Rivers Charter High School, and Trillium Charter School need to display a clear one-step link to the School Accountability Report Card on the first page of their website, labeling that link "School Accountability Report Card (SARC)" in order to make the school's data easily accessible to the public and thereby comply with both the letter and the spirit of the law (Ed Code, section 33126(d). (F1)

⁴ http://internet.humboldt.k12.ca.us/freshwater_sd/FreshwaterElem_SARC%202012.html, December 13, 2013.

R2. All charter schools need to check the published California Department of Education data against their own “in house” records to make certain that the data the California Department of Education publishes is accurate. (F2)

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES for PART I

Pursuant to Penal Code § 933.05, the following responses are required; the Governing Boards of the following schools;

- Northcoast Preparatory and Performing Arts (R1, R2)
- Six Rivers Charter High School (R1, R2)
- Trillium Charter School (R1, R2)

The Governing Board of Freshwater Charter School should respond to recommendation 2 to clarify the published administrative salary found at the California Department of Education’s *Ed Data* website and the self-reported administrative salary submitted to the Grand Jury.

SUMMARY – PART II – Mattole Valley Charter School

When doing the investigation of Humboldt County’s charter schools, the Humboldt County Grand Jury found many problems with its attempt to obtain clear, transparent, and accurate data for the Mattole Valley Charter School on its website. Such a lack of accuracy and transparency is a violation of Education Code, section 33126(d). The Mattole Valley Charter School’s website also lacked easy access to the School Accountability Report Card and other information that parents might need in order to make informed choices for the education of their children.

DISCUSSION – PART II – Mattole Valley Charter School

The Mattole Valley Charter School is the least transparent with its public records of all schools the Grand Jury investigated this year. What should be a very simple internet search for the average person wishing to learn about the Mattole Valley Charter School – finding API scores, number of teachers, budgets, and general school qualifications – leads to a frustrating series of dead ends that offer little or no meaningful information without searching further on its website using a “hit or miss” method. The Mattole Valley Charter School Website is <http://www.mattolevalley.com/>, and it requires many steps to access any useful information. When Mattole Valley Charter’s information *is* finally accessed by going first to <http://www.mattolevalley.com/resources/student-parent-resources/>, one must select “resources,” which leads to another menu. On that menu, there is a link that leads to the School Accountability Report Card. However, when one searches the School Accountability Report Card for Mattole Valley Charter School, one does not know if the data is for Mattole Valley Charter School, its sponsoring agent, Mattole Unified School District, or both.

If this sounds confusing, it is. Just getting to Mattole Valley Charter School's School Accountability Report Card is hard enough for the average person making an inquiry into the school. Reading Mattole Valley Charter School's School Accountability Report Card is just as confusing for the average person with limited to average internet skills, because of the numerous references to its sponsoring agency (Mattole Unified School District). If a person were curious about the charter school, the School Accountability Report Card refers the person back to the sponsoring agent, for much of the information sought. Once on the Mattole Unified School District's website, the person searching information through the School Accountability Report Card is directed not to Mattole Valley Charter School, but to one of the smaller, traditional schools in the Mattole Unified District. And if one selects one of those schools' School Accountability Report Card, one discovers that he/she must now download a .pdf file and use the latest version of Adobe Reader in order to access any information.

If a person wished to inquire about any one of the 12 learning centers of the Mattole Valley Charter School network, one would discover that there is no statistical information about any of the learning centers. Instead, there is a description of the center and a link connecting the interested party to an application for information. There is also a link that leads the interested party back to the Mattole Unified School District website, which has a link leading to the charter school, which leads one back to the learning center webpage where the search began.⁵

There also appears to be a complete lack of specific School Accountability Report Card data generally on the Mattole Valley Charter's website for any of the individual "learning centers" that are spread throughout Humboldt County and the contiguous counties bordering Humboldt. Mattole Valley Charter School runs these "learning centers" and receives full funding for the enrollees. However, there is virtually no specific information for interested parents regarding the quality of information in these "learning centers." When one selects the "SARC" link on the Mattole Valley Charter School, the result as of December 13, 2013, is: "*Oops! That page can't be found.*" In short, the public must simply take on faith, rather than on hard data, that 1) there are revenue-generating students at those "Learning Centers," educated by qualified teachers; and 2) those students are, indeed, participating in the state's mandated testing program, a requirement for funding.

However, once the persistent person does access the School Accountability Report Card information of Mattole Valley Charter School by going to www.sarconline.org or a California Department of Education website for charter schools, one finds that the data can be accessed only with much difficulty, provided one knows

- The Mattole Valley Charter School is identified by the state's data sources as "Mattole Valley Charter (#159). Mattole Valley Charter School can be accessed via a secondary link through the Humboldt County Office of Education's website;
- The API report on the state website reflects that only 451 of the 747 students for the 2011-2012 school year provide the data for the school's aggregated API scores⁶ (only for the elementary school aged children in the case of the Mattole Valley Charter (#159)).

⁵ Mattole Valley Charter School website <http://www.mattolevalley.com/learningcenters.html>

⁶ <http://www.humboldt.k12.ca.us/sarcviewer/mattole-charter/>

451 students is not the 95% of all students mandated to be administered state examinations.

When one looks that the information available concerning the test scores, the number of attendees, the number of teachers employed, and the salaries of the teachers, the information is also inconsistent with data posted on the California Department of Education's *Data Quest* site (a site intended to be a cross-reference to the posted School Accountability Report Card information), as well as with hard copy data contained in the information sent to the Grand Jury by request. Another website⁷ that provides School Accountability Report Card data also offers information inconsistent with Mattole's website. In short, the data for the *entire* Mattole Valley Charter School is nearly useless for the person wishing to find out about the quality of education, test scores, finances, and characteristics of either the Charter School or the Unified District, due to all of the data from both institutions being "blended," one organization with the other.

Such inconsistencies would lead any reasonable person to recognize that there is a plentiful lack of transparency in the information that both the Mattole Unified School District and the Mattole Valley Charter school are presenting to the public concerning their nearly six million dollars in annual taxpayer funds received per the stated enrollment in order to operate their "blended" schools, the charter school and the unified district..

Another troubling finding is the blurred line between the positions of Mattole Unified District's Superintendent and Mattole Valley's Charter School's Director, two positions embodied in a single individual who has charge of both budgets. The potential for the appearance of using the charter school, to raise revenue for its sponsoring Local Educational Agency (Mattole Unified) is high. This "blurred line" of dual roles is exacerbated because of the witness testimony that neither the Superintendent of the Mattole nor the Director of the charter school (the same person) receive regular, formal, written evaluations.

The Mattole Unified District has a reserve account of more than 43% of the total budget of both the Unified District and the Charter Schools' annual income, which for the school year 2011 – 2012 was \$6,281,722 (See Appendix, Table 5). Mattole Unified School District's reserves were \$2,754,244. The California Department of Education recommends between a 5% – 7% amount of the total annual school budget to be in a reserve account. To achieve such a large reserve account, a district must overestimate the fiscal needs of the schools, which seems to be the case by looking at Mattole Unified's published income and expense per student.⁸ According to the latest California Department of Education budget information for Mattole Unified District (School Year 2011-2012), the income per student was \$26,472, which is 300% higher than the average income per student for the districts against which Mattole Unified was compared in this investigation. (See Appendix, Table 3) However, the expenses per student of the Mattole Unified indicates \$20,885, leaving a surplus of \$5,587 per student for that year. The amount of carry-over per student is huge. Such large carry-overs, whether real or in error, are nevertheless published by the California Department of Education and can raise questions which warrant

⁷ <http://www.zillow.com/petrolia-ca/schools/mattole-valley-charter-159-school-86843/>

⁸ California Department of Education - District Comparisons – income and expense per student http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/App_Resx/EdDataClassic/fsTwoPanel.aspx?#!bottom=/_layouts/EdDataClassic/fiscal/MC-Results.asp

explanations. (See Appendix, Table IV.) The surplus revenue from the Mattole Valley Charter School, according to the Mattole Unified District's own hard copy Audit Reports and witnesses testifying before the Grand Jury, is then transferred into the reserve of the Unified District, the charter school's own sponsoring school district. The sponsoring district of a charter school is charged with providing the oversight for the charter school. When the chartering sponsor, responsible for oversight of the chartered agency, are one in the same for all intents and purposes, the potential exists for lax or questionable oversight, especially if the chartered agency appears to be generating revenue for the charter's sponsor.

Furthermore, the data in the Appendix, Table 6 indicates that Mattole Unified District (the only Mattole Valley Charter School connected site) has 67 teachers and 50.6 Full Time Equivalent teachers for the 2011-12 school year. The figures for Mattole Valley Charter School are embedded into the figures for the Mattole Unified District. The California Department of Education's published figures are inconsistent with the facts of both the hard copy of the District's audit as well as the requested personnel sheet that displays all of the teachers by Full Time Equivalency. From the Mattole Valley Charter's own data sheets dated 7/1/2011, there were 39 Full Time Equivalent teachers and 11 administrative personnel.

FINDINGS for PART II

- F1. There is no clear and easily accessible access to the School Accountability Report Card listed prominently on the first page of the Mattole Valley Charter School. Instead, there is a School Accountability Report Card link on the first page of Mattole Valley's website that leads to a page listing School Accountability Report Cards for traditional schools in the Mattole Unified School District.
- F2. The website-published financial and School Accountability Report Card records of both Mattole Unified District and its sponsored Mattole Valley Charter School are "blended," blurring the transparency and clarity of information for both of those institutions
- F3. The position of Superintendent of Mattole Unified District and the Director of the Mattole Valley Charter School are performed by one individual for both institutions, blurring the line between the District's Local Educational Agency's oversight obligation for the sponsored Charter School.
- F4. California Department of Education published website data and self-reported; hard-copy data are inconsistent and / or contradictory with each other, especially as it relates to the number of teachers employed and average daily attendance (ADA) data for Mattole Valley Charter School.
- F5. The 12 "learning centers" of the Mattole Valley Charter School have no individual data published for the public, either on the Charter School's own website or on any California Department of Education website.

- F6. The Superintendent of Mattole Unified School District has not been given a formal, written evaluation for several years according to witness testimony.

RECOMMENDATIONS for Part II

- R1. Mattole Valley Charter School needs to display a prominent, single-click link to its School Accountability Report Card on the first page of its website, using the California Department of Education’s recommended format, and which clearly states “School Accountability Report Card (SARC)” in order to comply with the “spirit of the law” (Ed Code 33126(d). (F1, F2)
- R2. The Mattole Unified District needs to separate its demographic and financial data from those of the Mattole Valley Charter School on all publicly accessible websites, in order that the public may have a clear and transparent understanding of the charter school as differentiated from the traditional schools in the sponsoring district. (F2)
- R3. Two distinct positions need to be created with one clearly distinct person for each position: one person for the Superintendent of the Mattole Unified District and another person for the Director of the Mattole Valley Charter School in order to avoid any possibility of the appearance of a conflict of interest between the two institutions. (F3)
- R4. The Superintendent of the Mattole Unified School District or his designee needs to check the published California Department of Education’s data against the actual district data to make certain that both sets of data are accurate and consistent. (F4)
- R5. Mattole Valley Charter School needs to establish meaningful, easily navigated websites for each of its learning centers, including a separate School Accountability Report Card for each of the learning centers in order to assure the public that students in those “learning centers” are receiving sound education. (F5)
- R6. The Governing Boards of the Mattole Unified School District and the Mattole Valley Charter School are urged to give both the Superintendent of the District and the Director of the charter school an annual, formal, written evaluation. (F6)

REQUEST FOR RESPONSES for Part II

Pursuant to Penal Code section 933.05, the following responses are required:

- The Governing Boards of the Mattole Union School District and / or the Mattole Valley Charter School. (R1 through R6)

Reports issued by the Grand Jury do not identify individuals interviewed. Penal Code § 929 requires that reports of the Grand Jury not contain the name of any person or facts leading to the identity of any person who provides information to the Grand Jury.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alder Grove Charter School <http://www.aldergrovecharter.org/forms/SARC%20-%20Alder%20Grove%202011-12%20Proof.pdf>

California Education Code 33126 <http://law.onecle.com/california/education/33126.html>

California Department of Education – Data Quest <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>

California Department of Education - District Comparisons – income and expense per student
http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/App_Resx/EdDataClassic/fsTwoPanel.aspx?#!bottom=/_layouts/EdDataClassic/fiscal/MC-Results.asp

California Department of Education – Ed DATA <http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/welcome.asp>
Coastal Grove Charter School

http://coastalgrove.org/documents/SchoolAccountabilityReportCard_SARC_2011-12_CoastalGroveCharterSchool_02-15-13.pdf

Freshwater Charter Middle School http://internet.humboldt.k12.ca.us/freshwater_sd/charter.php
http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml

Humboldt County Charter Schools <http://www.humboldt.k12.ca.us/charter-schools.php>

Humboldt County Grand Jury Report of 2004-05, pp 17 ff
<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/grandjury/reports/2004-2005/2004-05finalreport.pdf>

Jacoby Creek Charter School
<http://www.humboldt.k12.ca.us/jacobycreekschool/SARCJacobyCreekCharter1011English.html>

Laurel Tree Charter School http://www.laureltreelc.org/files/SARC_2011-2012.htm

Mattole Valley Charter (#159) <http://www.sarconline.org/SarcPdfs/Temp/12753821230135.pdf>
Northcoast Preparatory and Performing Arts Charter
http://www.humboldt.k12.ca.us/blagoon_sd/blcssarc.htm (no SARC since 2007)

Pacific View Charter School <http://www.humboldt.k12.ca.us/pacificview>

Six Rivers Charter School <http://www.nohum.k12.ca.us/srcs/ebridge/>

Trillium Charter School <http://trilliumcharterschool.org>

Union Street Charter School <http://www.unionstreetcharter.org/>

APPENDIX

Note: Redwood Coast Montessori is not included on this chart, because it does not use the California assessment instruments to measure student achievement.

Table 1 – Annual Performance Index (API) Scores for 2007, 2010, and 2013	Yr 2007	Yr 2010	Yr 2013
Alder Grove Charter	661	694	698
Coastal Grove Charter	735	777	826
Freshwater Charter	851	869	855
Fuente Nueva Charter	891	823	836
Jacoby Creek Charter	900	909	921
Laurel Tree Charter	--	--	714
Mattole Valley Charter	651	724	740
Northcoast Prep and Performing Arts	--	881	899
Pacific View Chart	573	616	577
Redwood Prep	--	--	878
Six Rivers Charter	778	780	741
South Bay Charter	--	--	741
Trillium Charter	--	702	761
Union Street Charter	868	929	926
State API Scores	689	729	657

Table 2 – Average Teacher and Administrator Salary compared to State Averages				
School	This School's Average Teacher Salary	State Average Teacher Salary	This School's Average Administrator Salary	State Average Administrator Salary
Alder Grove	\$46,339	\$55,637	\$92,241	\$99,473
Coastal Grove	\$41,871	\$55,637	\$70,774	\$99,473
Freshwater Charter	\$55,555	\$55,637	\$18,400	\$99,473
Fuente Nueva	\$44,916	\$55,637	\$55,400	\$99,473
Jacoby	\$62,443	\$55,637	\$100,000	\$99,473

Creek Charter				
Laurel Tree	\$40,000	\$55,637	\$41,000	\$99,473
NCP and Performing Arts	\$43,500	\$55,637	\$77,000	\$99,473
Pacific View Charter	\$40,000	\$55,637	\$68,092	\$99,473
Redwood Prep Charter	\$38,999	\$55,637	\$50,000	\$99,473
Six Rivers Charter	\$55,720	\$55,637	\$85,248	\$99,473
South Bay Charter		\$55,637		\$99,473
Trillium Charter	\$30,000	\$55,637	\$21,000	\$99,473
Union Street Charter	\$55,582	\$55,637	\$104,460	\$99,473

Table 3 District Comparison Results for Enrollment, Expenditures / Expenses per Student⁹

District	Enrollment	Expenditure per Student	Revenue per Student
Arcata Elementary	932	\$9,707	\$10,090
Fortuna Elementary	1,288	\$8,654	\$9,077
Fortuna Union High	1,075	\$8,934	\$9,101
Freshwater Elementary	332	\$8,747	\$8,329
Jacoby Creek Elementary	427	\$7,469	\$7,438
Kneeland Elementary	32	\$12,855	\$12,263
Mattole Unified	794	\$24,093	\$27,341
Northern Humboldt Union High	1,722	\$11,074	\$10,495
South Bay Union Elementary	849	\$8,552	\$9,490
For all CA Districts	*	\$8,674	\$8,794

⁹ <http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/Pages/Home.aspx>, April 19, 2014 (select “Compare Districts” and follow website instructions).

Table 4¹⁰

District Finance Comparison Results, Fiscal Year 2011-12¹¹
 (10 of 10 matches listed, sorted by District Name)

<u>County Name</u>	<u>District Name</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>ADA</u>	Revenues per Student	Expenditure per Student by Type
				<u>Total Revenue</u>	<u>Subtotal Expenditures</u>
Humboldt	<u>Arcata Elementary</u>	<u>913</u>	<u>483</u>	<u>\$9,314</u>	<u>\$10,165</u>
Humboldt	<u>Fieldbrook Elemeary</u>	<u>128</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>\$8,163</u>	<u>\$7,376</u>
Humboldt	<u>Fortuna Union High</u>	<u>1,150</u>	<u>1,075</u>	<u>\$8,683</u>	<u>\$8,387</u>
Humboldt	<u>Freshwater Elementary</u>	<u>326</u>	<u>264</u>	<u>\$9,151</u>	<u>\$9,059</u>
Humboldt	<u>Humboldt County Office of Education</u>	<u>467</u>			
Humboldt	<u>Jacoby Creek Elementary</u>	<u>443</u>	<u>428</u>	<u>\$7,341</u>	<u>\$6,819</u>
Humboldt	<u>Mattole Unified</u>	<u>724</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>\$26,472</u>	<u>\$20,885</u>
Humboldt	<u>Northern Humboldt Union High</u>	<u>1,711</u>	<u>1,386</u>	<u>\$11,055</u>	<u>\$10,803</u>
Humboldt	<u>Pacific Union Elementary</u>	<u>513</u>	<u>459</u>	<u>\$7,646</u>	<u>\$7,002</u>
Humboldt	<u>South Bay Union Elementary</u>	<u>739</u>	<u>411</u>	<u>\$9,575</u>	<u>\$8,965</u>

¹⁰ http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/App_Resx/EdDataClassic/fsTwoPanel.aspx?#!bottom=/_layouts/EdDataClassic/finance/MC-FinanceResults.asp, December 12, 2013

¹¹ http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/App_Resx/EdDataClassic/fsTwoPanel.aspx?#!bottom=/_layouts/EdDataClassic/finance/MC-FinanceResults.asp, December 12, 2013

Table 5¹²

GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS (01-60)
Mattole Unified, 2011-12

Fund	Description	Adjusted July 1 Beginning Balance	Total Revenues	Total Expenditures	Other Financing Sources/Uses	June 30 Ending Balance
General Fund (01-08)						
01	General Fund	\$346,971	\$1,573,788	\$1,253,319	\$(236,626)	\$430,814
Subtotal, General Fund		\$346,971	\$1,573,788	\$1,253,319	\$(236,626)	\$430,814

Table 6¹²
District Comparison Results, Fiscal Year 2011-12
(10 of 23 matches listed, sorted by Enrollment)

<u>County Name</u>	<u>District Name</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Teachers</u>		
			<u>Number of Teachers</u>	<u>Full-Time Equivalents</u>	<u>Pupils per Teacher</u>
Humboldt	<u>Green Point Elementary</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>7.5</u>
Humboldt	<u>Maple Creek Elementary</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>12.7</u>
Humboldt	<u>Orick Elementary</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>8.9</u>
Humboldt	<u>Kneeland Elementary</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>9.4</u>
Humboldt	<u>Peninsula Union</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>10.8</u>
Humboldt	<u>Bridgeville Elementary</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>13.3</u>
Humboldt	<u>Big Lagoon Union Elementary</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>14.2</u>
Humboldt	<u>Garfield Elementary</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>16.1</u>
Humboldt	<u>Fieldbrook Elementary</u>	<u>128</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>7.0</u>	<u>18.3</u>
Humboldt	<u>Mattole Unified</u>	<u>724</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>50.6</u>	<u>14.3</u>
Averages	for all Districts	5,959	*	*	22.7

Note: * A statewide average for this value is not computed by the California Department of Education.

¹² http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/App_Resx/EdDataClassic/fsTwoPanel.aspx?#!bottom=/layouts/EdDataClassic/finance/AllFunds.asp?tab=1&reportNumber=4&level=06, December 13, 2013

TABLE 7

Special Revenue Funds (09-20)

09	Charter Schools Special Revenue Fund	\$1,019,901	\$4,653,889	\$4,256,213	\$222,426	\$1,640,003
13	Cafeteria Special Revenue Fund	19,591	49,004	64,229	14,200	18,567
17	Special Reserve Fund for Other Than Capital Outlay Projects	644,327	4,938	0	0	649,265
Subtotal, Special Revenue Funds		\$1,683,820	\$4,707,831	\$4,320,442	\$236,626	\$2,307,835
Permanent Funds (57-60)						