

Item VII. Recommendation / Public Hearing

—. Adopt the Superintendent’s Recommendation to Authorize Petition for *Los Angeles Leadership Academy (LALA), Grades 6-12*: Renewal on Appeal Petition with Attached Report

- a. Staff Findings on the Renewal Petition for *Los Angeles Leadership Academy (LALA), Grades 6-12*, Pursuant to Education Code Sections 47605, 47607 and 47607.2

The *Los Angeles Leadership Academy (LALA)* renewal petition on appeal is presented to the Los Angeles County Board of Education (County Board) pursuant to Education Code (EC) sections 47605, 47607, and 47607.2. The renewal process requires the authorizer to evaluate both the past performance of the charter school and whether the renewal petition meets the criteria for approval. LALA is currently authorized by the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD).

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

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

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

**EC 47607.2(b)** states, in relevant part:

- (1) for all charter schools for which paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of Section 47607 and subdivision (a) of this section do not

apply, the chartering authority shall consider the schoolwide performance and performance of all subgroups of pupils served by the charter school on the state indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5 and the performance of the charter school on the local indicators included in the evaluation rubrics adopted pursuant to Section 52064.5.

- (2) The chartering authority shall provide greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal.
- (3) In addition to the state and local indicators, the chartering authority shall consider clear and convincing evidence showing either of the following:
  - (A) The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year’s progress for each year in school.
  - (B) Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.
- (4) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) shall be demonstrated by verified data, as defined in subdivision (c).

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

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

- (1) When considering a petition for renewal, the county board of education shall consider the past performance of the school’s academics, finances, and operation in evaluating the likelihood of future success, along with future plans for improvement, if any.
- (2) The county board of education may deny a petition for renewal of a charter school only if [it] makes written factual findings, specific to the particular petition, setting forth facts to support one or more of the grounds for denial set forth, as applicable, in **EC 47605(c) or failure to meet one of the criteria set forth in EC section 47607**. (Emphasis added)

**EC 47607(a)(5)(b)** states that renewals of charters are governed by the standards and criteria in EC 47605, and shall include, but not be

limited to, a reasonably comprehensive description of any new requirement of charter schools enacted into law after the charter was originally granted or last renewed.

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

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

- (1) The charter school presents an unsound educational program.
- (2) The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program.
- (3) The petition does not contain the required number of signatures.  
*(Not applicable to a renewal petition)*
- (4) The petition does not contain an affirmation of specified assurances.
- (5) The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of 15 required elements of a charter.
- (6) The petition does not contain a declaration of whether or not the charter school shall be deemed the exclusive public employer of the employees of the charter school for purpose of Chapter 10.7.

The County Board shall evaluate the petition according to the criteria and procedures established in law and may only deny the petition if it provides written findings addressing the reasons for the denial.

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

The complete report on the written findings of fact is attached.

LACOE staff will present the report to the County Board.

LALA Charter School Petition for Renewal on Appeal			Meets Requirements*
<b>EC 47607(c), EC 47607.2(a) and EC 47607.2(b): Academic performance level</b>			
<b>Finding 1</b>	The charter school provided evidence it met one of the statutory criteria for renewal.		Yes
<b>EC 47605(c): Failure to meet the criteria under Findings 2-5 is grounds for denial.</b>			
<b>Finding 2</b>	Sound Educational Practice		Yes
<b>Finding 3</b>	Ability to Successfully Implement Intended Program		Yes
<b>Finding 4</b>	Affirmation of Specified Conditions		Yes
<b>Finding 5:</b> The charter petition contains a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements.	1	Description of Educational Program	Yes*
	2	Measurable Pupil Outcomes	Yes*
	3	Method for Measuring Pupil Progress	Yes*
	4	Governance Structure	Yes
	5	Employee Qualifications	Yes*
	6	Health and Safety Procedures	Yes
	7	Racial and Ethnic Balance	Yes
	8	Admission Requirements	Yes
	9	Annual Independent Financial Audits	Yes*
	10	Suspension and Expulsion Procedures	Yes*
	11	Retirement Coverage	Yes
	12	Public School Attendance Alternatives	Yes
	13	Post-employment Rights of Employees	Yes
	14	Dispute Resolution Procedures	Yes*
	15	Closure Procedures	Yes*
<b>Finding 6:</b>	Serving All Students Without Fiscal or Governance Concerns		Yes
<b>Finding 7:</b> The charter petition meets the additional statutory requirements EC 47605 (d), (f) – (i), (l) – (n)	(d)	Standards, Assessments and Parent Consultation	Qualifies
	(f)	Employment is Voluntary	Not Applicable
	(g)	Pupil Attendance is Voluntary	Not Applicable
	(h)	Effect on Authorizer and Financial Projections Facilities, Administrative Services, Civil Liability and Financial Statements, Nonprofit Board Member Information	Qualifies
	(i)	Targets Academically Low Achieving Pupils**	Qualifies
	(l)	Teacher Credentialing	Qualifies
	(m)	Transmission of Audit Report	Qualifies
	(n)	Parent Involvement is Voluntary	Qualifies
<p><i>*Elements marked as meeting requirements may need further explanation, adjustment or technical changes; however, they are reasonably comprehensive and/or substantively comply with regulatory guidance and the LACOE standard of review described in Board Policy and the Superintendent’s Administrative Regulations.</i></p> <p><i>**Charters created to target academically low achieving pupils are given a priority for authorization.</i></p> <p><i>^There are indicators of potential civil liability effects upon the authorizer.</i></p>			

b. The Superintendent recommends that the Los Angeles County Board of Education (County Board) adopt the written findings of fact stated below and take action to approve the renewal of *Los Angeles Leadership Academy, Grades 6-12*, for a term of five years commencing July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2030, subject to meeting the following conditions by the specified dates:

1. **By June 1, 2025**, the school shall submit to the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) the signed Monitoring and Oversight Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) following approval by the school’s governing board.

2. **By July 1, 2025**, the school shall submit to LACOE a revised charter petition that addresses deficiencies and/or includes necessary technical adjustments identified in the LACOE report on the findings of fact to the County Board dated **April 15, 2025**. Changes include but not limited to:

Element 1 (Description of Educational Programs): Changes necessary to include further details on how IEP meetings and reclassification is handled for dually designated students as specified in the findings of fact.

Element 2 (Measurable Pupil Outcomes): Changes to address achievement gaps and clarifying language as specified in the findings of fact.

Element 3 (Method for Measuring Pupil Progress): Changes to more fully describe how data is to be collected, analyzed and used to trigger interventions that improve student outcomes as specified in the findings of fact.

Element 5 (Employee Qualifications): Changes that describe the special education staff and their qualifications as specified in the findings of fact.

Element 9 (Annual Independent Financial Audits): Changes to the due dates for fiscal reports as specified in the findings of fact.

Element 10 (Suspension and Expulsion Procedures): Changes to reflect recent laws regarding In-School Suspension and clarification on expulsion appeals as specified in the findings of fact.

Element 14 (Dispute Resolution Procedures): Changes to reflect the process in the LACOE Administrative Regulations as specified in the findings of fact.

Element 15 (Closure Procedures): Changes regarding Social Security and special education records as specified in the findings of fact.

The County Superintendent of Schools shall determine whether the changes are sufficient; if they are not, the school shall complete additional changes to be sufficient by **August 1, 2025**.

3. **By July 1, 2025, LALA shall submit to LACOE the following:**
  - a. A revised 2025-26 budget and multi-year projections for 2026-27 and 2027-28 based on reasonable assumptions, in line with the school’s enrollment trend.
    - i. A 2025-26 Position Control Budget, including salaries and benefits to accompany the budget
    - ii. A contingency plan with implementable actions to address any potential revenue and cash shortfalls to sustain operations and maintain fiscal viability.
  - b. A 2025-26 Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) approved by the charter school’s governing board.
  - c. LALA’s checking account is currently combined with both the CMO and the Los Angeles Leadership Primary Academy’s account under one account.
    - i. LALA is required to establish and maintain separate bank account(s) for all its financial transactions.
  - d. Review, update, and submit a revised board-approved General Accounting Policies and Procedures Manual (Fiscal Policy) to address the following deficiencies.
    - i. The current Fiscal Policy (page 4) states “Board President are authorized to make purchases on behalf of LALA”. Remove the authority that grants the Board President the ability to make purchases on behalf of the organization.
    - ii. The Fiscal Policy permits credit card limits of \$50,000 for the Chief Operations Officer (currently authorized to make purchases up to \$24,999.99) and \$25,000 for the Chief Executive Officer/Superintendent. Update the Fiscal Policy, including any restrictions on credit card purchases and the credit limits and/or transaction limits that the governing board determined to be reasonable for the designated authorized credit card users.
    - iii. LALA has indicated its Charter Management Organization (CMO) fees are charged based on each charter school’s ADA to cover the CMO’s operating costs. However, the Fiscal Policy does not describe the manner and method in which the Charter

Management Organization (CMO) fees are charged to the charter schools under its management. Update the Fiscal Policy to describe the manner and method for charging CMO fees and incorporate the CMO fee cap below.

- e. During the term of the charter, the CMO fee shall not exceed 15 percent of the school's revenue, defined as the amount received in the current fiscal year from the Local Control Funding Formula, as calculated pursuant to Education Code Section 42238.02 and implemented by Education Code Section 42238.03.
  - i. The LALA budgeted and projected CMO fees for 2025-26 through 2027-28 are below 10% of projected LCFF funding.
  - ii. The CMO fee allocation shall be the lesser of (5) or 5(a) during the charter's authorization.
  - iii. Annual documentation submitted for the CMO fee must include:
    - 1. The LALA Home Office Budget, including the position control budget.
    - 2. An Excel File with calculations for the CMO fee allocation and any written CMO plan or agreement.
    - 3. Details for total Home Office Expenditure Allocation (CMO fees) distributed across all LALA charter schools.
- f. By September 30, 2025, the School will receive an invoice for an amount equivalent to two months of estimated STRS/PERS contributions. These funds will be retained by LACOE to cover STRS/PERS payments if the charter is unable to fulfill its contribution obligations. At the end of each fiscal year, LACOE will reconcile the actual contributions and issue an invoice for any difference needed to maintain the equivalent of two months of contributions.
- g. By July 31, 2025, LALA must provide all documents and transaction records related to the Florence Crittenton Center (FCC) concerning Note 6 in the Financial Audits since LALA's assumption of the original agreement.

If any part or sub-part of conditions one (1) through three (3) is not met by the date specified, the Superintendent will notify the County Board at a regularly scheduled meeting. Failure to meet any of the

conditions by the specified timeline is grounds for terminating authorization.

Terminating authorization of the charter is considered a denial.

The complete Report of the Findings of Fact on the renewal petition for *Los Angeles Leadership Academy, Grades 6-12*, is attached.

# Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

Los Angeles County Office of Education  
Charter School Office  
Date: April 15, 2025

Staff Findings on the *Los Angeles Leadership Academy Charter School*, Grades 6-12  
Appeal of a Renewal Petition Denied by Los Angeles Unified School District Board of Education

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The petition for the *Los Angeles Leadership Academy (LALA)* is to renew the charter for a grades 6-12 school. The current enrollment of the school is approximately 324 students. The school is located at both 234 East Avenue 33, Los Angeles, CA 90031-1937 and 2670 Griffin Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90031-2311, both private facilities within the geographic boundary of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD).

LALA was originally authorized by LAUSD on March 12, 2002 and opened on September 3, 2002. The school is currently in their fourth charter term that is set to expire on June 30, 2025. Their petition to renew was denied by LAUSD on January 14, 2025 and submitted as an appeal to the LA County Board of Education on January 31, 2025.

LALA is one of two schools currently operated by the Los Angeles Leadership Academy, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation. This charter management organization (CMO) has two schools in Los Angeles County. The other school is the Los Angeles Leadership Primary Academy (LALPA), a K-5 school currently authorized by LAUSD and that shares a building with the 6-8 grade students of LALA.

**Mission and Vision:** The petition states the charter school’s mission is to prepare “urban students to succeed in secondary school, college or on chosen career paths, to live fulfilling, self-directed lives, and to be effective leaders in creating a just, democratic, and humane world.”

The school’s vision is “to create a seamless educational transition for TK-12 students in a school system that is focused on a rigorous, academic and social justice embedded curriculum.”

**Students Served by the School:** LALA serves students in grades 6-12, and the petition states enrollment is drawn mainly from Lincoln Heights and its neighboring communities.

Tables 1 and 2 below show the 2023-24 enrollment at LALA was approximately 349 students, with the following demographics: 94.6% Hispanic or Latino; 0% African American (AA) or Black; 0% Two or More Races; and 1.4% White; 94% Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students (SED); 12.9% Students with Disabilities (SWD); 22.1% English Learners (ELs); 5.4% Homeless Youth (HY) and 0.3% Foster Youth (FY).

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

**Table 1: LALA 2023-2024 Enrollment by Ethnicity**

Student Groups	Number Enrolled	Percent of Total Enrollment
All	349	100%
AA/Black	0	0
American Indian	2	0.6
Asian	4	1.1
Hispanic	330	94.6
Not Reported	8	2.3
Two or more	0	0
White	5	1.4

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp> Retrieved 2-10-25

**Table 2: LALA 2023-2024 Enrollment by Student Group**

Student Groups	Number Enrolled	Percent of Total Enrollment
EL	77	22.1
Foster	1	0.3
Homeless	19	5.4
LTEs	32	9.2
SED	328	94
SWD	45	12.9

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp> Retrieved 2-10-25

**Table 3: LALA Enrollment by Year and Grade**

Year	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	Total
2017-18	76	103	87	76	68	47	48	505
2018-19	84	84	106	62	60	64	44	504
2019-20	75	83	93	93	54	55	42	495
2020-21	52	80	84	92	64	35	32	439
2021-22	76	62	78	46	47	60	49	418
2022-23	52	72	66	40	47	49	61	387
2023-24	60	52	67	39	40	44	47	349

Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp> Retrieved 2-10-25

**Reason for Denial by the Local District**

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

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

The LAUSD Board found that LALA “demonstrated performance levels for All Students, and for all numerically significant student groups that are lower than the state average in 2022, 2023, and 2024 for ELA and Math; and in 2023 and 2024 for CCI; and in 2024 for ELPI.”

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

The LAUSD Board made the following written factual findings through its action on January 14, 2025:

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

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

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

The LAUSD Board found that LALA:

- Did not yield academic outcomes at a level equal to or higher than the state averages for All Students, and numerically significant student groups
- Did not have clear and convincing verified data results
- Did not meet three (3) of the four (4) benchmarks in the majority of years
- Has exhibited steadily declining enrollment

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

### **Response from the Petitioner**

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

### **Appeal to the Los Angeles County Board of Education**

LALA submitted a renewal petition to the Los Angeles County Board of Education (County Board) on January 31, 2025. The County Board held a Public Hearing to determine support for the petition on March 4, 2025. At the Public Hearing, six people spoke in support of the school: one current student; one student alumni; one parent; a teacher at the school; the principal of the school; and the Lead Petitioner. One spoke in opposition to the school: a member of the LAUSD Charter Schools Division.

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION REVIEW PROCESS

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

LACOE has adopted the petition review criteria established in 5 *CCR* section 11967.5.1(a-g) except where LACOE determined that the regulations provide insufficient direction or where they are not applicable because the structure or responsibility of the County Board and LACOE differ from those of the State Board of Education (SBE) and the California Department of Education (CDE). In these

---

<sup>1</sup> Words in italics indicate a direct reference to the language in these documents.

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

instances, LACOE developed its own local review criteria or added criteria to those developed by CDE to reflect the needs of the County Board as the authorizer and LACOE as the monitoring and oversight agency. These local criteria do not conflict with statute.

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

### CHARTER RENEWAL ELIGIBILITY

#### Statutory Framework and Criteria for Renewal<sup>2</sup>

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

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

#### LALA is designated as Middle Performing under *EC 47607.2(b)* Evaluation Purposes<sup>3</sup>

##### Middle Performing *EC 47607.2(b)*

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

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

<sup>2</sup> The full renewal criteria can be found in Appendix B.

<sup>3</sup> Source: CDE Charter Schools Performance Category Data Files  
<https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/performcategorydf.asp> Retrieved 11-16-24

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

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

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

AND

- (2) Closure is in the best interest of the pupils;

AND

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

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

The review team established that LALA has met the criteria for renewal. While the school has not outperformed all state academic indicators, student growth as evidenced by verified data has shown clear and convincing evidence that the students have grown academically by at least a year for a year of instruction. Additionally, the charter school has presented a sound educational program, they are likely to successfully implement the educational program, the petition contains the required affirmations in Ed Code 47605(e), and there is no evidence of fiscal or governance factors or that they are not serving all pupils. The petition was found to contain a reasonably comprehensive description of all elements, and the review team has concluded that the completion of technical adjustments will make the petition fully compliant.

### LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION FINDINGS OF FACT

**Finding 1: The charter school's academic performance criteria specified in EC section 47607(b) has resulted in it receiving a middle-performing classification.**

**LALA was assigned a Middle-performing classification by the CDE. Verified data were utilized in this renewal consideration [EC 47607.2(c)]. The charter school has met the renewal criteria specified in EC 47607.2(b).**

In reviewing the schoolwide performance and performance of all numerically significant student groups on the California School Dashboard and the verified data provided by the charter school, LALA has provided clear and convincing evidence that the school is making one year's progress through their NWEA MAP data as analyzed below on page 7.

As a grades 6-12 charter school, the California School Dashboard for LALA consists of the following indicators: academic performance on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress System (CAASPP) in English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics (Math); English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI); College/Career Indicator (CCI); Chronic Absenteeism Indicator; Graduation Rate Indicator; Suspension Rate Indicator; and Local Indicators.

LALA uses NWEA assessments as its verified data source for grades 6-12 to show one year's progress. Extensive data tables for the California School Dashboard indicators and NWEA verifiable data are available in Appendix C.

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

**Academic Performance Indicators on the California School Dashboard Compared to State**

Tables 4 and 5 below show that LALA academic performance in ELA and Math has trailed the state averages in Distance from Standard (DFS) for the past three years.

**Table 4: LALA ELA Distance From Standard Compared to the State**

	2022	2023	2024
Indicator	ELA		
Status Metric	Distance from Standard		
All Students	Lower	Lower	Lower
Numerically Significant Student Groups			
Hispanic or Latino	Lower	Lower	Lower
English Learners	Lower	Lower	Lower
LTEs			Higher
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Lower	Lower	Lower
Students with Disabilities	Lower	Lower	Lower
Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or above the state's DFS?	NO	NO	NO
Comprehensive ELA Dashboard data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C (Tables B, C, D)			

**Table 5: LALA Math Distance From Standard Compared to the State**

	2022	2023	2024
Indicator	Math		
Status Metric	Distance from Standard		
All Students	Lower	Lower	Lower
Numerically Significant Student Groups			
Hispanic or Latino	Lower	Lower	Lower
English Learners	Lower	Lower	Lower
Homeless Youth			Lower
LTEs			Higher
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Lower	Lower	Lower
Students with Disabilities	Lower	Lower	Lower
Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or above the state's DFS?	NO	NO	NO
Comprehensive Math Dashboard data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C (Tables E, F, G)			

As the school did not show clear and convincing evidence of academic achievement through the California Dashboard, the school's verified data, NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP), was reviewed. To demonstrate one year's progress, each student group's Cognitive Growth Index (CGI) must be greater than or equal to -0.2. The NWEA MAP data is disaggregated by grade level for all

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

students tested and numerically significant student groups as defined by the publisher (student groups with 10 or more students) for Reading, Language Usage, and Math.

In addition to reviewing CGI data, student participation rates on benchmark assessments were considered. The LALA enrollment for September was used to determine participation rate for the Fall test and the May enrollment was used to determine the Spring test participation rate. The participation rates of students taking NWEA MAP assessments for the last three years were all found to fall within an acceptable range and it was found that higher percentages of students in general were tested in the more recent years, and that the more recent years showed higher amounts of student growth.

Table 6 below shows a summary of the three prior years for Reading, Language Usage and Math. It shows that LALA demonstrated sufficient student growth for a majority of tested subjects for a majority of tested years. The Review Team considered the verified data results as clear and convincing evidence that students were sufficiently achieving at least one year of academic growth per year of instruction. Detailed data is shown in Appendix C. (Tables U, V, W, X, Y)

Table Legend For NWEA MAP Tables			
Green cell indicates a majority of grade levels for the student group has met the minimum requirement for one year's growth, CGI $\geq$ - 0.2			
Red cell indicates a majority of grade levels for the student group has not met the minimum requirement for one year's growth, CGI $<$ - 0.2			
Gray cell indicates there were insufficient amounts of data for most grade levels, making the group insufficiently comparable to other groups			
Data reflects grade levels with ten or more students with data in that student group.			

**Table 6: LALA NWEA MAP Reading, Language and Math Student Groups Meeting CGI**

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
	NWEA MAP Reading			NWEA MAP Language Usage			NWEA MAP Math		
	Grade Levels Meeting CGI			Grade Levels Meeting CGI			Grade Levels Meeting CGI		
All Students	0 of 6	2 of 7	5 of 7	2 of 5	4 of 6	7 of 7	5 of 6	4 of 7	7 of 7
Hispanic or Latino	0 of 6	2 of 7	5 of 7	3 of 5	4 of 6	4 of 6	5 of 6	5 of 7	7 of 7
English Learners	1 of 2**	1 of 2**	3 of 3**	1 of 2**	1 of 2**	2 of 3**	2 of 2**	1 of 2**	3 of 3**
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	1 of 6	5 of 7	5 of 7	3 of 5	4 of 6	4 of 6	5 of 6	4 of 7	7 of 7
Students with Disabilities	*	1 of 2**	*	*	1 of 2**	1 of 1**	*	2 of 3**	*
Participation Rate Met	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or above the publisher's metric?									
All Students	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Student Groups	No (0 of 2)	No (1 of 2)	Yes (2 of 2)	Yes (2 of 2)	No (2 of 2)	Yes (2 of 2)	Yes (2 of 2)	Yes (2 of 2)	Yes (2 of 2)
Both	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

The remaining Academic Indicators on the Dashboard are the CCI and the ELPI. While CCI percentages are lower than the state averages in the two years for which we have data, LALA has shown that in both years and for all student groups, the percentage of students prepared for college and career has been growing and the gap between LALA and the state has been decreasing. Table 7 below shows a summary of the data and detailed data is available in Appendix C (Tables I, J)

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

**Table 7: LALA CCI Percent Compared to the State**

	2022	2023	2024
Indicator	College and Career Indicator (CCI)		
Status Metric	Percent Prepared		
All Students	Not Reported in 2022	Lower	Lower
Numerically Significant Student Groups			
Hispanic or Latino		Lower	Lower
English Learners			Higher
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged		Lower	Lower
Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or above the state average?		NO (0 of 2)	NO (0 of 2)
Comprehensive CCI data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C (Tables I, J)			

For the ELPI, Table 8 below shows that LALA has outperformed the state in two of the prior three years. A significant drop was seen in the most recent year and the school administration has stated that a number of interventions are currently being deployed to address the single year drop.

**Table 8: LALA ELPI Percent Compared to the State**

	2022	2023	2024
Indicator	English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)		
Status Metric	Percent Making Progress		
English Learners	Higher	Higher	Lower
Comprehensive ELPI data including state comparison is available in Appendix C (Table H)			

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

Other Dashboard indicators, which are to be given lesser weight in the determination of renewal, are Graduation Rate, Chronic Absenteeism Rate, Suspension Rate and Local Indicators.

Table 9 below shows that LALA has outperformed the state in Graduation Rate for two of the prior three years.

**Table 9: LALA Graduation Rate Percent Compared to the State**

	2022	2023	2024
Indicator	Graduation Rate		
Status Metric	Percent Graduated		
All Students	Lower	Higher	Higher
Numerically Significant Student Groups			
Hispanic or Latino	Lower	Higher	Higher
English Learners	Lower	Higher	Higher
LTELs			Higher
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Lower	Higher	Higher
Students with Disabilities	Lower		
Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or above the state average?	NO (0 of 2)	YES (2 of 2)	YES (2 of 2)
Comprehensive Graduation data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C (Tables K, L, M)			

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

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

Table 10 below shows that for chronic absenteeism, LALA has not outperformed the state for all students or for a majority of student groups in the three prior years, but in the most recent year, the data for all numerically significant student groups were lower than the state averages for those groups.

**Table 10: LALA Chronic Absenteeism Percent Compared to the State**

	2022	2023	2024
Indicator	Chronic Absenteeism		
Status Metric	Percent Chronically Absent		
All Students	Higher	Higher	Higher
Numerically Significant Student Groups			
Hispanic or Latino	Higher	Higher	Lower
English Learners	Higher	Higher	Lower
Homeless Youth			Higher
LTEs			Lower
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Higher	Higher	Lower
Students with Disabilities	Higher	Lower	Lower
Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or below the state average?	NO (0 of 4)	NO (0 of 3)	NO (3 of 3)
Comprehensive Chronic Absenteeism data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C (Tables N, O, P)			

Table 11 below shows that LALA outperformed the state in the area of suspension rate in two out of three prior years.

**Table 11: LALA Suspension Rate Percent Compared to the State**

	2022	2023	2024
Indicator	Suspension Rate		
Status Metric	Percent of Students Suspended at Least One Day		
All Students	Higher	Lower	Lower
Numerically Significant Student Groups			
Hispanic or Latino	Higher	Lower	Lower
English Learners	Higher	Lower	Lower
Homeless Youth			Lower
LTEs			Lower
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Lower	Lower	Lower
Students with Disabilities	Higher	Lower	Lower
Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or below the state average?	NO	YES	YES
Comprehensive Suspension data including student groups and state comparison is available in Appendix C (Tables Q, R, S)			

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

Table 12 below shows that LALA met all Dashboard local indicators for the last three years.

**Table 12: LALA Local Indicators**

	2022	2023	2024
<b>Local Indicators</b>			
Basics: teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilities	Standard Met	Standard Met	Standard Met
Implementation of Academic Standards	Standard Met	Standard Met	Standard Met
Parent & Family Engagement	Standard Met	Standard Met	Standard Met
Local Climate Survey	Standard Met	Standard Met	Standard Met
Access to a Broad Course of Study	Standard Met	Standard Met	Standard Met

Source: <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/>

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

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

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

5 CCR 11967.5.1(c) provides four indicators for the Board to consider *in determining whether charter petitioners are “demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program.”* The review team determined the petitioners are likely to successfully implement the charter as long as the school:

- (1) Meets its enrollment projections and
- (2) Meets its Average Daily Attendance (ADA) projections.

The Review Team has found that:

1. The petitioners have not had a past history of involvement in charter schools or other education agencies (public or private), that LACOE regards as unsuccessful.
2. The petitioners are familiar with the content of the petition or the requirements of law that would apply to the proposed charter school.
3. The petitioners do not lack the necessary background in areas critical to the charter school’s success.
4. The petitioners have, however, presented an unrealistic financial and operational plan for the proposed charter school.

The following fiscal analysis was used in making this Finding and is provided for the Board’s consideration.

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

**Finance and Operations**

The Los Angeles Leadership Academy (Academy) is a Charter Management Organization (CMO) that operates two charter schools – the Los Angeles Leadership Academy (LALA) and the Los Angeles Leadership Primary Academy (LALPA). This section of the report summarizes the operational results of the Academy over the past five fiscal years from 2019-20 through 2023-24, and separately that of LALA.

Table 13 below illustrates the Academy’s financial performance and financial data, including its Operating Results, Net Cash Flow, Cash Balance, Liabilities, Net Assets, and Annual Report average daily attendance (ADA) for the past five fiscal years.

**Table 13**

Fiscal Year	Operating Results	Net Cash Flow	Cash Balance as of June 30	Liabilities as of June 30	Net Assets as of June 30	Annual Report ADA
2019-20	(\$283,979)	\$1,915,947	\$5,291,511	\$3,566,250	\$9,613,068	760.70
2020-21	\$2,274,211	(\$398,839)	\$4,892,672	\$2,570,577	\$11,887,279	762.00
2021-22	(\$792,492)	(\$1,303,504)	\$3,589,168	\$2,580,605	\$11,094,787	654.41
2022-23	(\$83,351)	\$1,853,144	\$5,442,312	\$9,428,791	\$11,011,436	601.12
2023-24	(\$314,331)	(\$1,685,160)	\$5,302,693	\$7,980,697	\$10,697,105	559.08

Source: Los Angeles Leadership Academy’s Consolidated Annual Audit Reports.

As reflected in Table 13, the Academy incurred operating deficits in the past three fiscal years and four out of five fiscal years. The primary cause of the deficits was the loss of revenues due to declining enrollment. Both LALA and LALPA experienced a combined decline of 201.62 ADA or 26.5 percent over the past five years, from 760.70 ADA in 2019-20 to 559.08 ADA in 2023-24.

Table 14 below highlights separately the Academy’s financial performance of LALA, LALPA, and the CMO over the past five fiscal years from 2019-20 through 2023-24. LALA’s financial performance is discussed below in further detail.

**Table 14**

Fiscal Year	Operating Results	Net Cash Flow	Cash Balance as of June 30	Liabilities as of June 30	Net Assets as of June 30	Annual Report ADA
<b>LALA</b>						
2019-20	(\$186,268)	\$900,899	\$3,193,188	\$2,548,456	\$5,504,051	454.50
2020-21	\$1,344,963	(\$284,247)	\$2,908,941	\$1,898,257	\$6,849,014	454.50
2021-22	(\$894,110)	(\$959,554)	\$1,949,387	\$1,955,646	\$5,954,904	370.14
2022-23	(\$125,085)	\$857,798	\$2,807,185	\$6,450,898	\$5,829,819	342.15
2023-24	(\$482,588)	(\$1,344,688)	\$1,462,497	\$5,705,839	\$5,347,231	318.40
<b>LALPA</b>						
2019-20	(\$97,711)	\$1,030,717	\$2,026,736	\$960,873	\$4,089,022	306.20
2020-21	\$939,378	(\$139,426)	\$1,887,310	\$585,764	\$5,028,400	307.50
2021-22	\$101,618	(\$363,465)	\$1,523,845	\$518,888	\$5,130,018	284.27
2022-23	\$41,734	\$991,741	\$2,515,586	\$2,868,217	\$5,171,752	258.97
2023-24	\$145,577	(\$220,931)	\$2,294,655	\$2,192,899	\$5,317,329	240.68
<b>CMO</b>						
2019-20	\$0.00	(\$15,669)	\$71,587	\$56,921	\$19,995	n/a
2020-21	(\$10,130)	\$24,834	\$96,421	\$86,556	\$9,865	n/a
2021-22	\$0.00	\$19,515	\$115,936	\$106,071	\$9,865	n/a
2022-23	\$0.00	\$3,605	\$119,541	\$109,676	\$9,865	n/a
2023-24	\$22,680	(\$119,541)	\$1,545,541	\$81,959	\$32,545	n/a

Source: Los Angeles Leadership Academy’s Consolidated Annual Audit Reports.

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

As reflected in Table 14, LALA incurred operating deficits in the past three fiscal years and four out of five fiscal years. These deficits were (\$186,268) in 2019-20, (\$894,110) in 2021-22, (\$125,085) in 2022-23 and (\$482,588) in 2023-24. LALA also had negative net cash flows in three of those years; notably, a negative net cash flow of (\$1,344,688) in 2023-24. As discussed previously, the primary cause of deficit spending was loss of revenues due to declining enrollment and ADA.

**Annual Audit Reports for the Past Five Fiscal Years**

Table 15 below summarizes the annual audit results of the Academy, whereby the auditor expressed unmodified opinions, reflecting that the financial statements fairly represent the Academy's financial position in all material respects, and there were no audit findings in fiscal year 2019-20 through 2023-24.

**Table 15**

<b>Summary of Annual Audit Reports of the Academy</b>					
<b>Entity</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Auditing Firm</b>	<b>Opinion</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Net Assets as of June 30</b>
Los Angeles Leadership Academy Charter Schools	2019-20	CliftonLarsonAllen LLP	Unmodified Opinion	None	\$9,613,068
Los Angeles Leadership Academy Charter Schools	2020-21	CliftonLarsonAllen LLP	Unmodified Opinion	None	\$11,887,279
Los Angeles Leadership Academy Charter Schools	2021-22	CliftonLarsonAllen LLP	Unmodified Opinion	None	\$11,094,787
Los Angeles Leadership Academy Charter Schools	2022-23	CliftonLarsonAllen LLP	Unmodified Opinion	None	\$11,011,436
Los Angeles Leadership Academy Charter Schools	2023-24	CliftonLarsonAllen LLP	Unmodified Opinion	None	\$10,697,105

Source: Los Angeles Leadership Academy's Consolidated Annual Audit Reports.

As of June 30, 2024, the Academy reported Net Assets of \$10,697,105, of which LALA's Net Assets were \$5,347,231.

Below, the most recent audit describes the status of the lease arrangement between LALA and FCC.

<b>CliftonLarsonAllen LLP</b>
<b>Note 6</b>
<b>Notes to Financial Statements June 30, 2024</b>
In January 2008, the California School Finance Authority (CSFA) granted the Academy \$1,047,000 in order to purchase property from the Florence Crittendon Center (FCC). The purchase price was \$2,096,000, the sum of the CSFA grant and the existing mortgage held by the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA). As part of the purchase, the Academy assumed the CRA mortgage for \$1,049,000.
In June 2009, the Academy transferred title to this property back to FCC. In exchange, the Academy received an unsecured purchase money note in the amount of \$3,000,000. The note has a term of 10 years and bears an annual interest rate of 5%, with principal and interest payable at maturity. As part of the transfer, FCC assumed the CRA mortgage for \$1,049,000. Due to the continuing involvement in this sale-leaseback, the sale was recorded using the deposit method. Under the deposit method of accounting for the sale-leaseback, the Academy continues to report in its financial statements as the net property and note payable from the CRA mortgage loan until the CRA loan is paid and the full amount of the purchase money note has been received.

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

The Academy entered into a 120-month operating lease agreement commencing June 5, 2009 with FCC. During the year ended June 30, 2019, the Academy exercised an option to extend the lease for ten additional years through June 2029.

Source: LALA Consolidated Annual Independent Audit Reports (FY 2019-20 thru FY 2023-24)

**Summary of LALA’s 2024-25 Budget and Multiyear Projections**

The data contained in Table 16 is based on LALA’s 2024-25 Budget and Multi-Year Projections.

**Table 16**

<b>Summary of LALA’s 2024-25 Budget and Multi-Year Projections</b>				
<b>Projections</b>	<b>2024-25 Budget</b>	<b>2025-26</b>	<b>2026-27</b>	<b>2027-28</b>
Enrollment	370	490	490	490
ADA	355.20	470.40	470.40	470.40
Total Revenues	\$8,052,763	\$10,336,654	\$10,483,606	\$10,682,088
Total Expenses	\$8,020,502	\$8,558,123	\$8,605,428	\$8,807,418
Net Income	\$32,261	\$1,778,531	\$1,878,178	\$1,874,670
Ending Net Assets	\$5,379,492	\$7,158,023	\$ 9,036,200	\$10,910,870
Ending Cash Balance	\$2,363,641	\$ 3,820,114	\$6,067,008	\$7,996,595

Source: Los Angeles Leadership Academy Renewal submission

**Declining Enrollment Trends**

As illustrated in Tables 16 and 17, LALA is projecting an enrollment of 490 students and ADA of 470.40 for 2025-26 and the subsequent two fiscal years.

**Table 17**

<b>School Year</b>	<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>ADA</b>	<b>Change in ADA</b>	<b>% Change from Prior Year</b>
2019-20	495	454.50		
2020-21	439	*454.50	-	0.0%
2021-22	418	370.14	(84.36)	(18.6%)
2022-23	387	342.15	(27.99)	(7.6%)
2023-24	349	318.40	(23.75)	(6.9%)
2024-25 (Certified P-1)	322	304.40	(14.0)	(4.4%)
<b>2025-26 (Projected)</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>470.40</b>	<b>+166.00</b>	<b>+54.5%</b>
2026-27 (Projected)	490	470.40	0.00	0.0%
2027-28 (Projected)	490	470.40	0.00	0.0%

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

LALA's ADA declined from 454.50 ADA to 318.40 ADA from 2019-20 to 2023-24, respectively. This represents a decline of 136.10 ADA or 29.9 percent over the past five years. LALA's enrollment declined from 495 to 349, a decline of 146 students, or 29.5 percent, over the same period. In addition, LALA's most recent certified enrollment and ADA are 322 and 304.40, respectively, based on 2024-25 First Principal (P-1) Apportionment. This represents an additional decline of 14.00 ADA or 4.4 percent from the prior fiscal year.

Given LALA's enrollment and ADA trends over the past five years, along with recent data, its financial projections appear highly optimistic. Therefore, LALA's 2025-26 budget and multiyear projections are found to be unrealistic.

At the capacity interview, LALA's leadership indicated that the projections were based on their target goals in order to serve their community and due to improved recruitment outreach. LALA leadership committed to making necessary budget revisions and adjustments to ensure fiscal sustainability.

A cursory review of LALA's 2024-25 Second Interim Report indicates that LALA has updated its financial projections, including adjustments for revenues and expenses due to the ADA shortfall in 2024-25. The Second Interim Report projects an operating loss of (\$333,148) compared to the Adopted Budget surplus of \$32,261, an Unrestricted Net Position of \$1,557,267, and a Reserve for Economic Uncertainties (REU) of 21.0 percent for 2024-25.

To remain fiscally viable, LALA's Budget and Multi-Year Projections are contingent upon the school achieving its enrollment and average daily attendance (ADA) projections. The trend of declining enrollment and deficit spending indicates LALA has a structural deficit and is depleting one-time resources, which is unsustainable should it continue. Therefore, if approved, it will be necessary for LALA to:

- (1) Revise its projections for the 2025-26 budget and the subsequent two fiscal years and
- (2) Develop a contingency plan with implementable actions to address any potential revenue and cash shortfalls in order to sustain operations and maintain fiscal viability.

When asked about past deficit spending, the LALA board members stated that they had decided to use some of their healthy reserves in order to maintain programs that no longer were supported through grant funding but that they would continue to closely monitor spending.

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

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

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

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

The petition requires additional language describing the situations where a student is dually identified as both an EL and a SWD. This includes what additional IEP team members must be present and how reclassification is handled if an EL student takes the alternate ELPAC.

The petition should explicitly include Ethnic Studies as a graduation requirement in accordance with current law.

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

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

The petition has the same annual goals for different student groups, despite the groups having different baselines and larger gaps with the state averages.

Goals should be more aligned to how data is collected and displayed according to the state priorities. Petition mixes meet/exceed standards data with DFS data and does not use current teacher assignment metrics.

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

The petition does not fully describe how data is to be collected, analyzed and used to trigger interventions that improve student outcomes.

**Element 4: Governance Structure.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

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

The petition does not sufficiently address the provision of special education staff and their qualifications.

**Element 6: Health and Safety Procedures.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

**Element 7: Means to Achieve a Reflective Racial, Ethnic Balance, Special Education and English Learners.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

Demographic comparisons to both the community and the local district are shown in tables 18 and 19 below. LALA trails the local community in Asian students and is over representative in Hispanic/Latino students. LALA is comparable to LAUSD in students with disabilities and English learners and has a larger percentage of students redesignated as English proficient.

**Table 18: Racial and Ethnic Composition of LALA and Local Community**

Student Groups	Percent of Total Enrollment of School 2023-2024	Community* Zip code 90031
		Percent of Total Community
African American or Black	0	2.1
American Indian	0.6	1.9
Asian	1.1	26.7
Filipino	0	2.8
Hispanic or Latino	94.6	57.5
Pacific Islander	0	0.8
Two or more Races	0	10.5
White	1.4	15.4

“—” = no data  
 Source: CDE Data & Statistics/Accessing Educational Data/Census Day Enrollment Data <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/filesenrcensus.asp> Retrieved 2-10-25  
 \*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2019-2023 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates <https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDP5Y2023.DP05?g=860XX00US90031>

**Table 19: Student Program of LALA and Local District**

Student Groups	Percent of Total Enrollment of School 2023-2024	District is LAUSD
		Percent in LAUSD
SWD	12.9	14.8
EL	22.1	20.1
RFEP	43.3	24.5
Source: DataQuest: <a href="https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/">https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/</a> Retrieved 3/6/25		

**Element 8: Admission Requirements.** *Reasonably comprehensive*

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

Petition needs to align fiscal reporting dates to those of the county office.

**Element 10: Suspension and Expulsion Procedures.** *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

Petition needs updates to In-School suspension that reflect recent changes in law. Petition language needs refinement to address inconsistencies within the expulsion appeal process as written.

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

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

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

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

Petition language needs to be revised to align with LACOE Administrative Regulations

**Element 15: Closure Procedures.** *Reasonably comprehensive with specific deficiencies*

Petition language needs to clarify notification to social security and the disposition of special education records.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

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

Based on documents received from LALA, in 2022, concerns were raised about the validity of the sale-leaseback arrangement of the property located at 234 East Avenue 33, Los Angeles, CA 90031 involving Florence Crittenton Center Inc. (FCC) and LALA.

There is currently active litigation concerning this property which was not acknowledged in the petition or in the capacity interview that potentially affects LALA's ability to use the property as a school site. Additionally, the LALA founder/FCC board member is counsel to both FCC and LALA in the litigation.

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

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

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

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

## Appendix A

### LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION REVIEW PROCESS

**Review Criteria:** The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE) Charter School Review Team (Review Team) considered the petition according to the requirements of the *Education Code* and other pertinent laws, guidance established in the *California Code of Regulations (5 CCR)*, Title 5, County Board Policy and Superintendent’s Administrative Regulations.<sup>4</sup>

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

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

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

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

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

- Adjustments necessary to reflect the County Board as the authorizer as required by statute. These adjustments are necessary because the petition was initially submitted to a local district and contains specific references to and/or language required by that district and/or the petition does not reflect the structure of the County Office.

---

<sup>4</sup> Words in italics indicate a direct reference to the language in these documents.

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

- Adjustments needed to bring the petition current with changes made to law since the petition was submitted to the district as required by statute.
- Adjustments necessary to address clerical errors or inconsistencies where making the adjustment would not be a material revision (as defined in statute and County Board Policy) to the charter.

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

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

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

### **Legislative Intent**

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

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

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

### **Additional Review Criteria Specific to a Renewal Petition**

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

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

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

## Appendix B

### RENEWAL CRITERIA

#### Statutory Framework and Criteria for Renewal

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

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

#### High Performing *EC 47607(c)*

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

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

#### Middle Performing *EC 47607.2(b)*

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

- A. Shall consider schoolwide performance and performance of all subgroups on the Dashboard, while providing greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance in determining whether to grant a charter renewal
- B. Shall also consider clear and convincing evidence with verified data showing either:
  1. The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school

## Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

OR

2. Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.

Note: MAY DENY ONLY upon making written findings that:

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

AND

- (2) Closure is in the best interest of the pupils;

AND

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

### **Low Performing EC 47607.2(a)**

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

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

OR

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

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

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

AND

2. There is a clear and convincing evidence, demonstrated by verified data showing either:
  - a. The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school

OR

- b. Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

Appendix C

**LOS ANGELES LEADERSHIP ACADEMY (LALA)  
CALIFORNIA DASHBOARD INDICATORS AND VERIFIED DATA**

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

**Table A: LALA Charter School California Dashboard**

Year	ELA	Math	ELPI	CCI	Graduation Rate	Chronic Absenteeism	Suspension
2022	Low	Very Low	High	—	Low	Very High	Medium
2023	Orange	Orange	Blue	Low	Green	Orange	Blue
2024	Yellow	Orange	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow

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

**Table B: LALA 2022 ELA Indicator**

Student Groups	Participation Rate	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	Distance From Standard	Change	State Distance From Standard	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	96	Low	259	-46.9	—	-12.2	-34.7	Lower
AA/Black	100	NPL*	1	*	—	-57.7	*	*
Asian^	100	NPL*	2	*	—	63	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	96	Low	246	-47.2	—	-38.6	-8.6	Lower
White^	100	NPL*	1	*	—	21.9	*	*
English Learners	95	Very Low	93	-73.7	—	-61.2	-12.5	Lower
Foster Youth	100	NPL*	3	*	—	-85.6	*	*
Homeless Youth	—	—	0	—	—	-101.8	—	—
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	97	Low	232	-48	—	-41.4	-6.6	Lower
Students With Disabilities	97	Very Low	35	-118.2	—	-97.3	-20.9	Lower
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average?					<b>NO</b>	All Students	NO	
						Student Groups	NO 0 of 4	

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-20-25

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

**Table C: LALA 2023 ELA Indicator**

Student Groups	Participation Rate	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	Distance From Standard	Change	State Distance From Standard	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	98	Orange	222	-51.5	-4.6	-13.6	-37.9	Lower
AA/Black	0	NPC*	1	*	*	-59.6	*	*
Asian^	100	NPC*	1	*	*	61.8	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	99	Orange	217	-50.8	-3.6	-40.2	-10.6	Lower
White^	100	NPC*	1	*	*	20.8	*	*
English Learners	99	Red	92	-77.9	-4.3	-67.7	-10.2	Lower
Foster Youth	100	NPC*	2	*	*	-89.2	*	*
Homeless Youth	50	NPC*	2	*	*	-67.9	*	*
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	98	Orange	202	-49.2	-1.2	-42.6	-6.6	Lower
Students With Disabilities	100	NPC**	27	-108.6	9.5**	-96.3	-12.3	Lower**
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average?					NO	All Students	NO	
						Student Groups	NO 0 of 3	

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

**Table D: LALA 2024 ELA Indicator**

Student Groups	Participation Rate	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	Distance From Standard	Change	State Distance From Standard	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	99	Yellow	208	-45.9	5.6	-13.2	-32.7	Lower
AA/Black	—	—	0	—	—	-58.9	—	—
Asian^	100	NPC*	2	*	*	60.7	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	99	Yellow	201	-45.1	5.7	-39.3	-5.8	Lower
White^	100	NPC*	3	*	*	19.2	*	*
English Learners	99	Orange	84	-74.1	3.8	-67.6	-6.5	Lower
Foster Youth	—	—	0	—	—	-87.3	—	—
Homeless Youth	89	NPC**	9	*	*	-70.4	*	*
LTELs	100	NPC**	26	-99.4	-8.4**	-109.6	10.2	Higher**
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	99	Yellow	195	-45.2	4.0	-40.9	-4.3	Lower
Students With Disabilities	97	NPC**	29	-111.1	-2.5**	-95.6	-15.5	Lower**
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average?					NO	All Students	NO	
						Student Groups	NO 0 of 3	

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

Table E: LALA 2022 Math Indicator

Student Groups	Participation Rate	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	Distance From Standard	Change	State Distance From Standard	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	96	Very Low	258	-123.9	—	-51.7	-72.2	Lower
AA/Black	100	NPL	1	*	—	-106.9	*	*
Asian^	100	NPL	2	*	—	48.4	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	96	Very Low	245	-124.2	—	-83.4	-40.8	Lower
White^	100	NPL	1	*	—	-13.4	*	*
English Learners	94	Very Low	93	-147.2	—	-92	-55.2	Lower
Foster Youth	100	NPL	3	*	—	-126.3	*	*
Homeless Youth	—	—	0	—	—	-101.8	—	—
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	96	Very Low	230	-123.1	—	-84	-39.1	Lower
Students With Disabilities	95	Very Low	34	-180.7	—	-130.8	-49.9	Lower
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average?					NO	All Students	NO	
						Student Groups	NO 0 of 4	

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

Table F: LALA 2023 Math Indicator

Student Groups	Participation Rate	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	Distance From Standard	Change	State Distance From Standard	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	98	Orange	221	-117.4	6.5	-49.1	-68.3	Lower
AA/Black	0	NPC*	1	*	*	-104.5	*	*
Asian^	100	NPC*	1	*	*	50.8	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	98	Orange	216	-116.8	7.5	-80.8	-36	Lower
White^	100	NPC*	1	*	*	-11.1	*	*
English Learners	99	Red	92	-146.1	2.2	-93.4	-52.7	Lower
Foster Youth	100	NPC*	2	*	*	-127.4	*	*
Homeless Youth	50	NPC*	2	*	*	-101.3	*	*
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	98	Orange	201	-117.6	5.6	-80.8	-36.8	Lower
Students With Disabilities	100	NPC**	27	-166	14.6**	-127.3	-38.7	Lower**
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average?					NO	All Students	NO	
						Student Groups	NO 0 of 3	

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

**Table G: LALA 2024 Math Indicator**

Student Groups	Participation Rate	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	Distance From Standard	Change	State Distance From Standard	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	98	Orange	209	-110.4	7	-47.6	-62.8	Lower
AA/Black	—	—	0	—	—	-102.2	—	—
Asian <sup>^</sup>	100	NPC*	2	*	*	49.5	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	98	Orange	202	-109.7	7.1	-79.2	-30.5	Lower
Two or More <sup>^</sup>	—	—	0	—	—	-5.3	—	—
White <sup>^</sup>	100	NPC*	3	*	*	-10.3	*	*
English Learners	98	Orange	85	-135.3	10.8	-93.4	-41.9	Lower
Foster Youth	—	—	0	—	—	-125.1	—	—
Homeless Youth	91	NPC**	11	-167.8	—	-106	-61.8	Lower**
LTEs	100	NPC**	26	-156.6	16.4**	-163.5	6.9	Higher**
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	98	Orange	196	-109.1	8.5	-78.2	-30.9	Lower
Students With Disabilities	97	NPC**	29	-150.8	15.2**	-124.3	-26.5	Lower**
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average?					NO	All Students	NO	NO
						Student Groups	NO	0 of 3

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

**Table H: LALA English Learner Progress Indicator**

Year	Dashboard Color	Participation Rate	Number of Students	School Percent	State Percent	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
2022	High	96.3	96	64.6	50.3	14.3	Higher
2023	Blue	92	77	71.4	48.7	22.7	Higher
2024	Red	98.7	68	22.1	45.7	-23.6	Lower

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

**Table I: LALA 2023 College/Career Indicator**

Student Groups	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	School Percent	Change	State Percent	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	Low	56	23.2	*	43.9	-20.7	Lower
AA/Black	—	0	—	—	25.1	—	—
Asian^	NPL*	1	*	*	75.8	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	Low	51	25.5	*	35.5	-10	Lower
Two or More^	—	0	—	—	52.9	—	—
White^	NPL*	1	*	*	53.2	*	*
English Learners	NPL*	9	*	*	15.3	*	*
Foster Youth	—	0	—	—	11.6	—	—
Homeless Youth	NPL*	1	*	*	20.4	*	*
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Low	56	23.2	*	35.4	-12.2	Lower
Students With Disabilities	NPL*	6	*	*	12.3	*	*
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average?				NO	All Students		NO
					Student Groups		NO 0 of 2
Source: CA School Dashboard <a href="https://www.caschooldashboard.org/">https://www.caschooldashboard.org/</a> Retrieved 2-10-25							

**Table J: LALA 2024 College/Career Indicator**

Student Groups	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	School Percent	Change	State Percent	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	Yellow	46	34.8	11.6	45.3	-10.5	Lower
AA/Black	—	0	—	—	28.1	—	—
Asian^	—	0	—	—	74.5	—	—
Hispanic or Latino	Green	45	35.6	10.1	37.4	-1.8	Lower
Two or More^	—	0	—	—	53.7	—	—
White^	—	0	—	—	54.3	—	—
English Learners	NPC**	14	21.4	—	17.2	4.2	Higher**
Foster Youth	—	0	—	—	13	—	—
Homeless Youth	NPC*	3	*	*	21.8	*	*
LTEs	NPC*	10	*	*	16.5	*	*
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Yellow	46	34.8	11.6	37.4	-2.6	Lower
Students With Disabilities	NPC*	4	*	*	13.5	*	*
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average?				NO	All Students		NO
					Student Groups		NO 0 of 2
Source: CA School Dashboard <a href="https://www.caschooldashboard.org/">https://www.caschooldashboard.org/</a> Retrieved 2-10-25							

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

Table K: LALA 2022 Graduation Rate Indicator

Student Groups	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	School Percent	Change	State Percent	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	Low	51	70.6	—	87.4	-16.8	Lower
AA/Black	—	0—	—	—	79.5	*	*
Asian <sup>^</sup>	NPC*	2	*	—	95.2	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	Low	49	69.4	—	85.3	-15.9	Lower
Two or More <sup>^</sup>	—	0—	—	—	89.6	—	—
White <sup>^</sup>	—	0—	—	—	90.8	—	—
English Learners	NPC**	16	56.3	—	73.3	-17	Lower**
Foster Youth	NPC*	2	*	—	64.1	*	*
Homeless Youth	—	0—	—	—	74.4	—	—
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Low	51	70.6	—	85.1	-14.5	Lower
Students With Disabilities	NPC**	14	64.3	—	75.2	-10.9	Lower**
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average?				NO		All Students	NO
						Student Groups	NO 0 of 2

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

Table L: LALA 2023 Graduation Rate Indicator

Student Groups	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	School Percent	Change	State Percent	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	Green	58	87.9	17.3	86.4	1.5	Higher
AA/Black	—	0—	—0	—	78.5	—	—
Asian <sup>^</sup>	NPC*	1	*	*	94.5	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	Green	53	88.7	19.3	84.2	4.5	Higher
Two or More <sup>^</sup>	—	0—	—0	—	88.6	—	—
White <sup>^</sup>	NPC*	1	*	*	89.8	*	*
English Learners	NPC**	11	81.8	25.6**	73.5	8.3	Higher**
Foster Youth	—	0—	—0	—	63.2	—	—
Homeless Youth	NPC*	1	*	*	73.7	*	*
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Green	58	87.9	17.3	83.7	4.2	Higher
Students With Disabilities	NPC*	8	*	*	72.7	*	*
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average?				YES		All Students	YES
						Student Groups	YES 2 of 2

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

Table M: LALA 2024 Graduation Rate Indicator

Student Groups	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	School Percent	Change	State Percent	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	Yellow	49	87.8	-0.2	86.7	1.1	Higher
AA/Black	—	0	—	—	79.1	—	—
Asian <sup>^</sup>	—	0	—	—	92.2	—	—
Hispanic or Latino	Orange	47	87.2	-1.4	85.3	1.9	Higher
Two or More <sup>^</sup>	—	0	—	—	88.3	—	—
White <sup>^</sup>	—	0	—	—	89.2	—	—
English Learners	NPC**	15	80	-1.8**	77.9	2.1	Higher**
Foster Youth	—	0	—	—	65.7	—	—
Homeless Youth	NPC*	3	*	*	75.7	*	*
LTELs	NPC**	11	90.9	—	80.8	10.1	Higher**
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Yellow	49	87.8	-0.2	84.4	3.4	Higher
Students With Disabilities	NPC*	4	*	*	74.4	*	*
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing above the state average?				YES	All Students	YES	
					Student Groups	YES 2 of 2	

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

Table N: LALA 2022 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator

Student Groups	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	School Percent	Change	State Percent	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	Very High	223	39.5	—	30	9.5	Higher
AA/Black	NPL*	1	*	—	42.9	*	*
Asian <sup>^</sup>	NPL*	1	*	—	11.5	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	Very High	215	39.5	—	35.8	3.7	Higher
Two or More <sup>^</sup>	NPL*	4	*	—	25.1	*	*
White <sup>^</sup>	—	0	—	—	21.9	—	—
English Learners	Very High	66	40.9	—	33.6	7.3	Higher
Foster Youth	NPL*	4	*	—	42.1	*	*
Homeless Youth	—	0	—	—	45.1	—	—
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Very High	197	40.6	—	37.4	3.2	Higher
Students With Disabilities	Very High	33	42.4	—	39.6	2.8	Higher
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average?				NO	All Students	NO	
					Student Groups	NO 0 of 4	

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

**Table O: LALA 2023 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator**

Student Groups	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	School Percent	Change	State Percent	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	Orange	195	36.9	-2.5	24.3	12.6	Higher
AA/Black	NPC*	1	*	*	36.4	*	*
Asian^	NPC*	1	*	*	10.1	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	Orange	188	36.7	-2.8	28.4	8.3	Higher
Two or More^	NPC*	4	*	*	21.6	*	*
White^	NPC*	1	*	*	18.5	*	*
English Learners	Red	55	43.6	2.7	26.3	17.3	Higher
Foster Youth	NPC*	4	*	*	33.6	*	*
Homeless Youth	—	0	—	—	38.7	—	—
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Orange	175	37.7	-2.9	29.9	7.8	Higher
Students With Disabilities	NPC**	26	30.8	-11.7**	33.1	-2.3	Lower**
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average?				NO	All Students	NO	
					Student Groups	NO 0 of 3	

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

**Table P: LALA 2024 Chronic Absenteeism Indicator**

Student Groups	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	School Percent	Change	State Percent	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	Yellow	191	19.9	-17	18.6	1.3	Higher
AA/Black	—	0	—	—	31.3	—	—
Asian^	NPC*	1	*	*	7.5	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	Yellow	186	18.8	-17.9	21.7	-2.9	Lower
Two or More^	NPC*	1	*	*	16.2	*	*
White^	NPC*	3	*	*	13.5	*	*
English Learners	Yellow	50	16	-27.6	20.1	-4.1	Lower
Foster Youth	NPC*	1	*	*	30.5	*	*
Homeless Youth	NPC**	12	58.3	—	32.7	25.6	Higher**
LTEs	NPC**	28	10.7	-39.3**	23.9	-13.2	Lower**
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Yellow	178	19.7	-18.1	23.4	-3.7	Lower
Students With Disabilities	NPC**	23	21.7	-9**	26.3	-4.6	Lower**
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average?				NO	All Students	NO	
					Student Groups	YES 3 of 3	

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

Table Q: LALA 2022 Suspension Indicator

Student Groups	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	School Percent	Change	State Percent	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	Medium	451	3.3	—	3.1	0.2	Higher
AA/Black	NPL*	1	*	—	7.9	*	*
Asian^	NPL*	4	*	—	0.9	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	Medium	431	3.5	—	3.3	0.2	Higher
Two or More^	NPL*	9	*	—	2.6	*	*
White^	NPL*	3	*	—	2.9	*	*
English Learners	Medium	117	4.3	—	3.2	1.1	Higher
Foster Youth	NPL*	6	*	—	12.4	*	*
Homeless Youth	NPL*	2	*	—	5.5	*	*
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Medium	397	3.3	—	4	-0.7	Lower
Students With Disabilities	High	68	5.9	—	5.4	0.5	Higher
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average?				NO	All Students		NO
					Student Groups		NO 1 of 4

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

Table R: LALA 2023 Suspension Indicator

Student Groups	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	School Percent	Change	State Percent	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	Blue	418	1	-2.4	3.5	-2.5	Lower
AA/Black	NPC*	1	*	*	8.8	*	*
Asian^	NPC*	5	*	*	1.1	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	Blue	393	1	-2.5	3.8	-2.8	Lower
Two or More^	NPC**	12	0	—	3.3	-3.3	Lower**
White^	NPC*	4	*	*	2.9	*	*
English Learners	Blue	98	1	-3.3	3.7	-2.7	Lower
Foster Youth	NPC*	8	*	*	13.6	*	*
Homeless Youth	NPC*	2	*	*	6.5	*	*
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Blue	375	0.8	-2.5	4.5	-3.7	Lower
Students With Disabilities	Green	54	1.9	-4	5.9	-4	Lower
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average?				YES	All Students		YES
					Student Groups		YES 4 of 4

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

Table S: LALA 2024 Suspension Indicator

Student Groups	Dashboard Color	Number of Students	School Percent	Change	State Percent	Difference from State Average	Higher or Lower
All	Yellow	377	1.3	0.3	3.2	-1.9	Lower
AA/Black	—	0	—	—	8.4	—	—
Asian^	NPC*	4	*	*	1	*	*
Hispanic or Latino	Yellow	358	1.4	0.4	3.4	-2	Lower
Two or More^	NPC*	8	*	*	3	*	*
White^	NPC*	5	*	*	2.6	*	*
English Learners	Blue	87	0	*	3.4	-3.4	Lower
Foster Youth	NPC*	1	*	*	13.2	*	*
Homeless Youth	NPC**	21	0	—	5.7	-5.7	Lower**
LTELs	Blue	52	0	—	8.1	—	Lower
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	Yellow	354	1.4	0.6	4	-2.6	Lower
Students With Disabilities	Blue	51	0	-1.9	5.4	-5.4	Lower
Are All Students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing below the state average?				YES	All Students	YES	
					Student Groups	YES 5 of 5	

Source: CA School Dashboard <https://www.caschooldashboard.org/> Retrieved 2-10-25

**Verified Data**

Table Legend For All NWEA MAP Tables									
Tables are a Summary of the NWEA MAP Reports									
Green cell indicates student group has met the minimum requirement for one year's growth, CGI $\geq$ - 0.2									
Red cell indicates student group has not met the minimum requirement for one year's growth, CGI $<$ - 0.2									
* indicates the number is less than 10 students, the minimum size for reporting in one or more grade levels.									
** less than 50% of eligible grade levels for that student group have valid data									
"—" No data available									
N/A indicates test does not apply to student group.									
"A" – NWEA does not provide CGI scores for Language Usage in grade 12, but the school still administered the test.									
Data reflects grade levels with ten or more students in that student group.									

**Table T: LALA NWEA MAP Reading, Language and Math Student Groups Meeting CGI**

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
	NWEA MAP Reading			NWEA MAP Language Usage			NWEA MAP Math		
	Grade Levels Meeting CGI			Grade Levels Meeting CGI			Grade Levels Meeting CGI		
All Students	0 of 6	2 of 7	5 of 7	2 of 5	4 of 6	7 of 7	5 of 6	4 of 7	7 of 7
Hispanic or Latino	0 of 6	2 of 7	5 of 7	3 of 5	4 of 6	4 of 6	5 of 6	5 of 7	7 of 7
English Learners	1 of 2**	1 of 2**	3 of 3**	1 of 2**	1 of 2**	2 of 3**	2 of 2**	1 of 2**	3 of 3**
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	1 of 6	5 of 7	5 of 7	3 of 5	4 of 6	4 of 6	5 of 6	4 of 7	7 of 7
Students with Disabilities	*	1 of 2**	*	*	1 of 2**	1 of 1**	*	2 of 3**	*
Participation Rate Met	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Are all students and the majority of the numerically significant student groups performing at or above the publisher's metric?									
All Students	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Student Groups	No (0 of 2)	No (1 of 2)	Yes (2 of 2)	Yes (2 of 2)	No (2 of 2)	Yes (2 of 2)	Yes (2 of 2)	Yes (2 of 2)	Yes (2 of 2)
Both	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

**Table U: LALA NWEA MAP Reading, Language and Math (All Students)**

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
	NWEA MAP Reading			NWEA MAP Language Usage			NWEA MAP Math		
Grade Level	Conditional Growth Index			Conditional Growth Index			Conditional Growth Index		
6	*	-1.97	-0.76	*	-2.52	1.35	*	-2.03	3.67
7	-1.93	-4.81	-3.12	-0.24	-4.68	-0.08	0.83	-1.75	0.7
8	-0.26	-0.21	0.76	-0.01	1.59	0.98	1.48	0.66	2.06
9	-0.58	0.20	0.21	-0.44	2.01	-0.12	1.24	-1.17	1.89
10	-1.32	-1.22	1.19	1.09	2.09	0.70	0.06	1.08	4.19
11	-0.88	0.28	4.13	-1.36	0.71	3.42	-0.88	0.56	5.11
12	-3.05	-0.56	0.71	^	^	^	0.87	5.5	4.36

Staff Findings on the Renewal for the Los Angeles Leadership Academy

Table V: LALA NWEA MAP Reading, Language and Math (Hispanic)

Grade Level	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
	NWEA MAP Reading			NWEA MAP Language Usage			NWEA MAP Math		
	Conditional Growth Index			Conditional Growth Index			Conditional Growth Index		
6	*	-1.65	-0.77	*	-2.45	1.71	*	-1.86	3.68
7	-1.93	-4.91	-3.05	-0.17	-4.61	0.07	0.88	-1.75	0.76
8	-0.36	-0.21	0.76	-0.08	1.59	0.98	1.48	0.66	2.06
9	-0.49	0.60	0.21	-0.58	1.49	-0.40	1.29	-0.11	1.79
10	-1.62	-1.00	1.56	1.02	2.55	-0.40	-0.09	1.17	3.52
11	-0.70	0.61	4.08	-1.30	0.82	3.48	-1.03	0.75	3.98
12	-3.24	-0.37	0.47	^	^	^	0.7	6.07	3.78

Table W: LALA NWEA MAP Reading, Language and Math (SED)

Grade Level	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
	NWEA MAP Reading			NWEA MAP Language Usage			NWEA MAP Math		
	Conditional Growth Index			Conditional Growth Index			Conditional Growth Index		
6	*	-1.97	-1.1	*	-2.19	0.84	*	-1.51	3.43
7	-1.35	-4.64	-3.35	0.05	-4.04	-0.39	0.89	-1.57	0.55
8	-2.04	-0.01	1.08	-1.8	1.41	1.12	0.48	0.62	2.19
9	0.09	0.11	0.20	0.95	2.27	-0.59	1.6	-1.98	2.00
10	-1.51	-0.15	1.25	1.45	2.75	0.63	0.21	1.72	4.14
11	-0.51	0.28	4.08	-1.01	0.82	3.48	-0.33	0.42	4.49
12	-5.18	0.47	0.71	^	^	^	1.1	5.58	4.36

Table X: LALA NWEA MAP Reading, Language and Math (EL)

Grade Level	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
	NWEA MAP Reading			NWEA MAP Language Usage			NWEA MAP Math		
	Conditional Growth Index			Conditional Growth Index			Conditional Growth Index		
6	*	*	0.69	*	*	2.26	*	*	6.41
7	-2.38	-5.36	*	-1.68	-5.24	*	0.41	-3.24	*
8	-0.02	0.74	1.23	-0.15	0.88	1.25	2.14	0.84	3.03
9	*	*	0.38	*	*	-0.59	*	*	1.88
10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
12	*	*	*	^	^	^	*	*	*

Table Y: LALA NWEA MAP Reading, Language and Math (SWD)

Grade Level	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
	NWEA MAP Reading			NWEA MAP Language Usage			NWEA MAP Math		
	Conditional Growth Index			Conditional Growth Index			Conditional Growth Index		
6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-1.19	*
7	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
8	*	-0.15	*	*	-1.18	1.33	*	0.22	*
9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
10	*	-2.57	*	*	3.31	*	*	1.92	*
11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
12	*	*	*	^	^	^	*	*	*