



## SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

Agenda Item# 11.5

**Meeting Date:** April 10, 2025

**Subject:** Determination Hearing for Charter Renewal for The MET

- ☐ Information Item Only
- ☐ Approval on Consent Agenda
- ☐ Conference (for discussion only)
- ☐ Conference/First Reading (Action Anticipated: \_\_\_\_\_)
- ☐ Conference/Action
- ☒ Action
- ☒ Public Hearing

**Division:** Deputy Superintendent's Office

**Recommendation:** Based on The MET's status in the California Department of Education's middle-performing renewal level, a comprehensive review of the charter renewal petition, and an evaluation of its program over the most recent charter term, the district review team has determined that The MET satisfied all required criteria. The MET is eligible for a five-year renewal of its charter beginning on July 1, 2025, and ending on June 30, 2030.

**Background/Rationale:** On January 31, 2025, The MET submitted a petition to renew its charter. It is requesting to renew the term of its charter, which expires on June 30, 2025. On March 6, 2025, the District held an initial public hearing to consider the level of support for the petition from the district's teachers, other employees, and parents/guardians. The governing board of the school district shall either grant or deny the renewal of the charter within 90 days of receipt of the petition. At the hearing in which the governing board votes on the renewal of the charter, the charter petitioners must be provided with equal time and procedures as district staff to address the board on the proposed recommendation and findings on the petition.

District staff, in collaboration with an external review team, reviewed the submitted petition, artifacts from The MET most recent charter term, and publicly-available student outcome data. Findings from that process were compiled into the Staff Renewal Report, which was posted on the district's website on March 19, 2025. The Staff Renewal Report (attached) also includes an overview of the legal guidance on the criteria for renewal.

Education Code sets out specific procedures that must be followed as part of the petition review process. One of these procedures is for District staff to propose written factual findings concerning the petition, which could support either a reauthorization or a denial of the charter. This were done in the form of the Staff Renewal Report. They are based on staff's evaluation, and the Board is not required to adopt the findings in that report in whole or in part. If there are specific findings of fact that the Board desires to make concerning the petition, which may include findings supporting a denial, that is its prerogative, and such action is consistent with the statutory language of The Charter Schools Act.

Ultimately, the Board is the decisionmaker on whether to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the charter. The attached sample resolution is designed to provide the board with draft language around which to formalize that decision. The Board may consider other options or resolution language.

**Financial Considerations:** Review of the fiscal portions of the petition did not reveal any fiscal concerns that would likely result in a change of financial position for either the charter or the district. As a locally-funded ("Dependent") Charter School, the District is the sole employer of all The MET staff. The MET is a member of the SCUSD SELPA. The MET requested approval of a financial contribution from the District for the 2024-25 school year. Though currently projecting a deficit for the 2025-26 school year, The MET is taking all possible steps toward fiscal solvency.

**LCAP Goal(s):** Goal 2: Improving Academic Outcomes

**Documents Attached:**

1. Staff Renewal Report for The MET
2. Sample Resolution Language for Board Consideration

**Estimated Time of Presentation:** 10 minutes (Charter School must be allotted equal time to district staff)

**Submitted by:** Mary Hardin Young, Deputy Superintendent  
Amanda Goldman, Director Innovative Schools

**Approved by:** Lisa Allen, Superintendent



# Sacramento City Unified School District

## Staff Renewal Report

Published March 19, 2025



### The MET Sacramento

**Requested Term: July 1, 2025 - June 30, 2030**

On January 31, 2025, The MET Sacramento High School (“The MET”) petitioned the Sacramento City Unified School District (District or SCUSD) to renew its charter. The current charter expires on June 30, 2025. If approved, The MET would be eligible for a five-year charter term, from July 1, 2025, through June 30, 2030.

In compliance with Education Code (EC) Section 47605(b), the SCUSD Board of Education held a public hearing on March 6, 2025, to consider the level of support for the Charter petition by District teachers, other District employees, and parents/guardians. The Board will conduct a second public hearing and either approve or deny the renewal petition on April 10, 2025. This *Staff Report*, including findings of fact, was published on the District’s website and shared with the school leadership on March 19, 2025, at least fifteen (15) days before the second public hearing.

## Criteria For Renewal

### Petition and Required Elements

Education Code Section 47607 guides the petition review for the renewal of charter schools. As part of that review, the authorizer must consider the schoolwide and all student groups' performance on state and local indicators, with a greater weight applied to measurements of academic performance, as described in Education Code Section 47607(c)). Furthermore, EC Section 47607(b) states that charter renewals are governed by the standards and criteria described in Section 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. This provision is further clarified or supported by 5 CCR s 11967.5.1, which states that:

*A "reasonably comprehensive" description, within the meaning subdivision (f) of this section and Education Code section 47605(c)(5), 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, it addresses essentially all aspects of the elements, not just selected aspects.*
- (3) Is specific to the proposed charter petition, not to charter schools or charter petitions.*
- (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 those 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.*

## Performance Levels

Based upon a charter school's performance on the California School Dashboard, academic achievement indicators (i.e., CAASPP ELA and math, the English Language Proficiency Indicator (ELPI), and the College Career Indicator (CCI)) in the two consecutive years immediately preceding the renewal decision, the California Department of Education (CDE) places a charter school in one of the three performance categories: high, middle, or low. For middle and high-performance tier schools, the presumption is that the board will renew unless conditions for denial are present (EC Section 47607(2)). Low-performance tier charter schools have a presumption of denial. However, charter schools may receive a maximum two-year renewal based on a “second look,” in which the authorizer conducts a deeper evaluation of the charter school’s academic achievement and determines whether they meet conditions for an additional two-year term (EC 47607.2).

## Reasons for Denial

The authorizer may deny the renewal of a charter if it makes written factual findings that the charter school failed to meet the standards and criteria outlined in EC Section 47605:

1. The charter school will provide an unsound educational program for students during the term of its charter;
2. The charter school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program outlined in the petition;

3. The petition does not contain the necessary affirmations and assurances;
4. The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of the fifteen required elements set forth in the Charter Schools Act.
5. The petition does not declare whether the charter school shall be deemed the exclusive public employer of the charter school's employees for purposes of Chapter 10.7 (commencing with EC Section 3540) of Division 4 of Title 1 of the Government Code.

Notwithstanding EC Sections 47607(c), 47607.2(a), and 47607.2(b), pursuant to 47607(e), the authorizing board may also deny renewal of any charter school upon a finding that:

6. The charter school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to substantial fiscal or governance factors or
7. As documented by EC Section 47607(d), the charter school is not serving the pupils who wish to attend.

To deny, the authorizer must provide 30 days' notice with a reasonable opportunity to cure the violation(s) and make a finding that either:

- The corrective action proposed by the charter school has been unsuccessful, or
- The violations are sufficiently severe and pervasive to render a corrective action unviable.

## Executive Summary

Please note the color coding, which directs the reader to areas that may be potential findings for denial rather than items that could be addressed in other ways.		
Meets all expectations and/or standards; supports the case for renewal	Substantially meets expectations and/or standards; worthy of note but <u>does not indicate</u> a serious issue or cause for denial, but may need to be addressed	May not meet expectations and/or standards; should be considered carefully as a potential non-renewal issue

Performance Level assigned by CDE (High, Middle, Low)	MIDDLE
Has a notice to cure an alleged violation been issued?	NO

→ If notice was issued, has a response been submitted?	N/A
--	-----

<b>Did the charter petition meet all primary requirements for renewal?</b>		<b>YES</b>
1	Does this charter present an <u>unsound</u> educational program?	<u>NO</u>
2	Are the petitioners demonstrably <u>unlikely</u> to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition?	<u>SUBSTANTIALLY</u>
3	Does the petition contain the necessary affirmations and assurances of the Charter Schools Act?	<u>YES</u>
4	Does the petition contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all 15 elements described below?	<u>SUBSTANTIALLY</u>
5	Does the petition contain a declaration of whether the charter school shall be deemed the exclusive public employer of the charter school's employees?	<u>YES</u>
<b>Were there any findings that could trigger a notice to cure an alleged violation under either of the following?</b>		<b>NO</b>
6	Is the charter school demonstrably <u>unlikely</u> to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition <i>due to substantial fiscal or governance factors</i> ?	<b>NO</b>
7	Does the charter school serve the pupils who wish to attend, as documented by E.C. Section 47607(d)?	<b>YES</b>

## Review of Required Elements

ELEMENT	TOPIC	MEETS STANDARD	KEY FINDINGS
Element 1/A	Educational Program	<b>YES</b>	
Element 2/B	Measurable Student Outcomes	<u>SUBSTANTIALLY</u>	LCAP lacks some elements
Element 3/C	Student Progress Measurement	<u>SUBSTANTIALLY</u>	
Element 4/D	Governance	<u>SUBSTANTIALLY</u>	Advisory Council updates
Element 5/E	Employee Qualifications	<b>YES</b>	

Element 6/F	Health and Safety	<b><u>SUBSTANTIALLY</u></b>	Clarity between District policies and Charter School procedures
Element 7/G	Racial/ Ethnic Balance	<b>YES</b>	
Element 8/H	Admissions	<b>YES</b>	
Element 9/I	Independent Audits	<b>YES</b>	
Element 10/J	Suspension/Expulsion	<b><u>SUBSTANTIALLY</u></b>	Clarity between District policies and Charter School procedures
Element 11/K	STRS	<b>YES</b>	
Element 12/L	Attendance Alternatives	<b>YES</b>	
Element 13/M	Post-Employment Rights	<b>YES</b>	
Element 14/N	Dispute Resolution	<b>YES</b>	
Element 15/O	Closure Procedures	<b>YES</b>	
<b>REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION</b>		<b>MEETS STANDARDS</b>	<b>KEY FINDINGS</b>
Financial/ Administrative Plan		<b><u>SUBSTANTIALLY</u></b>	
Facilities		<b>YES</b>	
Impact Statement		<b>YES</b>	
Special Education		<b>YES</b>	

## Detailed Findings of Fact

This section contains greater detail regarding any of the above-mentioned areas that did not meet the requirements. **Items not described met requirements.**

### 1. Does this charter present an unsound educational program? **NO**

District Staff believe that The MET presents a sound educational program.

#### *Relative Strengths*

The petition presents a detailed overview of The MET's educational program, outlining its target student population, defining the characteristics of an "educated person" in the 21st century, and explaining effective learning strategies. The petition describes The MET's use of

the Big Picture, project-based instructional model and emphasizes its commitment to preparing students for college and career pathways. Additionally, it includes specific support provisions for students with exceptional needs, including Students with Disabilities, English Learners, high-performing students, and those needing additional academic assistance.

A five-year analysis of student ELA summative outcomes at The MET reveals notable fluctuations in schoolwide performance across dashboards. In 2023, students scored 27 points below standard, but by 2024, performance improved to three points above standard. This upward trend is also reflected among Socio-economically Disadvantaged, Hispanic, and White student groups.

The past three dashboards with reportable data show a significant increase in the percentage of English Learner students making progress toward proficiency, rising from 31% to 69%.

However, because The MET's English Learner student group consists of fewer than 30 students, the state does not assign a dashboard color for these outcomes.

### *Opportunities for Focus*

A five-year review of Mathematics summative outcomes highlights the need for greater attention to student proficiency, both schoolwide and within specific student groups. The petition does not present a clear strategy for closing the proficiency gap between The MET students and their statewide peers. While page 30 of the petition notes that Quantitative Reasoning is integrated into student PBL projects, high school PBL models often incorporate mathematics at a rigor comparable to grades 6-8 unless intentionally structured to meet high school proficiency standards. To ensure students receive appropriate instruction, the petition or the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) should outline specific measures to maintain grade-level rigor in Mathematics.

A five-year analysis of College and Career readiness outcomes underscores the need for increased focus on improving or reporting student progress in this area, as measured by the California Dashboard. Both schoolwide and student group data indicate a persistent gap between The MET students and their statewide peers, emphasizing the need for targeted interventions to enhance postsecondary readiness.

Graduation rate data over the past five years reflects strong overall performance and notable fluctuations among some student groups. Schoolwide graduation rates peaked at 97% in 2022 but declined to 83% in 2023 and 2024. As a small high school, The MET has a relatively small number of students in each graduating class, which may account for some of the fluctuations in the graduation rate.

A more detailed summary of all available data can be found in [Exhibit A](#).



2. Are the petitioners demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program outlined in the petition? **NO**

### Education Program

Despite identified areas for collaborative focus between Charter and District staff described below, staff believes that the charter school has the structures that make it **likely to successfully implement its proposed program.**

The MET's College and Career Readiness Indicator (CCI) is surprisingly low, given the school's model and mission. Staff recommends that The MET **work closely with District staff to refine their internal processes for properly reporting all potential metrics for college and career readiness.**

### Governance

As a locally-funded "Dependent" charter, the SCUSD School Board serves as the authorizing and governing board. The board policies and administrative regulations adopted by the SCUSD Board apply to the Charter School. The Charter School maintains a local advisory council that functions similarly to a school site council and is held to the same guidance under the Greene Act. The Charter School's advisory council is expected to foster transparency and community engagement in its decision-making.

Despite the identified areas for collaborative focus between Charter and District staff, as described below, staff believes that the charter school has the governance structures that make it **likely to successfully implement its proposed program.**

Staff found that the documentation around The MET's advisory council needs to be strengthened. Specific concerns about how the advisory council is defined in the petition are listed in element 4/D below. **More holistically, staff recommends that The MET's advisory council focus on clearly defining its role relative to the District Board and ensuring that its by-laws cohesively describe that relationship.**

### Fiscal

As a locally-funded "Dependent" charter, the Charter School's apportioned funds pass through the District and are held within Fund 09 of the District's accounts. The Charter School pays fees for District departments to administer and manage their budget. The Charter School complies with the District systems, budget development, and reporting timeliness. The District is the sole public employer of all Charter School employees; the salaries and benefits are determined through labor agreements. As such, the Charter School leader's actionable space around fiscal sustainability is based primarily on their ability to accurately project and maintain enrollment, spend within budgeted limits, manage their fund balance, and pursue additional funds.

Based on a thorough analysis of The MET's financial documents and overall fiscal condition, certain factors could impact or undermine its financial viability. However, if The MET engages in a collaborative focus with the District to meaningfully address the items detailed below, staff believes the school will be likely to successfully implement its charter school program within the first two years of its proposed renewal term. A summary of The MET's recent financial picture is available in [Exhibit B](#).

1. **Enrollment and ADA:** The MET experienced a post-COVID drop in enrollment and has struggled to regain the student population it once had. Daily attendance is increasing in the current school year. The petition contains a detailed recruitment campaign to increase enrollment. To improve financial sustainability, the school should:
  - a. Continue to fully implement their recruitment campaign to increase enrollment
  - b. Make a concerted effort to bring average daily attendance (ADA) up to 95% by ensuring that the school uses all allowable collection methods under independent study law.
  - c. Ensure that their budget assumptions for enrollment and ADA are reasonable and realistic.
2. **Deficit Spending:** The MET initially experienced a deficit of \$483,750 in 2023-24, largely due to retroactive salary increases. The MET is once again projecting a deficit in 2024-25 (\$748,465) and 2025-26 (\$114,353). The 2024-25 deficit could be attributed largely to the nearly 3% decrease in the state allocation COLA between budget development and budget adoption. In the same time period, there were substantial increases to both personnel and District-mandated costs. The projected deficit decreases significantly each year following significant cuts made by the school. To improve financial sustainability, the school should:
  - a. Continue to match program (FTEs and course offerings) to enrollment numbers.
  - b. Seek additional sources of funding (i.e., grants).
  - c. Work with District staff to spend within the limits of their adopted budget.
3. **Fund Balance:** Prior to 2023-24, the MET had a reasonable fund balance. They met the District's required 5% minimum. The MET covered its 2023-24 deficit from its fund balance. However, the remaining fund balance will likely not be adequate to cover the outstanding costs in 2024-25 or 2025-26. This may require a request for a financial contribution from the SCUSD Board (anticipated April 3, 2025).

3. Does the petition contain the necessary affirmations and assurances of the Charter Schools Act? **YES**

Appropriate declarations and affirmations were included in the petition.

4. Does the petition contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all the 15 required elements? **SUBSTANTIALLY**

**The following petition elements were deemed potentially incomplete, not reasonably comprehensive, or not legally compliant.** Please note color coding to direct the reader to areas that may be potential findings for denial versus items that could be addressed in other ways.

Meets all expectations and/or standards; supports the case for renewal	Substantially meets expectations and/or standards; worthy of note but <u>does not indicate</u> a serious issue or cause for denial, but may need to be addressed	May not meet expectations and/or standards; should be considered carefully as a potential non-renewal issue
--	--	---

#### **Element 2/B: Measurable Student Outcomes & Element 3/C: Student Progress Measurements**

The MET petition combines Elements 2/B and 3/C in its description of measurable student outcomes and methods of measurement. The petition points to The MET's LCAP for descriptions of desired student outcomes at both schoolwide and student-group levels, methods of measurement, and actions to achieve those outcomes. The petition also includes a description of state and local assessments used at The MET and how those assessments are used to monitor student academic progress. The MET's petition describes grade-level milestones students will achieve each year at The MET. The charter school acknowledges that it has not met its growth goals on page 47 of the petition.

In reviewing the LCAP, as a part of the petition, the review team found that the LCAP lacked specific actions and associated expenditures that were explicitly written to improve Mathematics outcomes at The MET. Mathematics outcomes were listed as a metric in Goal 2 of the LCAP, but there was no specific action or expenditure associated with Math, except IXL instructional software. The MET LCAP was missing the following required metrics: for College and Career Readiness. Upon a review of The MET website, the LCAP could not be easily located on the charter school's website. The review team located the LCAP on the charter school's California Dashboard page. **Staff recommend that The MET make these edits to their LCAP and prominently post the LCAP on the homepage, as required, in advance of the June 2025 LCAP approval.**

#### Element 4/D: Governance Structure

While the petition includes a reference to and inclusion of the school's Bylaws in the Appendix, the mere attachment of the Bylaws does not provide a comprehensive description of the governance structure. Several concerns were identified in the review. Through the oversight process, Staff is confident that the MET's advisory council understands its role but may need to continue refining its documented procedures.

- **Role and Function of the Advisory Council:** The Bylaws indicate the school has been operated by a "Board of Directors" selected by an Advisory Council since 2010; however, this composition is not appropriate for a "dependent" charter school, and the petition does not reflect this organizational structure (i.e., Governing Board, Board of Directors, Advisory Council). It is recommended that the Bylaws be updated to reflect the District Board as the governing board and a school site Advisory Council.
  - The Advisory Council's roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined. Duties appear redundant or conflicting, hindering a clear understanding of how the Council will function effectively.
- **Advisory Council Composition:** The Board of Directors Bylaws do not indicate the inclusion of any educational partners. Advisory Council Bylaws were not included and should be. The best practice and legal requirement for this Title I-funded school is to ensure the composition of the Advisory Council includes a majority of non-employee educational partners for educational partner input and decision-making. This information is very important for a dependent charter to include in its petition as the school's primary source for educational partner involvement and decision-making.
- **Lack of Clarity on Organizational Policies v. School Level Procedures:** The petition suggests that the charter school has its own independent policies rather than internal procedures aligned with SCUSD Board policies. This may imply a misunderstanding of the "dependent" nature of the relationship between the charter school and SCUSD or simply require clarification in language.

#### Element 6/F: Health And Safety Policy

The petition would be more comprehensive with an explanation of how site-level Health and Safety procedures align with District policies. Although for a dependent charter, the District takes the lead on updating the Comprehensive Safety Plan and staff training, the petition should describe how the school implements these policies in practice.

#### Element 10/J: Suspension/Expulsion

The petition would be more comprehensive with an explanation of how site-level suspension and expulsion procedures align with District policies. For a dependent charter, the petition should describe how the school implements these policies in practice, including the shared roles and responsibilities of both the school and the District, and how the school ensures due process, particularly for students with disabilities.

In reviewing Element 10, one key area lacked a comprehensive description:

- **Involuntary Removal:** The petition does not explicitly state that no pupil will be involuntarily removed without written notice to the parent or guardian in their native language. Clarifying this would ensure the school aligns fully with the requirements and commits to providing such notice before any involuntary removal occurs.

An analysis of The MET's suspension data underscores the need for ongoing refinement of disciplinary practices. While schoolwide suspension rates have consistently exceeded statewide averages, they have declined over the past two CA Dashboards. However, suspension rates have risen significantly for African American and White student groups during this period.

5. Does the petition contain a declaration of whether the charter school shall be deemed the exclusive public employer of the charter school employees? **YES**

The renewal petition states that Sacramento City Unified School District will be deemed the exclusive public employer of the charter school employees per agreements as a locally funded "Dependent" charter.

## RENEWAL CONCLUSION

The MET Sacramento High School was placed into the "middle" renewal tier under EC Section 47607(c)(2)(A) following the release of the 2023-24 California School Dashboard. Schools assigned a middle-level renewal are entitled to a presumption of charter renewal with a 5-year charter term.

Even with categorization in the "middle" performance group, there are allowable grounds for denial of a renewal petition. Reasons for denial include:

1. Submission of a renewal petition that is incomplete does not include a reasonably comprehensive description of all new requirements applicable to charter schools since the last authorization or does not include reasonably comprehensive descriptions necessary to reflect the current program offered by the charter EC Section 47607(c)(2)(F);
2. Serious fiscal and/or governance concerns, which in the case of a school falling into the high renewal tier described below also must not have been adequately addressed, or are

incapable of being addressed, during a required 30-day opportunity to correct (EC Section 47607(e) or

3. Failure to serve all students who wish to attend the school (EC Section 47607(e))

The charter school has not been issued any notices of serious fiscal and/or governance concerns. Based on the findings in this report, The MET is not eligible for denial under these conditions.

## Additional Recommendations and Considerations

Although The MET is a locally funded (dependent) charter school, Staff strongly recommend that the District develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) specific to their “dependent” status. The MOU could outline the roles and financial responsibilities of key departments within the District (e.g., Human Resources, Information Technology, Maintenance and Operations, Curriculum and Instruction, Fiscal, and Special Education), compared to the charter schools' responsibilities. This clarification would help guide staff in supporting the success of these schools. Additionally, the MOU could define oversight expectations, including expectations related to findings in the final staff report, to ensure that the District’s locally funded charters are held to the same high standards as all the District’s authorized charters. This sort of agreement should greatly impact all of the areas described above.

As described in the Fiscal section above, the Charter School may require a financial contribution request from the SCUSD Board (anticipated April 3, 2025). The Board is encouraged to make any decision regarding a contribution separately from this decision to renew. Staff strongly recommends that any contribution be made in tandem with a fiscal sustainability agreement to guide the school toward solvency in the coming years.

## SCUSD Board of Education Options

The SCUSD Board of Education has several legally compliant options. The Board may also consider other options not listed here.

**Option A:** If the Board is satisfied that the information provided in the renewal petition is satisfactory, the Board may adopt *Resolution 3485-A* to approve The MET’s charter for the term dates July 1, 2025, through June 30, 2030. The Charter School will make required updates to its LCAP as required by law. This resolution further directs the Charter school and the District Staff to negotiate an Operational MOU describing the interaction of the District’s dependent charter schools with District departments by June 30, 2026.

**Option B:** If the Board is mostly satisfied with the information provided in the renewal petition by The MET, the Board may adopt *Resolution 3485-B* to approve the renewal of The MET’s

charter for the term dates July 1, 2025, through June 30, 2030 (5 years) with the following conditions:

- a) The Charter School will collaborate with District staff to regularly report to the Board on the Charter School's fiscal condition and steps taken to reach financial sustainability.

Should this option be approved, The MET's charter will be renewed, and the District will notify CDE accordingly. *Resolution 3485-B* indicates that the Board has delegated authority to the Superintendent or a designee to report regularly on the MET's fiscal condition. This resolution further directs the Charter school and the District Staff to negotiate an Operational MOU describing the interaction of the District's dependent charter schools with District departments by June 30, 2026.

**Option C:** If the Board is not satisfied with the information provided in the petition, the Board may take action to deny the renewal of The MET's renewal petition. The Board would need to make written findings of fact based upon one or more legal grounds included in the Education Code as a basis for denial of the renewal petition.

### Potential for Appeal

There is no distinction in the Education Code between locally funded "dependent" charter schools and direct-funded "independent" charter schools. If the SCUSD Board denies a charter renewal petition, the law does not specifically preclude a dependent charter school from appealing the decision to the Sacramento County Board of Education (SCOE) within 30 days, as per EC Section 47605(k)(1). However, an appeal by a locally funded Charter School would require a complete material revision of the charter (essentially re-organizing the school as a direct-funded charter), which would require the approval of the SCUSD Board. This is highly unlikely. A denial would likely result in the closure of the charter school.

## List of Referenced Exhibits

Exhibit A: [Summary of Available Data and Renewal Tier Placement](#)

Exhibit B: [Summary of Recent Fiscal History](#)

## Exhibit A: Summary of Available Data and Renewal Tier Placement

# The MET Sacramento High School

## Student Data and Renewal Tier

### Performance Level Determination

The MET Sacramento High School is assigned the **Middle-Performance Level** for charter renewal (EC Section 47607(c)(2)(A)).

Schools assigned a middle-performance level are entitled to a presumption of charter renewal with a 5-year charter term.

### **Summary of the CA Dashboard Academic Indicators**

Participation rates of less than 95% result in students receiving the Lowest Obtainable Scale Score (LOSS), which negatively impacts overall performance data. Data is sourced from the CA Dashboard Additional Reports.

#### State Assessment Participation Rates

Spring	Overall	Student Groups Below 95%
ELA	96% (44/46)	White 88% (15/17)
Math	96% (44/46)	White 88% (15/17)
ELPAC	100%	None

**Academic Performance Indicators:** CAASPP ELA and math assessments, taken annually by students in grades 3–8 and 11, English Learner Progress, and the College Career Indicator. All data for eligible populations are sourced from the school’s CA Dashboard profile.

**Performance Color:** Indicates change from the previous year.

**Status:** Status is the ‘statewide average’ for academic Measures. An average is much more precise than a color. Student groups outperforming the State are not compared to charter school performance (gray). Similarly, student groups of less than 30 students are not compared.

**Distance from Standard:** Measures how far, on average, students are from the lowest possible score to meet the standard.

#### 1. English Language Arts Performance Color and Status



Groups	Charter Spring 2023	State Spring 2023	Charter Spring 2024	State Spring 2024
All Students	-27 points	-14 points	+3 points	-13 points
SE Disadvantaged	-26 points <sup>+</sup>	-43 points	-8 points <sup>+</sup>	-41 points
Hispanic	-25 points <sup>+</sup>	-40 points	-10 points <sup>+</sup>	-39 points
White	-50 points <sup>+</sup>	+21 points	-35 points <sup>+</sup>	+19 points

<sup>+</sup> Less than 30 students were represented in this group for this year.

## 2. Mathematics Performance Color and Status

Groups	Charter Spring 2023	State Spring 2023	Charter Spring 2024	State Spring 2024
All Students	-111 points	-49 points	-119 points	-48 points
SE Disadvantaged	-105 points <sup>+</sup>	-81 points	-136 points <sup>+</sup>	-78 points
Hispanic	-90 points <sup>+</sup>	-81 points	-157 points <sup>+</sup>	-79 points
White	-142 points <sup>+</sup>	-11 points	-115 points <sup>+</sup>	-10 points

<sup>+</sup> Less than 30 students were represented in this group for this year.

## 3. English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) Performance Color and Status

Groups	Charter Spring 2023	State Spring 2023	Charter Spring 2024	State Spring 2024
English Learners	No data	—	69% progressing <sup>+</sup>	46% progressing
Long-Term ELs	No Data	—	75% progressing <sup>+</sup>	46% progressing

## 4. College and Career Indicator Performance Color and Status

Groups	Charter Spring 2023	State Spring 2023	Charter Spring 2024	State Spring 2024
All Students	38% prepared	44% prepared	39% prepared	45% prepared
SE Disadvantaged	32% prepared	35% prepared	36% prepared	37% prepared
Hispanic	33% prepared <sup>+</sup>	36% prepared	42% prepared <sup>+</sup>	37% prepared
White	53% prepared <sup>+</sup>	53% prepared	27% prepared <sup>+</sup>	54% prepared

<sup>+</sup> Less than 30 students were represented in this group for this year.

## **Summary of the CA Dashboard Non-Academic Dashboard Indicators**

Additional CA Dashboard metrics provide context for a school's successful implementation of the approved educational program. The school's data isn't compared to the states', and it should show evidence of continuous improvement based on performance color year over year.

### **Graduation Rate**

<b>Groups</b>	<b>Charter Spring 2023</b>	<b>Charter Spring 2024</b>
<b>All Students</b>	83%	83%
<b>SE Disadvantaged</b>	79%	87%
<b>Hispanic</b>	88% <sup>+</sup>	90% <sup>+</sup>
<b>White</b>	93% <sup>+</sup>	55% <sup>+</sup>

+ Less than 30 students were represented in this group for this year.

### **K-8 Chronic Absenteeism Rate**

This indicator does not apply to 9-12 school programs.

### **Suspension Rate**

<b>Groups</b>	<b>Charter Spring 2023</b>	<b>Charter Spring 2024</b>
<b>All Students</b>	9%	6%
<b>English Learners</b>	0% <sup>+</sup>	10% <sup>+</sup>
<b>Long-Term EL</b>	No Data	11% <sup>+</sup>
<b>Disabilities</b>	9%	7%
<b>SE Disadvantaged</b>	12%	7%
<b>African American</b>	9% <sup>+</sup>	11% <sup>+</sup>
<b>Hispanic</b>	10%	3%
<b>Two or More Races</b>	18% <sup>+</sup>	12% <sup>+</sup>
<b>White</b>	3%	6%

+ Less than 30 students were represented in this group for this year.

## **CA Dashboard Local Indicators**

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Status: Met/Not Met</b>
-------------------	----------------------------

<b>Basics: Teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilities</b>	Met
<b>Implementation of Academic Standards</b>	Met
<b>Parent and Family Engagement</b>	Met
<b>Local Climate Survey</b>	Met
<b>Access to a Broad Course of Study</b>	Met

### Locally Determined Verified Data

A charter school designated as middle-performing may choose (but is not required) to support its case for renewal by providing verified data aligned with the November 2023 State Board of Education requirements. Authorizers must consider this data when submitted by a school assigned a middle-performance level.

**The MET chose **not to include**** verified data in alignment with the November 2023 State Board of Education requirements.

## **Exhibit B: Summary of Recent Financial History**

(Next Page)

## The MET; Budget Summary, 2022-2025

From 2022-23 SY to 2023-24 SY			
Enrollment / ADA constant	Constant	2022-23 Deficit	\$ (57,203.00)
Revenue slightly increased	\$ 150,344.00	June 2023 Ending Fund Balance	\$ 859,201.00
Total Expenses increased faster than revenue	\$ 413,595.00	2023-24 Deficit	\$ (483,750.00)
Personel Cost Increase	\$ 445,151.00	June 2024 Ending Fund Balance	\$ 375,451.00
Mandatory Cost Increase	\$ 83,589.00	Contribution Needed?	No
Summary: In the 2023-24 school year personel cost increased, due to raises and retroactive payments, far faster than revenue. The Charter was able to weather those increases by utilizing their reserves and reducing other costs. 2023-24 was the first year in which the site level deficit was routinely monitored.			
From Budget Development (January 2024) to Budget Adoption (June 2024); 2024-25 SY			
Enrollment/ADA Decrease	-15 ADA	Surplus projected at BDP	\$ 3,000.00
COLA Decrease	3.8% --> 1.07%	Deficit Projected at Adoption	\$ (242,925.54)
Revenue Decrease	\$ (192,605.00)	Ending Fund Balance Projected at BDP	\$ 368,452.00
Total Expenses increased (Mitigated by restricted funds)	\$ 144,531.54	Ending Fund Balance Projected at Adoption	\$ 122,526.46
Personel Cost Increase	\$ 334,660.00		
Mandatory Cost Slight Increase	\$ 70.00	Contribution Needed?	Maybe
Summary: At Budget Development, the Charter School projected a slight surplus and anticipated a Fund Balance of over \$300,000. After Budget Development, the projected COLA was considerably reduced. A second round of salary increases impacted overall expenses. Mandatory Costs, charged on a per enrollment basis, only increased slightly overall due to decreased enrollment but increased on a per student basis. This meant that the charter school went from projecting a small surplus to projecting a major deficit practically overnight. The charter school was unable to make FTE cuts as this occurred after the notification deadlines. In addition, the charter school over projected enrollment and ADA, leading to even greater deficit. At this time, the charter school projected finish the year with an ending balance below the required reserve. The Board could have decided waive that requirement or make a contribution to meet the required reserve.			
Changes During School Year 2024-25 (From Budget Adoption in Jun 2024 to 2nd Interim in March 2025)			
Enrollment/ADA Decrease	-30 ADA	Deficit Projected at 2nd Interim	\$ (748,465.00)
Revenue Decrease	\$ (551,064.00)	Ending Fund Balance Projected at 2nd Interim	\$ (383,013.00)
Total Expenses decreased	\$ (14,646.54)	Contribution Needed	Yes
Personel Cost Decrease	\$ (280,741.64)	Contribution needed to start 25-26 with RR	\$ 540,967.60
Mandatory Cost Slight Decrease	\$ (75,052.65)		
Summary: The Charter School's P1 ADA (certified in late February) was even lower than projected, resulting in a considerable loss of revenue. With the retirement of several higher paid staff, lower mandatory costs due to lower enrollment, and minimized spending on all other costs, the charter school was able to make up for some lost revenue, but are still projecting a large deficit. Increased ADA in the 2nd half of the year could result in additional funds, and the charter school has already seen ADA increase since January. However, a contribution will be necessary to close the books on 2024-25 and start 2025-26 with the required reserve. The required reserve is currently set at 5% of anticipated expenses.			
Taking Steps Toward Solvency for 2025-26			
Projecting slight but reasonable ADA increase	+20 ADA	Deficit Projected for 2025-26	\$ (114,353.00)
Reductions to FTEs (maintaining A-G)	- 1.4 FTE	Deficit Reduced from Prior Year	\$ 634,112.00
Overall Cost Decreases (Helped by use of one-time funds)	\$ (307,076.00)	Ending Fund Balance for 2025-26	\$ 43,601.60
Personel Cost Decrease	\$ (172,348.45)	Contribution Needed	Maybe
Mandatory Cost Increase	\$ 111,181.65	Contribution Up To	\$ 114,353.00
Summary: In planning for 2025-26, the Charter school made a more reasonable ADA projection, based on current year applicants and reduced FTEs to the minimum necessary to offer A-G requirements on campus. In doing so, they reduced their deficit by over \$600,000 from the previous year, despite more than \$100,000 of mandatory cost increase. The Charter School may still make further cost reductions and seek additional funding. Negotiations with the District regarding mandatory costs and strengthening the school's reporting of Non-Classroom Based ADA will further improve the fiscal position. Unanticipated cost increases will negatively impact the fiscal position. If nothing changes, the charter school will adopt a budget projecting a slight deficit, but will have adequate reserves to cover it if they go below the required minimum.			
*Note: This summary is designed to show big picture budget trends. Specific accounting details can be found in other resources. Please reach out to request access.			

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
OF THE SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Resolution No. 3485-A**

**Resolution to Approve the Renewal Petition for  
The MET Sacramento High School**

**WHEREAS**, the approval of charter schools is governed by the Charter Schools Act of 1992, as subsequently amended, codified in Education Code sections 47600 *et seq.*, and the implementing regulations of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations (5 C.C.R. § 11960 *et seq.*);

**WHEREAS**, on January 31, 2025, the Sacramento City Unified School District (“District”) received a petition to renew the charter (“Renewal Petition”) for The MET Sacramento High School, a dependent charter school of the District (“Charter School”);

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on the Renewal Petition was held on March 6, 2025, at which time the District’s Board of Education (“Board”) considered the level of support for the Renewal Petition by teachers employed by the District, other employees of the District, and parents/guardians;

**WHEREAS**, the District’s *Staff Renewal Report* was published on March 19, 2025 which includes staff’s proposed findings of fact based on its evaluation of the Renewal Petition, information from the Charter School’s last charter term, and available student outcome data, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated herein by reference;

**WHEREAS**, the Board has convened on April 10, 2025 to consider whether to grant or deny the Renewal Petition;

**WHEREAS**, renewals of charters are governed by the standards and criteria set forth in Education Code sections 47605, 47607, and 47607.2;

**WHEREAS**, the consideration of a renewal petition requires the District to (1) determine whether the charter school meets applicable eligibility requirements using the new accountability criteria under the law and reflected in the California School Dashboard, and (2) evaluate whether the renewal petition meets the standards and criteria set forth in Education Code section 47605;

**WHEREAS**, Education Code section 47607 describes a three-tiered system that categorizes a charter school as a high-performing, middle-performing, or low-performing charter school. The designation of a charter school in a particular tier determines the level of review that the chartering authority must conduct to evaluate whether the charter school is eligible for renewal of its charter;

**WHEREAS**, for charter schools designated as middle-performing, the District must evaluate the following: (1) the charter school’s performance on the state and local indicators on the California School Dashboard, both on a schoolwide basis and for all student subgroups served by the charter school, giving greater weight to the charter school’s performance on measurements of academic performance, and (2) clear and convincing evidence, as demonstrated by verified data, which shows that the charter school

has either (a) achieved measurable increases in student academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school, or (b) strong post-secondary outcomes (e.g., college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers). If a charter school satisfies such criteria, the Board may grant a renewal term of five years;

**WHEREAS**, the governing board of a school district shall not deny a petition unless it makes written factual findings specific to the particular petition, setting forth specific facts to support one or more of the following findings:

1. The charter school presents an unsound educational program for the students to be enrolled in the charter school.
2. The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.
3. The petition does not contain the number of signatures required by subdivision (a) of Education Code section 47605. *(The signature requirement is not applicable to a renewal petition.)*
4. The petition does not contain an affirmation of each of the required conditions.
5. The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all required elements.
6. The petition does not contain a declaration of whether or not the charter school shall be deemed the exclusive public school employer of the employees of the charter school for purposes of the Educational Employment Relations Act.
7. The charter school is demonstrably unlikely to serve the interests of the entire community in which the school is proposing to locate. *(This finding is not applicable to a renewal petition.)*
8. The school district is not positioned to absorb the fiscal impact of the proposed charter school. *(This finding is not applicable to a renewal petition.)*

**WHEREAS**, the governing board of a school district may deny the renewal of a charter school in the middle-performing tier only upon making the following specific written findings:

1. The school has failed to make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to the school's students; and
2. Closure of the school is in the students' best interests; and
3. The decision provided greater weight to performance on "measurements of academic performance"—the test-based indicators in English-Language Arts and mathematics, the English Learner Progress Indicator, and the Career and College Indicator.

**WHEREAS**, the Charter School is designated as a "middle-performing" charter school by the California Department of Education;

**WHEREAS**, the District has reviewed, evaluated, and considered the academic performance data provided by the Charter School as part of its Renewal Petition; and

**WHEREAS**, in considering the academic performance of the Charter School's students, the District has determined that the Charter School has met the applicable criteria to be eligible for renewal, a summary of which is included in the *Staff Renewal Report* published on March 19, 2025, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Board of Education of the Sacramento City Unified School District does resolve, determine, and order the following:

1. The foregoing recitals are hereby adopted as true and correct.
2. The Board has considered the Renewal Petition of the Charter School, including its academics, finances, operations, and other components, in addition to the criteria for renewal set out in the Education Code.
3. The Board has considered, and approves of, the admissions preferences described in the Renewal Petition.
4. The Board hereby approves the Renewal Petition for a five-year term, beginning on July 1, 2025, and ending on June 30, 2030, subject to the findings of fact set forth in the *Staff Renewal Report* published on March 19, 2025 and included in Exhibit A to this Resolution, which includes the Charter School's obligation to update its local control and accountability plan as required by law.
5. The Board directs District staff and the Charter School to develop a memorandum of understanding addressing the respective rights, roles, and obligations of the parties consistent with the authorizer-charter relationship, which shall be approved by the Board within the first year of the Charter School's renewal term (no later than June 30, 2026).
6. The Superintendent or her designee is authorized and directed to take such action as may be reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose and intent of this Resolution.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the Board of Education on April 10, 2025, at a duly noticed meeting by the following vote:

AYES: \_\_\_\_\_ NOES: \_\_\_\_\_ ABSENT: \_\_\_\_\_ ABSTAIN: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Allen, Superintendent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jasjit Singh, Board President

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
OF THE SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Resolution No. 3485-B**

**Resolution to Approve with Condition the Renewal Petition for  
The MET Sacramento High School**

**WHEREAS**, the approval of charter schools is governed by the Charter Schools Act of 1992, as subsequently amended, codified in Education Code sections 47600 *et seq.*, and the implementing regulations of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations (5 C.C.R. § 11960 *et seq.*);

**WHEREAS**, on January 31, 2025, the Sacramento City Unified School District (“District”) received a petition to renew the charter (“Renewal Petition”) for The MET Sacramento High School, a dependent charter school of the District (“Charter School”);

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on the Renewal Petition was held on March 6, 2025, at which time the District’s Board of Education (“Board”) considered the level of support for the Renewal Petition by teachers employed by the District, other employees of the District, and parents/guardians;

**WHEREAS**, the District’s *Staff Renewal Report* was published on March 19, 2025 which includes staff’s proposed findings of fact based on its evaluation of the Renewal Petition, information from the Charter School’s last charter term, and available student outcome data, a copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated herein by reference;

**WHEREAS**, the Board has convened on April 10, 2025 to consider whether to grant or deny the Renewal Petition;

**WHEREAS**, renewals of charters are governed by the standards and criteria set forth in Education Code sections 47605, 47607, and 47607.2;

**WHEREAS**, the consideration of a renewal petition requires the District to (1) determine whether the charter school meets applicable eligibility requirements using the new accountability criteria under the law and reflected in the California School Dashboard, and (2) evaluate whether the renewal petition meets the standards and criteria set forth in Education Code section 47605;

**WHEREAS**, Education Code section 47607 describes a three-tiered system that categorizes a charter school as a high-performing, middle-performing, or low-performing charter school. The designation of a charter school in a particular tier determines the level of review that the chartering authority must conduct to evaluate whether the charter school is eligible for renewal of its charter;

**WHEREAS**, for charter schools designated as middle-performing, the District must evaluate the following: (1) the charter school’s performance on the state and local indicators on the California School Dashboard, both on a schoolwide basis and for all student subgroups served by the charter school, giving greater weight to the charter school’s performance on measurements of academic performance, and (2) clear and convincing evidence, as demonstrated by verified data, which shows that the charter school has either (a) achieved measurable increases in student academic achievement, as defined by at least one year’s progress for each year in school, or (b) strong post-secondary outcomes (e.g., college enrollment,



persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers). If a charter school satisfies such criteria, the Board may grant a renewal term of five years;

**WHEREAS**, the governing board of a school district shall not deny a petition unless it makes written factual findings specific to the particular petition, setting forth specific facts to support one or more of the following findings:

1. The charter school presents an unsound educational program for the students to be enrolled in the charter school.
2. The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.
3. The petition does not contain the number of signatures required by subdivision (a) of Education Code section 47605. *(The signature requirement is not applicable to a renewal petition.)*
4. The petition does not contain an affirmation of each of the required conditions.
5. The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all required elements.
6. The petition does not contain a declaration of whether or not the charter school shall be deemed the exclusive public school employer of the employees of the charter school for purposes of the Educational Employment Relations Act.
7. The charter school is demonstrably unlikely to serve the interests of the entire community in which the school is proposing to locate. *(This finding is not applicable to a renewal petition.)*
8. The school district is not positioned to absorb the fiscal impact of the proposed charter school. *(This finding is not applicable to a renewal petition.)*

**WHEREAS**, the governing board of a school district may deny the renewal of a charter school in the middle-performing tier only upon making the following specific written findings:

1. The school has failed to make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to the school's students; and
2. Closure of the school is in the students' best interests; and
3. The decision provided greater weight to performance on "measurements of academic performance"—the test-based indicators in English-Language Arts and mathematics, the English Learner Progress Indicator, and the Career and College Indicator.

**WHEREAS**, the Charter School is designated as a "middle-performing" charter school by the California Department of Education;

**WHEREAS**, the District has reviewed, evaluated, and considered the academic performance data provided by the Charter School as part of its Renewal Petition; and

**WHEREAS**, in considering the academic performance of the Charter School's students, the District has determined that the Charter School has met the applicable criteria to be eligible for renewal, a summary of which is included in the *Staff Renewal Report* published on March 19, 2025, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Board of Education of the Sacramento City Unified School District does resolve, determine, and order the following:

1. The foregoing recitals are hereby adopted as true and correct.
2. The Board has considered the Renewal Petition of the Charter School, including its academics, finances, operations, and other components, in addition to the criteria for renewal set out in the Education Code.
3. The Board has considered, and approves of, the admissions preferences described in the Renewal Petition.
4. The Board hereby approves the Renewal Petition for a five-year term, beginning on July 1, 2025, and ending on June 30, 2030, subject to the findings of fact set forth in the *Staff Renewal Report* published on March 19, 2025 and included in Exhibit A to this Resolution, which includes the Charter School's obligation to update its local control and accountability plan as required by law, and also subject to full satisfaction of the following condition which must be met by the Charter School:
  - a. The Charter School shall collaborate with District staff to regularly report to the Board on the Charter School's fiscal condition and steps taken to reach financial sustainability.
5. The Superintendent or her designee shall have authority to determine whether the condition specified above has been effectively met by the Charter School.
6. The Board directs District staff and the Charter School to develop a memorandum of understanding addressing the respective rights, roles, and obligations of the parties consistent with the authorizer-charter relationship, as well as the Charter School's interactions with the District departments, which shall be approved by the Board within the first year of the Charter School's renewal term (no later than June 30, 2026).
7. The Superintendent or her designee is authorized and directed to take such action as may be reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose and intent of this Resolution.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the Board of Education on April 10, 2025, at a duly noticed meeting by the following vote:

AYES: \_\_\_\_\_ NOES: \_\_\_\_\_ ABSENT: \_\_\_\_\_ ABSTAIN: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Allen, Superintendent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jasjit Singh, Board President