



American Indian  
Model Schools  
*A School at Work!*

**AIPCS I & II**

*Downtown Oakland Campus*

171 12th Street  
Oakland, CA 94607

Phone: 510.893.8701  
Fax: 510.893.0345  
Website: aimschools.org

**AIPHS**

*Lakeview Campus*

746 Grand Avenue  
Oakland, CA 94610

Phone: 510.893.8701  
Fax: 510.893.0345  
Website: aimschools.org

May 1, 2019

Via E-mail: [sonali.murarka@ousd.org](mailto:sonali.murarka@ousd.org)

Sonali Murarka  
Office of Charter Schools  
Oakland Unified School District  
1000 Broadway, Suite 639  
Oakland, CA 94607

**Re: *American Indian Public Charter School II  
Response to District's Final Offer  
Proposition 39 2019-2020***

Dear Ms. Murarka:

American Indian Public Charter School II ("AIPCS II" or "Charter School") is in receipt of the Oakland Unified School District's ("District") April 1, 2019 letter ("Final Offer") regarding AIPCS II's request for facilities under Proposition 39 ("Prop. 39") for the 2019-2020 school year.

The District's Final Offer is for a total of eleven (11) teaching stations, including one (1) specialized classroom, at Webster Middle School, and 43.6% shared use of the non-teaching station space at Webster, six (6) teaching stations, including three (3) specialized classrooms, and 32.1% shared use of the non-teaching station space, at Hoover Elementary School, and ten (10) teaching stations and 49.9% shared use of the non-teaching station space, at Brookfield Elementary School. The Final Offer is based on a projected in-District ADA of 551.95.

Section 11969.9(i) of the Prop. 39 Implementing Regulations (the "Implementing Regulations") requires the Charter School to notify the District whether or not the Charter School intends to occupy the offered space. Accordingly, as a result of the deficiencies in the Final Offer (which are identified herein to the extent practicable, with all rights reserved) and as set forth in the response to the Preliminary Offer ("Response"), which is incorporated here by reference, the Charter School declines the offered space, without waiving any of its legal rights under applicable local, state, or federal law, including Proposition 39 rights and remedies. The District should be aware that one of the primary reasons for its declination of the offered space is the very negative experience that Charter School representatives experienced during their walk-through of Hoover Elementary School, which included protests outside the school, signs in every classroom and hallway making clear that the Charter School was not welcome on the site, and individuals being included on the walk-through who were not representatives of the District, school or the Charter

School, all of which made the Charter School concerned for its students and staff should it co-locate at Hoover.

### **The District's Teaching Station to ADA Analysis**

While AIPCS II has declined the offer, AIPCS II will still take this opportunity to note ongoing concerns with the teaching station to ADA ratio calculated by the District.

### **The District's Use of a Weighting Factor Is Inconsistent with the Language and Intent of Prop. 39.**

The District continues to use a weighting factor in calculating its teaching station to ADA ratio for the comparison schools, arguing that the weighting factor “more accurately reflect the ADA-to-classroom ratio of the average student attending the comparison schools...which factors in the relative proportion that each comparison school's ADA contributes to the total comparison group ADA.”

AIPCS II does not agree that using a weighted average more accurately captures the individual experience of students at the comparison schools, given that in fact it gives more weight to the larger number of students who occupy schools that have higher enrollment and are more crowded. In fact, AIPCS II students would be more likely to enroll in the schools with smaller enrollments as these schools likely have more available space.

However, whether or not the District believes use of a weighted average more accurately reflects a student's experience at the comparison schools, very simply, the clear language of the Prop. 39 regulations and the applicable case law do not contemplate or provide for use of a weighted average. 5 CCR Section 11969.3(b)(1) states that “School district ADA shall be determined using projections for the fiscal year and grade levels for which facilities are requested” – and does not state that any adjustments to this ADA can be made. It also requires use of the inventory established pursuant to 2 CCR 1859.30 to determine the number of teaching stations – again, without any weighting adjustment.

The District further claims that AIPCS II “indicated that schools with a higher ADA would always have a lower ADA-to-classroom ratio.” This is not what the Response said. In fact, as is exemplified by the District's Final Offers, the Response stated that the District's larger schools would have a higher teaching station to ADA ratio, as they are more crowded, and that higher teaching station to ADA ratio. Thus, by weighting these schools more than smaller schools, this results in fewer teaching stations for the charter school – which is likely why the District chose to add this extra step to the Prop. 39 analysis.

Lastly, AIPCS II notes that in every Final Offer, using the weighting factor results in a reduction of the amount of space owed to a charter school.

Prop. 39 Does Not Allow the District to Pull Out Special Day Classes from the Teaching Station to ADA Ratio Calculation, and Then Not Include Them Anywhere Else.

The District has entirely removed all of its Special Day Class ADA and facilities from its Prop. 39 analysis and allocation of space to AIPCS II, thus denying AIPCS II a reasonably equivalent allocation of special education space, in violation of Prop. 39.

The District's Final Offer states that the District removed both its special day classes and its special day class ADA from the comparison school information in calculating the teaching station to ADA ratio "as these students require a lower ADA-to-classroom ratio than the general student population....Currently, because the Charter School does not serve students who require an SDC setting, the non-SDC ADA-to-classroom ratio is used to determine classroom entitlement for the Charter School. However, if the Charter School served SDC students, space would be allocated for these students based on comparison schools' SDC ADA-to-classroom ratio."

In other words, the District took out a number of teaching stations and ADA from its teaching station to ADA ratio related to its SDC students and facilities, and these spaces were also entirely excluded from every aspect of the District's Prop. 39 analysis.

This is not allowed by Prop. 39 – instead, the District must count and allocate for all of its facilities in the Prop. 39 process, and allocate reasonably equivalent amounts of each kind of space that exists at the comparison schools to the charter school.

More specifically, all public schools, including charter schools, have a legal obligation to provide a "free and appropriate public education" to enrolled students with special needs. (20 U.S.C. § 1401, subd. (9); 20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(1)(A); Cal. Educ. Code § 56040.) The penalties for a failure to do so can be substantial. As is evidenced from the District's own exhibits, each District comparison school site has numerous unique, separate special education spaces which it uses to provide services to District students with special needs.

*Bullis Charter School v. Los Altos School District* (2011) 200 Cal. App. 4th 1022 is extremely clear about the District's obligation to include all these spaces in its analysis:

"[T]he District contends that in the case of nonclassroom facilities, it need only consider those that are common to each of the schools in the comparison group...There is no support in the regulations for this viewpoint....For instance, using the above example, if all five schools had tennis courts, but one school chose to use the area for badminton only, in the District's view, the space would not be considered in the Proposition 39 analysis...This common usage approach could lead to—as has occurred here—the exclusion of a substantial amount of nonteaching station space from the analysis, to the potential detriment of the charter school. We believe that a school district, in determining the amount of nonteaching

station space it must allocate to the charter school, must take an objective look at all of such space available at the schools in the comparison group. A school district may achieve the mandate under Proposition 39 and the regulations of “giv[ing] the same degree of consideration to the needs of charter school students as it does to the students in district-run schools” (*cite*) only if it considers the entire nonclassroom space in the facilities offer. (*Bullis, supra*, at 1047.)

Consistent with the *Bullis* language cited above, the District must include all of the special education spaces at the comparison schools in its analysis, and then allocate a reasonably equivalent amount of those spaces to AIPCS II. (Education Code Section 47614, 5 CCR Section 11969.3(b)(3).) Despite this mandate, the District’s calculation excludes all Special Day Class from its analysis. Had they been included, AIPCS II would be entitled to either additional teaching stations or additional special education space.

The District appears to justify this exclusion by stating that AIPCS II does not serve SDC students, and if it did it would be allocated space for these students. Yet the number of students receiving special education services is irrelevant to the Prop. 39 analysis, and there is a good reason for this. Often, a school will not know until the first day whether a student has special education needs. In addition, many students are found eligible for special education during the school year. Thus, if a school district only had to allocate special education space to a charter school based on documented need, it would be a constantly moving target and students might be denied their rights. Even *California Charter School Association v. Los Angeles Unified School District*, a case about allocation of teaching stations, acknowledges that Prop. 39 does not allow a district to dictate or control a charter school’s specific use of spaces once those spaces are allocated in compliance with the law:

“The Legislature authorized the creation of charter schools in order to promote choice, innovation, and competition on the premise that charter schools, while [\*1241] remaining accountable for student outcomes, would be largely free to adopt different educational approaches and make different decisions than those made by the school districts in which they operate. Counting only those classrooms staffed by an assigned teacher would effectively impute to charter schools the same staffing decisions made by the District. But there is no reason to think a charter school would necessarily use classrooms in the same way that the District does.” (*California Charter Schools Assn. v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist.*, 60 Cal. 4th 1221, 1240-1241.)

As such, the District may not completely exclude Special Day Class spaces from its reasonable equivalence analysis as well as its allocation of space to AIPCS II because it believes AIPCS II does not serve Special Day Class students. Instead, the District should have either included this space in the teaching station to ADA ratio calculation (including SDC ADA as well) or included it in the specialized or non-teaching station space allocations.

**The Final Offer Does Not Allocate Sufficient Specialized Classroom and Non-Teaching Station Space to AIPCS II and Does not Allocate any Special Education Classrooms**

As stated in detail in the Response, AIPCS II is entitled to reasonable allocations of specialized and non-teaching station space. Section 11969.3(b)(2) requires that, if a school district includes specialized classroom space, such as science laboratories, in its classroom inventory, the Proposition 39 offer of facilities provided to a charter school must include a share of the specialized classroom space. The Final Offer must include “a share of the specialized classroom space and/or a provision for access to reasonably equivalent specialized classroom space.” (5 CCR § 11969.3(b)(2).) The amount of specialized classroom space allocated and/or the access to specialized classroom space provided shall be determined based on three factors:

1. the grade levels of the charter school’s in-district students;
2. the charter school’s total in-district classroom ADA; and
3. the per-student amount of specialized classroom space in the comparison group schools.<sup>1</sup>

As such, the District must allocate specialized classroom space, such as science laboratories, art rooms, computer labs, music rooms, weight rooms, etc., commensurate with the in-District classroom ADA of AIPCS II. The allocated site must include all of the specialized classroom space included across all of the different grade levels.

In addition, the District must provide non-teaching station space commensurate with the in-District classroom ADA of AIPCS II and the per-student amount of non-teaching station space in the comparison group schools. (5 CCR § 11969.3(b)(3).) Non-teaching space is all of the space at the comparison school that is not identified as teaching station space or specialized space and includes, but is not limited to, administrative space, a kitchen/cafeteria, a multi-purpose room, a library, a staff lounge, a copy room, storage space, bathrooms, a parent meeting room, special education space, nurse’s office, RSP space, and play area/athletic space, including gymnasiums, athletic fields, locker rooms, and pools or tennis courts. (*Ibid.*)

The allocation of specialized teaching space and non-teaching space is based on an analysis of the square footage of each category of space available to students at the comparison schools (i.e., “the per-student amount of specialized classroom space in the comparison group schools”). (5 CCR § 11969.3(b)(2)(C).)

a. **Allocation of Specialized Classroom Space to AIPCS II.**

---

<sup>1</sup> *Id.*; see also *Bullis Charter School v. Los Altos School Dist.* (2011) 200 Cal.App.4th 296 (“*Bullis*”) and *California School Bds. Assn. v. State Bd. of Education* (2010) 191 Cal.App.4th 530 (“*CSBA*”).

The Final Offer again does not allocate sufficient specialized classroom space to AIPCS II, instead claiming that AIPCS II is “underallocated” specialized classroom space by 1,474 square feet. While AIPCS II accepts the District’s offer of space, it will note its ongoing concerns with the allocation as the Final Offer did not substantively address the concerns outlined in the Response.

First, the District states that its process for allocation is correct because specialized classrooms can be included as a “subset” of teaching station space, and then states that “[i]f the specialized classroom allocation should, in fact, not be considered a subset of the classroom allocation, then all specialized classrooms should be removed prior to calculating the ADA to-classroom ratio, an argument the Charter School has not made.”

This statement is very strange, given that in the Preliminary Proposals, the District literally removed all specialized classrooms from its ADA to classroom ratio calculation. Exhibit C to the Preliminary Proposal categorized all science lab space, art/music/band rooms, computer labs and other specialized technology rooms as specialized classroom space, and did not include them in the teaching station to ADA ratio. As proof, please see the Response, which identifies the number of teaching stations used by the District in the teaching station to ADA ratio calculation. These numbers are different from the number of teaching stations identified for each comparison school in the Final Offer.

Moreover, AIPCS II did specifically state in its Response that specialized classrooms should be categorized, counted and allocated separately from regular teaching stations, as these rooms have specialized furnishings and equipment (for example lab stations in a science classroom) that do not exist in general education teaching stations, and which are necessary for certain kinds of instruction. For example, science classrooms typically have lab stations and gas and water hookups; not only do general education classrooms not have these furnishings and equipment, but it would be difficult if not impossible to teach lab science without this specialized space. Therefore, inclusion of these spaces in the teaching station to ADA ratio is not only not contemplated by Prop. 39, but an allocation of extra general education classrooms instead of actual specialized classroom space would not be reasonably equivalent.

The District’s very limited reference to 5 CCR Section 11969.3(b)(2) (which ignores the second portion of the section) does not suggest, as the District claims, that specialized classrooms should be included in the teaching station to ADA ratio analysis without also ensuring that a charter school has access to reasonably equivalent specialized classroom space. If that were the case, the regulation would not provide for a different formula for calculating reasonably equivalent specialized classroom space (based on square feet per ADA at the comparison schools) and for calculating the appropriate number of teaching stations. The regulation states that “If the school district includes specialized classroom space, such as science laboratories, in its classroom inventory, the space allocation provided pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) shall include a share of the specialized classroom space and/or a provision for access to reasonably equivalent

specialized classroom space.” The “classroom inventory” referenced (the SAB 50-02) is the inventory prepared pursuant to 2 CCR Section 1859.31, which includes all facilities and classrooms of all kinds in the school district’s inventory of facilities.

5 CCR Section 11969.3(b)(2) then goes on to state that “[t]he amount of specialized classroom space allocated and/or the access to specialized classroom space provided shall be determined based on three factors:

- (A) the grade levels of the charter school’s in-district students;
- (B) the charter school’s total in-district classroom ADA; and
- (C) the per-student amount of specialized classroom space in the comparison group schools.

Thus, the regulation is simply saying that if the District’s facilities, as identified in the SAB 50-02, include specialized classroom spaces such as science labs, the District must then perform the per-square-foot analysis of all of these kinds of spaces, and ensure that the square footage allocated to the charter school is reasonably equivalent.

It appears the District is now claiming that it did count these rooms in the teaching station to ADA ratio calculation in the Final Offer, and thus as long as the number of allocated teaching stations includes a square footage of specialized classroom space, it is reasonably equivalent.

However, the actual data included in the Final Offer and as exhibits to the Final Offer show that the District did not actually do this. The District appears to suggest that its Exhibit C counted all rooms that were either general education classrooms or specialized classrooms (see the column “Consider as Classroom” of the Rooms Inventory tab in Exhibit C).

Yet, for each comparison school, if one counts the number of rooms marked YES under the column “Consider as Classroom” of the Rooms Inventory tab in Exhibit C, which was supposedly used by the District to prepare Table 7, those numbers differ from the “Classrooms Provided to Students” in Table 7. As a result, the District did not actually count the number of total classrooms, including specialized classrooms, when determining the teaching station to ADA ratio:

	<b>“Classrooms Provided to Students” from Final Offer</b>	<b>Actual Number of Rooms Under “Consider as Classrooms”<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Claimed Projected ADA</b>	<b>Corrected Teaching Station to ADA Ratio</b>

<sup>2</sup> Does not include rooms identified as “SpEd Special Day Classroom,” as well as “SpEd Life Skills Lab” and “SpEd Resource Room.”

<b>Sankofa Academy</b>	12	14	160.23	11.45
<b>Emerson Elementary</b>	17	18	277.59	15.42
<b>Lincoln Elementary</b>	30	30	716.93	23.90
<b>Piedmont Avenue Elementary</b>	18	19	315.53	16.61
<b>Chabot Elementary</b>	25	26	559.76	21.53
<b>Hillcrest School</b>	13	15	278.99	18.60
<b>Peralta Elementary</b>	14	15	319.58	21.31
<b>Kaiser Elementary</b>	11	12	252.86	21.07
<b>Hillcrest School</b>	13	14	104.38	20.39
<b>Claremont Middle School</b>	19	20	443.31	22.17
<b>Westlake Middle School</b>	26	35	236.32	6.7
<b>Average</b>				<b>18.10</b>

Thus, the District must include all classrooms, specialized or otherwise, in the teaching station to ADA ratio calculation and then use the corrected teaching station to ADA ratio to allocate classrooms, and it must separately calculate the number of square feet of specialized classroom space at the comparison schools, determine the number of square feet per ADA provided to students at the comparison schools, and allocate space based on this number.

Lastly, the District has also used a weighting factor for the allocation of specialized classroom space. For the reasons outlined in the teaching station to ADA ratio section, this is not consistent with the actual language nor intent of Prop. 39, and in every case results in a reduction of space allocated to a charter school.

b. Allocation of Non-Teaching Station Space to AIPCS II

As the District has not substantively responded to AIPCS II' concerns in the Response related to the allocation of non-teaching station space, AIPCS II will only incorporate the Response by reference.

Pro Rata Charge Worksheet

For all the reasons enumerated in the Response, AIPCS II does not believe the District may separately charge it for custodial services or utilities for the site, and even if for purposes of argument it does agree to separate charges, it is not appropriate for these costs to be based on a proportion of ADA at the site. Instead, it should be based on the actual square footage occupied by AIPCS II on the site, as this more accurately reflects the amount of utilities and other costs consumed by each program.



Prop. 39 requires the pro rata share to be based on “actual facilities costs in the year preceding the fiscal year in which facilities are provided” (5 CCR Section 11969.7(d)); as the current pro rata share is based on 18-19 “working budget,” it would need be updated once the 18-19 budget is final.

Lastly, there are certain terms of the Facilities Use Agreement that need to be addressed for future reference:

1. **Section 1.7:** This section is a new addition to the FUA and has never existed in a District FUA before, and AIPCS II would not agree to this language (nor would it agree to the language placing a grade range restriction on AIPCS II outside the grade ranges served by the school). Once the space has been allocated, AIPCS II can use it for whichever students, and in whatever grade configuration it deems necessary for its program. Prop. 39 does not allow the District to take space away from the Charter School once that space has been offered by the District and accepted. This section is also not consistent with the definition of overallocation in the Prop. 39 regulations, which is based on the school’s total in-District ADA at P-2, not the in-District ADA accommodated on the site.
2. **Section 3:** The FUA proposes monthly payments, yet the Final Offer proposes quarterly payments.
3. **Section 8:** The District carves out a limitation on AIPCS II using the Site related to joint use agreements that were “entered into between the District and a third party prior to January 1 of the school year to the Term.” The District has provided no other information as to whether such a Joint Use Agreement exists at the Site. Without knowing this information, and how this will affect AIPCS II’ access to the Site, AIPCS II could not agree to this provision.
4. **Section 10:** Given how this section has been changed, the District needs to provide some assurance or warranty in the FUA that the Site can be used as a public school facility.
5. **Section 18:** This section should also apply to the District.
6. **Section 22:** This section currently states that AIPCS II can only install “an onsite sign” on the campus. AIPCS II assumes that it was not the District’s intent to limit its signage ability to a single sign on campus.

*Sonali Murarka*  
*Office of Charter Schools*  
*Re: American Indian Public Charter School*  
*Response to District's Final Offer*  
*Proposition 39 2019-2020*  
*May 1, 2019*  
*Page 10*

We have attempted in this letter to enumerate all of our concerns with the District's Final Offer; however, we note that our failure to mention a concern in this letter should not be interpreted as acceptance of that term. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Respectfully,

*P.P. [Signature]*

Superintendent Maya Woods-Cadiz  
American Indian Model School

Cc: Sarah Kollman, Young, Minney & Corr, LLP  
AIMS' Board Members