

## Response to Grand Jury Report Form

Report Title: oversight of Charter Schools Authorized by Ventura County School Districts and VCOE

Report Date: April 6, 2020

Response by: Charmon Evans Title: Executive Director

### FINDINGS / CONCLUSIONS

- I (we) agree with the Facts / Conclusions numbered: \_\_\_\_\_
- I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the Facts / Conclusions numbered: C-01  
(Attach a statement specifying any portions of the Facts / Conclusions that are disputed; including an explanation of the reasons.)

### RECOMMENDATIONS

- Recommendations numbered R-01 R-04 have been implemented.  
(Attach a summary describing the implemented actions and date completed.)
- Recommendations number \_\_\_\_\_ have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.  
(Attach a time frame for the implementation.)
- Recommendations numbered \_\_\_\_\_ require further analysis.
- Recommendations numbered R-05 will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable.

Date: 6/26/2020

Signed: 

Number of pages attached: 2



# UNIVERSITY PREPARATION CHARTER SCHOOL AT CSU CHANNEL ISLANDS

1099 Bedford Drive

Camarillo CA, 93010

805-482-4608 - phone \*\*\*\* 805-512-8149 - fax

---

June 26, 2020

RE: Grand Jury Final Report: Oversight of Charter Schools Authorized by Ventura County School Districts and the Ventura County Office of Education  
Response Requested for: C-04, R-01, R-04, and R-05

## Findings/Conclusions

### I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the Facts/Conclusions numbered:

**C-04** – Our schools does have a representative from our Authorizer, PVSD, and we have a representative from Ventura County Office of Education our board, but I do think that there can be a conflict of interest if the representative from the authorizer is a current employee of the authorizer. There are times where a charter and an authorizer may disagree and if the representative from the authorizer is a current employee, they may find it hard to act in the best interest of the charter as a sworn director of the charter. In our board by-laws it states that the authorizer position, on the board, CANNOT be a current employee of the district. This has worked well for us.

## Recommendations:

### All Recommendations have been fully implemented.

**R-01** – PVSD already uses the FCMAT tool for our annual review

**R-04** – We do have a representative from PVSD, but it is stated in our board by-laws that this is NOT a current PVSD employee in order to avoid a conflict of interest situation.

### Recommendations that will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable.

**R-05** – While we do have a PVSD representative and a VCOE representative on our board I do not agree that this should be recommended to be included in a charter petition. I think charter authorizers play a different role than charter boards and each are equally important for checks and balances. A charter board provides governance similar to a district or county school board. According to the document published in March 2019 by the Charter Task Force, Hon. Tony Thurmond, State Superintendent of Public Instruction entitled, *Overview of Charter Schools In California*, charter authorizers have five basic responsibilities (1) identify a contact person at the charter school; (2) visit the charter school at least annually; (3) ensure the charter school completes all required reports, including the Local Control and Accountability Plan; (4) monitor the charter school's finances; and (5) notify the SBE if a charter is renewed, revoked, or the

school closes. I think it is very important that for these two groups, in order to fulfill their responsibilities and very different but key roles, are kept separate. This is why, although we have a PVSD representative on our board, it is NOT a current PVSD employee.