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## Subject

Consideration of Determination of Funding Requests with “Reasonable Basis”/Mitigating Circumstances as Required for Nonclassroom-Based Charter Schools Pursuant to California *Education Code* Sections 47612.5 and 47634.2, and Associated *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5.

## Type of Action

Action, Information

## Summary of the Issue

California *Education Code* (*EC*)sections 47612.5 and 47634.2 established the eligibility requirements for apportionment funding for charter schools that offer nonclassroom-based (NCB) instruction. The statutes specify that a charter school that offers NCB instruction in excess of the amount authorized by *EC* Section 47612.5(e)(1) may receive apportionment funding for NCB instruction only if a determination of funding is made by the California State Board of Education (SBE).

Pursuant to *California Code of Regulations*, Title 5 (5 *CCR*), the California Department of Education (CDE) reviews a charter school’s determination of funding request and presents it for consideration to the Advisory Commission on Charter Schools (ACCS). The ACCS shall develop a recommendation to the SBE, and the CDE shall present that recommendation to the SBE. The ACCS may include the consideration of mitigating circumstances in conjunction with a recommendation to the SBE, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 11963.4(e).

This item considers determination of funding requests with mitigating circumstances from six charter schools.

## Proposed Recommendation

The CDE proposes to recommend that the SBE take the following actions, which are further detailed in Attachment 1:

1. Approve the determination of funding requests for three charter schools at a funding level higher than what they qualify to receive pursuant to regulatory criteria, with the consideration of mitigating circumstances, for two fiscal years
2. Approve the determination of funding requests for three charter schools at the funding levels for which they qualify to receive pursuant to regulatory criteria, for two fiscal years

## Funding Determination Criteria

*EC* Section 47634.2(a)(1) provides the following:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount of funding to be allocated to a charter school on the basis of average daily attendance that is generated by pupils engaged in nonclassroom-based instruction…shall be adjusted by the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education shall adopt regulations setting forth criteria for the determination of funding for nonclassroom-based instruction, at a minimum the regulation shall specify that the nonclassroom-based instruction is conducted for the instructional benefit of the pupil and substantially dedicated to that function. In developing these criteria and determining the amount of funding to be allocated to a charter school pursuant to this section, the State Board of Education shall consider, among other factors it deems appropriate, the amount of the charter school’s total budget expended on certificated employee salaries and benefits and on schoolsites, as defined in paragraph (3) of subdivision (d) of Section 47612.5, and the teacher-to-pupil ratio in the school.

*EC* Section 47634.2(a)(4) further states:

For the 2003–04 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, the amount of funding determined by the State Board of Education pursuant to this section shall not be more than 70 percent of the unadjusted amount to which a charter school would otherwise be entitled, unless the State Board of Education determines that a greater or lesser amount is appropriate based on the criteria specified in paragraph (1) of subdivision (a).

Pursuant to *EC* Section 47634.2 and SBE-adopted regulations, a charter school may qualify for 70 percent, 85 percent, or 100 percent funding, or may be denied funding (i.e., 0 percent) for its NCB instruction.

To qualify for a recommendation of 100 percent funding, a charter school must meet the following criteria as outlined in 5 *CCR* Section 11963.4(a)(3):

* Spend at least 40 percent of the charter school’s public revenues on salaries and benefits for all employees who possess a valid teaching certificate, permit, or other document equivalent to that which a teacher in other public schools would be required to hold issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and who work in the charter school in a position required to provide direct instruction or direct instructional support to students
* Spend at least 80 percent of the charter school’s total revenues on instruction and related services
* Maintain a ratio of average daily attendance (ADA) for independent study pupils to full-time certificated employees responsible for independent study that does not exceed a pupil-teacher ratio (PTR) of 25:1 or the PTR of the largest unified school district in the county or counties in which the charter school operates

The expenditure and PTR criteria for all funding levels for which a charter school may qualify to receive for its NCB instruction are specified in 5 *CCR* Section 11963.4(a). A summary of the criteria is provided in the table below:

*Nonclassroom-Based Instruction Funding Levels*

| **Funding Level** | **Percentage Spent on Certificated Salaries and Benefits** | **Percentage Spent on Instruction and Related Services** | **PTR[[1]](#footnote-1)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100%** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 80 | ≤ 25 to 1 |
| **85%** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 70 | Not Applicable |
| **70%** | ≥ 35 | ≥ 60 | Not Applicable |
| **0%** | < 35 | < 60 | Not Applicable |

### Mitigating Circumstances

The ACCS may find that there is a “reasonable basis” (also referred to as mitigating circumstances) by which to make a recommendation other than what a charter school qualifies to receive for its NCB instruction based on the criteria specified in 5 *CCR* Section 11963.4(a). Specifically, 5 *CCR* Section 11963.4(e) allows the ACCS to consider “documented data regarding individual circumstances of the charter school” and provides examples of the types of mitigating circumstances that the ACCS might consider, which may include, but are not limited to, the following:

* Information provided by the charter school, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 11963.3(b)(2) through (8)
  + PTR, calculated pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 11704
  + Listing of entities receiving $50,000 or 10 percent or more of total expenditures
  + Identification of governing board members
  + Explanation of outgo transfers; explanation of reserves, if over the allowable amount
  + Facility costs and square footage
  + Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) employees with a valid teaching certificate
* Documented data regarding individual circumstances of the charter school (e.g., one-time or unique or exceptional expenses for facilities, acquisition of a charter school bus, acquisition and installation of computer hardware not related to the instructional program, special education charges levied on the charter school by a local educational agency, restricted state, federal, or private grants of funds awarded to the charter school that cannot be expended for teacher salaries, or contracted instructional services other than those for special education)
* The size of the charter school
* The number of years the charter school has been in operation

Additionally, under 5 *CCR* Section 11963.4(e), the ACCS shall give charter schools with less than a total of 100 units of prior year second period ADA or that are in their first year of operation serious consideration of 100 percent funding for their NCB instruction.

When considering a charter school’s request for mitigating circumstances, the CDE also reviews other information provided by the charter school as a part of its determination of funding request. Additionally, the CDE may consider a charter school’s previous requests that included mitigating circumstances.

### Funding Periods

A determination of funding may not exceed five years, pursuant to *EC* Section 47612.5(d)(2). For a new charter school in its first year of operation, a funding determination shall be for a period of two fiscal years, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 11963.6(a). For an existing charter school with an active funding determination, a funding determination shall be in increments of a minimum of two years and a maximum of five years in length, pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 11963.6(c).

Regarding five-year funding periods, *EC* Section 47612.5(d)(2) provides the following:

A charter school that has achieved a rank of six or greater on the Academic Performance Index for the two years immediately prior to receiving a funding determination…shall receive a five-year determination.

Based on the CDE’s interpretation of statute and regulations, the CDE recommends a funding period between two to four years for an existing charter school with an active funding determination. Because the Academic Performance Index is no longer calculated, the CDE does not recommend five-year funding determination periods.

For a charter school requesting the consideration of mitigating circumstances, the CDE typically recommends a funding determination period of two years. A period of two years allows the CDE to revisit a charter school’s funding determination sooner, ensure that the charter school meets the expenditure criteria for its approved level of funding for its NCB instruction, and follow up on other matters reported by the charter school in its determination of funding request.

## Review of Funding Determination Requests

Based on reported fiscal year (FY) 2023–24 data, the charter schools presented in this item do not meet the regulatory requirements to qualify for their requested level funding of 100 percent for their NCB instruction without the consideration of mitigating circumstances. A summary of each charter school’s mitigating circumstances as well as links to each charter school’s determination of funding request, is provided below.

If a charter school’s determination of funding request is approved, the charter school will be eligible to receive funding for its ADA generated through NCB instruction as approved by the SBE, pursuant to *EC* Section 47634.2(c).

If a charter school’s determination of funding request is approved at a funding level lower than requested, the CDE notes that pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 11963.6(g),

If, during the effective period of a determination of funding, a charter school wishes to seek a higher or lower determination of funding, it shall do so by the filing of a new determination of funding request. During the effective period of a charter school's determination of funding, no more than one additional determination of funding request (which would replace the determination of funding then in effect) may be submitted by the charter school in the same fiscal year.

### Recommendations for Approval at a Higher Level of Funding

The CDE finds a reasonable basis for the charter schools included in this section to be approved for a higher level of funding than for which they qualify to receive pursuant to regulatory criteria. Therefore, the CDE proposes to recommend that the SBE approve the charter schools’ determination of funding requests at a funding level higher than what they qualify to receive pursuant to regulatory criteria, with the consideration of mitigating circumstances, for two fiscal years.

#### Butterfield Charter (Charter #0867)

The following table provides the regulatory criteria for funding levels and the charter school’s expenditures percentage calculations and PTR as reported in its determination of funding request.

Butterfield Charter Nonclassroom-Based Instruction Funding Qualification

| **Criteria** | **Percentage Spent on Certificated Salaries and Benefits** | **Percentage Spent on Instruction and Related Services** | **PTR** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100 Percent** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 80 | ≤ 25 to 1 |
| **85 Percent** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 70 | Not Applicable |
| **70 Percent** | ≥ 35 | ≥ 60 | Not Applicable |
| **Charter School** | 50.09 | 59.83 | 18.27 to 1 |

Without the consideration of mitigating circumstances, the charter school’s determination of funding request shall be recommended for denial, which would mean the charter school would not receive funding for its NCB instruction.

The charter school’s complete determination of funding request with mitigating circumstances is provided on the June 2025 ACCS Meeting Agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cs/documents/accs-jun25item02a2.docx>. Mitigating circumstances cited by the charter school include the following:

* The charter school cites “rapid growth in enrollment,” which resulted in the charter school’s LCFF revenue being higher than originally budgeted. The charter school states that it was “unable to scale expenditures at the same pace”.
* The charter school states that hiring teachers in the middle of the year was difficult.
* The charter school notes various facility projects, including $1.3 million for an emergency roof repair and $45,000 for a parking area median repair and landscaping project. The charter school also notes, “Other projects in the amount of $500,000 include but are not limited to classroom equipment purchases and signage for the charter school.”

The CDE finds that there is a reasonable basis to recommend a higher level of funding than what the charter school qualifies for according to the regulatory criteria.

The CDE acknowledges that the charter school allocated significant funds toward various facility projects, including an emergency roof repair, which may have affected the charter school’s expenditure percentages. Pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 11963.4(e), one-time or unique or exceptional expenses for facilities may provide a reasonable basis for a recommendation other than one that results from the regulatory criteria.

The CDE also acknowledges that the charter school experienced enrollment growth, which caused revenues to be greater than what was originally budgeted, and that the charter school found it difficult to hire teachers in the middle of the year. The charter school states that all positions that were needed but not immediately filled in FY 2023–24 were filled in FY 2024–25.

The CDE therefore proposes to recommend that the charter school receive 100 percent funding for its NCB instruction for two years.

#### Liberty Independent Study (Charter #2102)

The following table provides the regulatory criteria for funding levels and the charter school’s expenditures percentage calculations and PTR as reported in its determination of funding request.

Liberty Independent Study Nonclassroom-Based Instruction Funding Qualification

| **Criteria** | **Percentage Spent on Certificated Salaries and Benefits** | **Percentage Spent on Instruction and Related Services** | **PTR** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100 Percent** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 80 | ≤ 25 to 1 |
| **85 Percent** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 70 | Not Applicable |
| **70 Percent** | ≥ 35 | ≥ 60 | Not Applicable |
| **Charter School** | 151.08 | 25.09 | 0.75 to 1 |

Without the consideration of mitigating circumstances, the charter school’s determination of funding request shall be recommended for denial, which would mean the charter school would not receive funding for its NCB instruction.

The charter school’s complete determination of funding request with mitigating circumstances is provided on the June 2025 ACCS Meeting Agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cs/documents/accs-jun25item02a3.docx>. Mitigating circumstances cited by the charter school include the following:

* The charter school cites low enrollment.

The CDE finds that there is a reasonable basis to recommend a higher level of funding than what the charter school qualifies for according to the regulatory criteria.

Pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 11963.4(e),

The Advisory Commission on Charter Schools shall give charter schools with less than a total of one hundred (100) units of prior year second period average daily attendance or that are in their first year of operation serious consideration of full funding.

The CDE notes that the charter school’s FY 2023–24 P-2 ADA was reported as 0.03. The charter school states that the reason for the low enrollment is that no teacher was employed at the charter school during FY 2023–24 because the teacher employed at the charter school during FY 2022–23 left. The charter authorizer, Liberty Elementary School District, is currently supplying a teacher as needed to supervise students, but the charter school cannot enroll additional students until a teacher is hired. The charter school states that it has two students enrolled in FY 2024–25 and plans to hire a teacher by the end of FY 2024–25.

The CDE therefore proposes to recommend that the charter school receive 100 percent funding for its NCB instruction for two years.

#### West Park Charter Academy (Charter #0044)

The following table provides the regulatory criteria for funding levels and the charter school’s expenditures percentage calculations and PTR as reported on its funding determination form.

West Park Charter Academy Nonclassroom-Based Instruction Funding Qualification

| **Criteria** | **Percentage Spent on Certificated Salaries and Benefits** | **Percentage Spent on Instruction and Related Services** | **PTR** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100 Percent** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 80 | ≤ 25 to 1 |
| **85 Percent** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 70 | Not Applicable |
| **70 Percent** | ≥ 35 | ≥ 60 | Not Applicable |
| **Charter School** | 63.91 | 70.80 | 15.69 to 1 |

Without the consideration of mitigating circumstances, the charter school qualifies for 85 percent funding for its NCB instruction.

The charter school’s complete determination of funding request with mitigating circumstances is provided on the June 2025 ACCS Meeting Agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cs/documents/accs-jun25item02a7.docx>. Mitigating circumstances cited by the charter school include the following:

* The charter school received in FY 2023–24 one-time federal and state funding from the following sources: Arts, Music, & Instructional Materials Block Grant, Every Student Succeeds Act, and Ethnic Studies.
* The charter school states that “the pandemic and lack of strong leadership has caused disruptions to program processes and timelines, which include difficulties in filling staffing vacancies in a timely manner and providing support to staff and students”.
* The charter school states that there were instruction and instruction-related vacancies that could not be filled, despite being advertised, until later in the year or at all.
* The charter school stated its intent to spend down its reserves by “purchasing curriculum as needed”, “purchasing other supplemental materials for students (to address students’ learning loss caused by the pandemic”, “hiring additional staff to accelerate student learning and advancement”, and offering “additional tutoring for students during Winter Break and Summer Break”.

The CDE finds that there is a reasonable basis to recommend a higher level of funding than what the charter school qualifies for according to the regulatory criteria.

The charter school received $179,795 in one-time funding that had a direct impact on the charter school’s expenditure calculations. However, had the one-time funding not been received, the charter school’s expenditure calculations would have been 68.37 percent and 75.47 percent, which meets the expenditure criteria for 85 percent funding.

The charter school estimates that had the open positions been filled, the charter school would have spent an additional $741,000 on instruction and related services; this would have caused the charter school’s calculated expenditure percentages to have been 63.91 percent and 96.29 percent, which would have qualified the charter school for a 100 percent funding recommendation.

Had the one-time funding not been received and the open positions had been filled, the charter school’s calculated expenditure percentages would have been 68.37 percent and 102.64 percent, which would have qualified the charter school for a 100 percent funding recommendation.

The CDE therefore proposes to recommend that the charter school receive 100 percent funding for its NCB instruction for two years.

### Recommendation for Approval at the Funding Level for Which It Qualifies

The CDE does not find a reasonable basis for the charter schools in this section to be funded at a higher level of funding than for which they qualify pursuant to regulatory criteria. As such, the CDE proposes to recommend that the SBE deny the charter schools’ requests to consider mitigating circumstances and approve the determination of funding requests at the funding levels for which they qualify pursuant to regulatory criteria, for two years.

#### Opportunity Youth Academy (Charter #1840)

The following table provides the regulatory criteria for funding levels and the charter school’s expenditures percentage calculations and PTR as reported in its determination of funding request.

Opportunity Youth Academy Nonclassroom-Based Instruction Funding Qualification

| **Criteria** | **Percentage Spent on Certificated Salaries and Benefits** | **Percentage Spent on Instruction and Related Services** | **PTR** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100 Percent** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 80 | ≤ 25 to 1 |
| **85 Percent** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 70 | Not Applicable |
| **70 Percent** | ≥ 35 | ≥ 60 | Not Applicable |
| **Charter School** | 109.67 | 72.51 | 28.70 to 1 |

Without the consideration of mitigating circumstances, the charter school qualifies for 85 percent funding for its NCB instruction.

The charter school’s complete determination of funding request with mitigating circumstances is provided on the June 2025 ACCS Meeting Agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cs/documents/accs-jun25item02a4.docx>. Mitigating circumstances cited by the charter school include the following:

* The charter school states, “The teacher to pupil ratio at the charter school is higher than the local school district requiring a higher funding level.”
* The charter school received one-time funding in FY 2022–23.

The CDE finds that there is not a reasonable basis to recommend a higher level of funding than what the charter school qualifies for according to the regulatory criteria. The CDE notes that one-time funding received in FY 2022–23 would not have a direct impact on the charter school’s funding determination calculations, which are based on FY 2023–24 financial data.

The CDE also notes that the charter school’s PTR was reported as 28.70. Pursuant to 5 *CCR* Section 11963.3(a)(3), one requirement to qualify for a recommendation for 100 percent funding is as follows:

[The] ratio of average daily attendance for independent study pupils to full-time certificated employees responsible for independent study does not exceed a pupil-teacher ratio of 25:1 or the equivalent ratio of pupils to full-time certificated employees for all other educational programs operated by the largest unified school district, as measured by average daily attendance, in the county or counties in which the charter school operates

On the Funding Determination Form, the charter school did not cite a unified school district that reported a higher PTR than 28.70. The CDE asked the charter school for clarification on this matter, and the charter school stated that San Jose Unified School District reported a PTR greater than 25 to 1. However, the CDE finds that the charter school did not provide satisfactory documentation indicating that San Jose Unified School District’s PTR, as measured by average daily attendance, is equal to or greater than the charter school’s PTR. The charter school has not responded to the CDE’s requests for further clarification regarding its PTR.

The charter school did not otherwise provide a reasonable basis to recommend a higher level of funding than what the charter school qualifies for according to the regulatory criteria.

The CDE therefore proposes to recommend that the charter school receive the funding level that the charter school qualifies for based on criteria, 85 percent, for its NCB instruction for two years.

#### San Jose Conservation Corps Charter (Charter #0425)

The following table provides the regulatory criteria for funding levels and the charter school’s expenditures percentage calculations and PTR as reported on its funding determination form.

San Jose Conservation Corps Charter Nonclassroom-Based Instruction Funding Qualification

| **Criteria** | **Percentage Spent on Certificated Salaries and Benefits** | **Percentage Spent on Instruction and Related Services** | **PTR** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100 Percent** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 80 | ≤ 25 to 1 |
| **85 Percent** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 70 | Not Applicable |
| **70 Percent** | ≥ 35 | ≥ 60 | Not Applicable |
| **Charter School** | 37.28 | 66.09 | 13.53 to 1 |

Without the consideration of mitigating circumstances, the charter school’s determination of funding request shall be recommended for denial, which would mean the charter school would not receive funding for its NCB instruction.

The charter school’s complete determination of funding request with mitigating circumstances is provided on the June 2025 ACCS Meeting Agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cs/documents/accs-jun25item02a5.docx>. Mitigating circumstances cited by the charter school include the following:

* The charter school “serves students who are considered to be high risk and who experience multiple de-stabilizing impacts in their lives making it difficult for them to come to school ready to learn.”
* The charter school states that it “strongly believes in taking a whole-student approach and that providing critical services, individualize attention, and support programs are essential to these students being able to succeed. Thus, we have a higher percentage of classified support staff than a traditional school might have so that case loads can be manageable and more individualized.”
* The charter school state that “some positions that may be certificated in other schools are not certificated here - such as the Dean of Student Success, which is open to professionals who might replace certification with lived experience that makes them an invaluable part of the success of students.”

The CDE finds that the charter school has not established a reasonable basis to recommend a higher level of funding than what the charter school qualifies for according to the regulatory criteria.

The CDE therefore proposes to recommend that the charter school receive the funding level that the charter school qualifies for based on criteria, 70 percent, for its NCB instruction for two years.

#### Santa Cruz County Career Advancement Charter (Charter #1904)

The following table provides the regulatory criteria for funding levels and the charter school’s expenditures percentage calculations and PTR as reported on its funding determination form.

Santa Cruz County Career Advancement Charter Nonclassroom-Based Instruction Funding Qualification

| **Criteria** | **Percentage Spent on Certificated Salaries and Benefits** | **Percentage Spent on Instruction and Related Services** | **PTR** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100 Percent** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 80 | ≤ 25 to 1 |
| **85 Percent** | ≥ 40 | ≥ 70 | Not Applicable |
| **70 Percent** | ≥ 35 | ≥ 60 | Not Applicable |
| **Charter School** | 54.93 | 73.09 | 20.67 to 1 |

Without the consideration of mitigating circumstances, the charter school qualifies for 85 percent funding for its NCB instruction.

The charter school’s complete determination of funding request with mitigating circumstances is provided on the June 2025 ACCS Meeting Agenda web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/cc/cs/documents/accs-jun25item02a6.docx>. Mitigating circumstances cited by the charter school include the following:

* The charter school states, “We have seen our enrollment grow steadily in the past several years.”
* The charter school serves adult students across Santa Cruz County, including students who are incarcerated at the three local correctional facilities.
* The charter school states, “For the current 24-25 school year, we anticipate meeting the 80% minimum for total revenues spent on instruction and related services, as we have increased our certificated and classified staff this year and are in the process of implementing new instructional resources to meet student need.”
* The charter school anticipates adding 2.0 FTE in 2025–26.
* The charter school is in the process of securing additional real estate to accommodate the growth of the program; the charter school has clarified that its charter authorizer, Santa Cruz County Office of Education, has purchased the property and that the charter school anticipates occupying the space beginning in the summer of 2025. The charter school has also clarified that the charter school will rent the facility from the authorizer.
* The charter school anticipates meeting the expenditure criteria for full funding in 2024–25.
* The charter school was unable to fill open positions due to a teacher shortage.

The CDE finds that there is not a reasonable basis to recommend a higher level of funding than what the charter school qualifies for according to the regulatory criteria.

While the charter school states in its request that it was in the process of “securing additional real estate”, the charter school clarified that its charter authorizer, Santa Cruz County Office of Education, is the entity that purchased the property and that the charter school anticipates renting the facility from the authorizer. The CDE notes that 5 *CCR* Section 11963.4(e) specifically references “one-time or unique or exceptional expenses for facilities”. The CDE finds that because the charter school anticipates renting the facilities from the authorizer, the expenses for facilities would not be “one-time”, and the charter school has not established that the facility expenses are “unique or exceptional”.

The charter school estimates that had the open positions been filled, the charter school would have spent an additional $96,372 on instruction and related services; this would have caused the charter school’s calculated expenditure percentages to have been 58.39 percent and 76.47 percent, which would not have qualified the charter school for a 100 percent funding recommendation.

The CDE finds that the charter school has not otherwise established a reasonable basis to recommend a higher level of funding than what the charter school qualifies for according to the regulatory criteria.

The CDE therefore proposes to recommend that the charter school receive the funding level that the charter school qualifies for based on criteria, 85 percent, for its NCB instruction for two years.
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1. The PTR criteria outlined in this table pertain only to charter schools submitting funding determination requests for their NCB instruction. All charter schools offering independent study are required to comply with the ADA to certificated-employee ratios outlined in *EC* Section 51745.6. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)