

This document was provided, as is, to the California Department of Education (CDE) by **Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy** for the Advisory Commission on Charter Schools June 2026 Meeting Agenda and is posted to the CDE website to meet the legal requirements of California *Education Code* Section 33009.5. Minor formatting changes may have occurred during document remediation.

For more information regarding the content of this material, please contact the Charter Schools Division by email at charters@cde.ca.gov.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

**RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD
OF THE OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**Resolution No. 2526-0004
(Revised¹)**

**DENYING CHARTER PETITION OF
Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy – GRADES 6-12
AND WRITTEN FINDINGS OF SUPPORT THEREOF**

WHEREAS, the Charter Schools Act (Ed. Code §47600, et seq.) establishes the criteria by which charter school renewals are to be approved or denied; and

WHEREAS, Education Code Section 47605(c) charges school district governing boards with the responsibility of reviewing charter petitions to determine whether they meet the legal requirements for a successful charter petition; and

WHEREAS, on August 1, 2025, the District received a renewal petition for Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy (“Petition”), a public charter school currently serving 403 students in grades 6-12 and authorized to serve grades 6-12; and

WHEREAS, the law outlines a three-tier system for most charter schools seeking renewal, including additional requirements for evaluating the soundness of the school’s educational program depending on the school’s renewal tier; and

WHEREAS, Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy was placed in the Middle tier by the California Department of Education based on its State Dashboard data; and

WHEREAS, a charter school placed in the Middle tier shall not be renewed if the chartering authority makes *all* of the following written factual findings, setting forth specific facts to support the findings:

1. The charter school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to the pupils of the school; and
2. The closure is in the best interest of the pupils; and
3. The decision provided greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance (if applicable); and

WHEREAS, a charter school placed in the Middle tier shall not be renewed if the chartering authority makes a written factual finding, setting forth specific facts to support the finding:

¹ Revised during Board Meeting.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

- A. Substantial fiscal or governance concerns; or
- B. The school is not serving all pupils who wish to attend, as documented by data provided by the CDE or by any substantiated complaints that the charter school has not complied with suspension, expulsion, or involuntary disenrollment procedures.

And the chartering authority has provided at least 30 days' notice to the charter school of the alleged violation and provided the charter school with a reasonable opportunity to cure the violation, including a corrective action plan proposed by the charter school, AND the chartering authority makes a written factual finding, setting forth specific facts to support the finding:

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

WHEREAS, the Governing Board did not issue a notice to the charter school which set forth specific facts to support the above findings; and

WHEREAS, on September 25, 2025, the Governing Board held an initial public hearing on the renewal petition as required by Education Code Section 47605(b); and

WHEREAS, on October 21, 2025, the Governing Board held a decision public hearing on the renewal petition as required by Education Code Section 47605(b); and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board, under Education Code Section 47605(b), is obligated to take action to grant or deny the renewal petition within 90 days of submission, unless Petitioner agrees to an extension of up to 30 days;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL HEREBY adopts all aspects of the Staff Report on Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy's petition, except to the extent that any aspect of the Staff Report is inconsistent with this Resolution;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL HEREBY FINDS that Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy has **not** met the requirements of Education Code Section 47605(c) and 47607(e) and the District's Charter Renewal Standards in that the Petition does not present a sound educational program for the pupils to be enrolled in the Charter School.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL HEREBY FINDS that in accordance with Education Code Section 47607.2(b)(6), the Governing Board has made the following findings:

1. The charter school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to the pupils of the school; as noted in the Staff Report,

Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy has had a decline in Math proficiency and DFS over the term, with current proficiency at 6.9% with a Red Dashboard indicator, schoolwide ELA proficiency and DFS remains below the District average, and A-G rates declined significantly during charter term; and

2. The closure is in the best interest of the pupils; students would be served better in comparison schools as highlighted in the Staff Report (including but not limited to Figures 49 and 50 from the Staff Report); and
3. The decision provided greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance (if applicable); as noted above, Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy has not made progress towards academic standards to provide a benefit to students and students would be served better at comparison schools.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED AND ORDERED by the Governing Board that the Charter Petition of **Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy – GRADES 6-12 be and is hereby denied.**

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board of the Oakland Unified School District this 21st day of October, 2025, by the following vote:

PREFERENTIAL AYE: None

PREFERENTIAL NOE: None

PREFERENTIAL ABSTENTION: None

PREFERENTIAL RECUSED: None

AYES: Rachel Latta, VanCedric Williams, Vice President Valarie Bachelor, President Jennifer Brouhard

NOES: Patrice Berry, Clifford Thompson, Mike Hutchinson

ABSTAINED: None

RECUSED: None

ABSENT: Maximus Simmons (Student Director), Marianna Smith (Student Director)


Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

CERTIFICATION


We hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a Resolution passed at a Special Meeting of the Governing Board of the Oakland Unified School District, held on October 21, 2025.

Legislative File Info.	
File ID Number:	25-2039
Introduction Date:	8/27/2025
Enactment Number:	25-1755
Enactment Date:	10/21/2025
By	ER

OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT



Jennifer Brouhard
President, Governing Board



Dr. Denise Saddler
Interim Superintendent and Secretary, Governing Board



Renewal Petition Staff Report
Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy
Decision Hearing: October 21, 2025

School Overview

Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy			
Charter Management Organization (CMO):	Aspire Public Schools	Previous Renewal Year(s):	2013, 2018
Year Opened:	2008	Campus Address:	1009 66 th Ave, Oakland, CA 94621
OUSD Board District:	6	Current Enrollment: ¹	403
Current Grades Served:	6-12	5-Year Projected Enrollment	432, 442, 456, 456, 456

Staff Recommendation

Although there are multiple legally compliant options, based on the contents of this Staff Report, Staff recommends approval of the renewal petition for Aspire Golden State Prep for 5 years, beginning July 1, 2026, until June 30, 2031, to serve students in Grades 6-12 and a projected annual enrollment as outlined in the table above, with fiscal and performance benchmarks as detailed in the full staff recommendation on page 37.

Summary of Findings:

Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very high percentage of ELs making progress in most recent year, with Blue EPLI indicator • Post-pandemic increase in high school ELA proficiency • Significant increases for Students with Disabilities in Math and ELA DFS in most recent year • High graduation rate with upward trajectory • Despite declining enrollment, remains a sustainable size with a healthy fund balance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decline in Math proficiency and DFS over the term, with current proficiency at 6.9% with a Red Dashboard indicator • Schoolwide ELA proficiency and DFS remains below the District average • A-G rates declined significantly during charter term, although have shown recent improvement • Most recent audit identified two material weaknesses

¹ Per first month statistical report submitted to OUSD on August 28, 2025.

Criteria for Evaluation and Procedural Background

Criteria for Renewal


The Charter Schools Act of 1992 and subsequent amendments established the criteria by which charter renewal applications must be evaluated. In order to recommend the approval of a charter school renewal, Office of Charter Schools (“OCS”) Staff must determine that the charter school has met the requirements set forth in Education Code (“Ed Code”) Sections 47605, 47607, and 47607.2. Specifically, in order to be recommended for renewal, OCS Staff determines whether the charter school has met the following renewal criteria:

- I. *Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?*
- II. *Is the Charter School Demonstrably Likely to Successfully Implement the Proposed Educational Program?*
- III. *Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?*
- IV. *Is the School Serving All Students Who Wish to Attend?*

Renewal Tier Analysis

In addition to the criteria outlined above, Education Code outlines a three-tiered system of performance categories for most² charter schools seeking renewal. This system provides additional criteria and conditions for evaluating the charter school’s renewal petition based on the performance category, or “Tier”, in which the school is placed. Figure 1 below shows a summary of the criteria used by the California Department of Education (“CDE”) to determine Aspire GSP’s Renewal Tier. A more detailed analysis of the Charter School’s Renewal Tier, including analyses of each criterion and sub-criterion, can be found in Figures 2-4.

Figure 1: Aspire GSP Renewal Tier Analysis



Sources: California School Dashboard; CDE Charter School Performance Category Data File; CDE “Determining Charter School Performance Category” Flyer

Criterion 1 Analysis

Criterion 1 is based on the performance colors received for **all** state indicators on the Dashboard for the two previous State Dashboard years. Per Education Code, if all state indicators are Blue or Green, the Charter School is assigned to the High Tier. If all state indicators are Orange or Red, the Charter School is assigned to the Low Tier. In all other circumstances, an evaluation of Criterion 2 is necessary to determine the Charter School’s Tier. As shown in Figure 2 below, Aspire GSP did not fit the requirements for Low Tier or for High Tier in Criterion 1, thus, an evaluation of Criterion 2 is necessary.

² The three-tiered system does not apply to schools that qualify for the Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) program.

³ “Academic indicators” refer to the ELA, Math, English Learner Progress, and College and Career Readiness Indicators on the California School Dashboard.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 2: Criterion 1 Analysis – Schoolwide Results

Indicator	2023	2024
ELA	Yellow	Orange
Math	Red	Red
EL Progress	Orange	Blue
College/Career	Medium	Blue
Graduation Rate	Green	Blue
Suspension Rate	Orange	Yellow
Chronic Absenteeism	Orange	Yellow

Source: California School Dashboard

Criterion 2 Analysis

Criterion 2 is based on the “Status” (or the current year data) for all **academic** indicators (ELA, Mathematics, EL Progress, and College/Career) with a performance color for the two previous Dashboard years. Performance determinations are then based on the overall status compared with the statewide averages for the previous two Dashboard years. Criterion 2 is broken into two sub-criteria – Criterion 2a evaluates the Charter School’s schoolwide performance and Criterion 2b evaluates the Charter School’s student group performance, specifically for student groups which scored below the statewide average⁴. Per Education Code, if (Criterion 2a) all **schoolwide** academic indicators are same or higher than the statewide average *and* (Criterion 2b) the majority of eligible student groups are higher than their group’s respective statewide average, then the Charter School is placed in the High Tier. If (Criterion 2a) all **schoolwide** academic indicators are same or lower than the statewide average *and* (Criterion 2b) the majority of eligible student groups are lower than their respective statewide average, then the Charter School is placed in the Low Tier. In all other circumstances, the Charter School is placed in the Middle Tier. As shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4 below, the Charter School did not meet the requirements for High Tier or for Low Tier, thus, Aspire GSP is placed in the Middle Tier⁵.

Figure 3: Criterion 2a Analysis

Academic Indicator	2023			2024		
	School Status	State Status	Result	School Status	State Status	Result
ELA	-58.8	-13.6	Lower	-69.8	-13.2	Lower
Math	-137.7	-49.1	Lower	-144.6	-47.6	Lower
EL Progress	37%	48.7%	Lower	58.7%	45.7%	Higher
College / Career	46.4%	43.9%	Higher	71.2%	45.3%	Higher

Source: California School Dashboard

Figure 4: Criterion 2b Analysis

Indicator	Student Group	2023			2024		
		School Status	State Status	Result	School Status	State Status	Result
ELA	African American	-85.1	-59.6	Lower	-120.8	-58.9	Lower
	English Learner	-89.6	-67.7	Lower	-111	-67.6	Lower
	Hispanic/Latino	-55.6	-40.2	Lower	-57.1	-39.3	Lower
	SED	-58.9	-42.6	Lower	-72	-40.9	Lower
	SWD	-152.5	-96.3	Lower	-130.2	-95.6	Lower

⁴ For more information regarding which student groups are included in the analysis for Criterion 2b, please see the CDE’s Performance Categories Flyer: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/documents/categoryflyer.pdf>

⁵ Charter school performance categories for all California charter schools can be found here: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/performcategorydf.asp>

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Math	African American	-164.4	-104.5	Lower	-173	-102.2	Lower
	English Learner	-158	-93.4	Lower	-174.3	-93.4	Lower
	Hispanic/Latino	-133.9	-80.8	Lower	-139.3	-79.2	Lower
	SED	-136.4	-80.8	Lower	-145.2	-78.2	Lower
	SWD	-184.6	-127.3	Lower	-189.6	-124.3	Lower
College / Career	Hispanic/Latino	46.7%	35.5%	Higher	71.7%	37.4%	Higher
	SED	46.2%	35.4%	Higher	71.2%	37.4%	Higher
EL Progress		37%	43.9%	Lower	58.7%	45.3%	Higher

Source: California School Dashboard

Additional Guidance for Middle Tier Schools

As noted previously, there are additional criteria and conditions for evaluating a Charter School’s petition depending on the assigned Renewal Tier. Figure 5 below outlines the renewal conditions and additional evaluation guidance applicable to schools placed in the Middle Tier.

Figure 5: Renewal Tier Additional Guidance

MIDDLE TIER - Additional Guidance and Decision Criteria	
Term	May only be renewed for a 5-year term.
Additional Renewal Conditions	<p>May be denied upon making written findings that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The charter school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to the pupils of the school; AND</i> <i>The closure is in the best interest of the pupils; AND</i> <i>The decision provided greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance (if applicable).</i> <p>May also be denied with a written finding that the school is demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition due to a finding which demonstrates either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Substantial fiscal or governance concerns; or</i> <i>The school is not serving all pupils who wish to attend, as documented by data provided by the CDE or by any substantiated complaints that the charter school has not complied with suspension, expulsion, or involuntary disenrollment procedures.</i> <p>A chartering authority may only deny for either of the two reasons listed above only after it has provided at least 30 days’ notice to the charter school of the alleged violation and provided the charter school with a reasonable opportunity to cure the violation, including a corrective action plan proposed by the charter school. The chartering authority may deny renewal only by making either of the following findings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The corrective action proposed by the charter school has been unsuccessful; or</i> <i>The violations are sufficiently severe and pervasive as to render a corrective action plan unviable.</i>
	Verified Data⁶ (Optional)

Source: Education Code §47607.2(b)

⁶ Ed Code §47607.2(c) defines verified data as data derived from nationally recognized, valid, peer-reviewed, and reliable sources that are externally produced. The State Board of Education established criteria to define verified data and identify an approved list of valid and reliable assessments that shall be used for this purpose. For more information, please review the CDE’s Verified Data website page: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/verifdata.asp>

⁷ Pending renewal of Ed Code §47607.2(b)(5) beyond January 1, 2026

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Procedure

1. The Charter School submitted a renewal petition to the District on August 1, 2025.
2. OCS Staff conducted an interview with 2 members of the Aspire Public Schools Governing Board on August 22, 2025, after all 4 members submitted a self-evaluation to assess strengths and gaps in the Governing Body.
3. The OUSD review team conducted a site visit on September 15, 2025. This site visit involved classroom observations and focus group interviews with students, families, teachers, and school leadership.
4. The review team conducted a review of the school's documents, policies, financials, academic performance, and renewal petition to assist in developing the staff report.
5. The initial public hearing was held on September 25, 2025.
6. Staff findings were made public by the 15-day posting requirement, which was October 6, 2025.
7. The decision public hearing is being held on October 21, 2025.

Table of Contents

I. Renewal Criteria I: Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?.....	7
A. SBAC Performance Summary – English Language Arts	7
B. SBAC Performance Summary – Mathematics	10
C. College and Career Readiness Measures.....	13
F. English Learner Progress.....	14
G. Differentiated Assistance Eligibility.....	15
H. Renewal Site Visit Summary.....	16
I. Additional Verified Data Provided by the School	18
II. Renewal Criteria II: Is the Charter School Demonstrably Likely to Successfully Implement the Proposed Educational Program?	19
A. Enrollment.....	19
B. Financial Condition	20
C. Enrollment Demographics	23
D. Notices of Concern and/or Notices to Cure and Correct	26
E. Board Health and Effectiveness.....	27
F. Staffing and Teacher Credentialing.....	28
III. Renewal Criteria III: Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?	29
A. The Required Fifteen Elements	29
B. Other Required Information.....	30
C. OUSD-Specified Requirements	31
IV. Renewal Criteria IV: Is the Charter School Serving All Students Who Wish to Attend?	31
A. State-Provided Enrollment Data	31
B. Substantiated Complaints and Notices of Concern Related to Noncompliance with Suspension / Expulsion Requirements.....	32
V. Recommendation Summary	33
A. Renewal Criteria I: Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?.....	33
B. Renewal Criteria II: Is the Charter School Demonstrably Likely to Successfully Implement the Proposed Educational Program?	33
C. Renewal Criteria III: Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?.....	34
D. Renewal Criteria IV: Is the School Serving All Students Who Wish to Attend?.....	34
E. Analysis of Other Public School Options if Renewal is Denied	34
F. Recommendation	37
VI. Appendices	38
Appendix A. Additional California School Dashboard Analyses – including Local Indicators	38
Appendix B. Additional Program Implementation Information	40
Appendix C. Charter Management Organization’s Key Fiscal Indicators.....	43
Appendix D. Charter School Response to Notice of Concern re: 2023-24 Audit Findings.....	43

I. Renewal Criteria I: Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?

In order for a charter school’s renewal petition to be approved, it must present a sound educational program for its students. For schools in the Middle Tier, the District is required to consider the school’s performance on California School Dashboard indicators, providing greater weight to performance on academic indicators. Although Education Code does not specifically reference similar criteria for schools meeting the Middle Tier criteria (outside of the Renewal Tier Analysis), the following is being included for context. To provide a comprehensive overview of the educational program, the evaluation below includes evidence from the California School Dashboard as well as results from the California Assessment of Student Performance Progress (“CAASPP”) Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (“SBAC”) assessments, graduation data, ELPAC results, and a summary of the renewal site visit. As a high-level summary, Figure 6 below represents the academic indicator results from the California School Dashboard over the course of the charter term, details for which can be found in the subsequent sections.

Figure 6: California School Dashboard Academic Indicator Summary

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
English Language Arts	Orange ↓ -23.10 pts	No Color ↔	No Color ↔	No Color ↔	Yellow ↔ 9.30 pts	Orange ↔ -11.00 pts
Math	Orange ↓ -30.20 pts	No Color ↔	No Color ↔	No Color ↔	Red ↔ -3.60 pts	Red ↔ -6.90 pts
English Learner Progress	No Color ↔	No Color ↔	No Color ↔	No Color ↔	Orange ↔ -3.00 pp	Blue ↔ 21.80 pp
College/Career Readiness	Green ↑ 13.70 pp	No Color ↔	No Color ↔	No Color ↔	No Color ↔	Blue ↔ 24.80 pp

Source: California School Dashboard

A. SBAC Performance Summary – English Language Arts

The below section represents a summary of the results from the ELA SBAC assessment at the Charter School including schoolwide average proficiency rates disaggregated by grade span and average Distance from Standard (“DFS”) results disaggregated by student group. Results for the California Alternate Assessments (“CAAs”) were not included as Aspire GSP did not surpass the required threshold of tested students and, therefore, no data is available. While a more detailed analysis can be found in the subsequent sections, a summary of these data is below:

- **Schoolwide Trends:** From 2021-22-2023-24, Aspire GSP’s schoolwide proficiency remained at a similar level and was below the District average.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District


- **Grade Span Trends:** Post-pandemic, Aspire GSP’s 6-8 grade proficiency rate increased in 2022-23 then decreased in 2023-24 and remained below the District average. Aspire GSP’s 9-12 grade proficiency rate increased in both 2022-23 and 2023-24 and exceeded the District average.
- **Student Group Trends:** Between 2021-22 and 2023-24, average DFS remained relatively steady for the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged and Hispanic student groups, decreased for the English Learner and Black/African American student groups, and increased for the Students with Disabilities student group.

Average Proficiency Rates and Grade Span Results

To supplement the information provided in the California School Dashboard, additional analyses of the results from the ELA SBAC assessment are provided in this and subsequent sections. Below, Figure 7 represents the Charter School’s average proficiency rates on the ELA SBAC over the course of the charter term, or the percentage of students who have met or exceeded the “Standard” threshold for this exam. The results have been disaggregated by grade span and the figure additionally includes average proficiency rates for the corresponding grade spans at OUSD for further context. As shown below:

- Although it increased in 2022-23, in 2023-24, Aspire GSP’s 6-8 grade proficiency rate declined about 11 percentage points and continued to be below the District average.
- Between 2021-22 and 2023-24, Aspire GSP’s 9-12 grade proficiency rate increased about 11 percentage points and was about 8 percentage points above the District average in 2023-24.
- In 2022-23 Aspire GSP’s 6-12 grade proficiency rate was similar to the District average. However, the following year the schoolwide proficiency rate decreased about 7 percentage points and was about 8 percentage points below the District average.

Figure 7: Schoolwide ELA SBAC Proficiency Rates Over Time – Aspire GSP and OUSD*



Source: Downloadable CAASPP Research Files

*Testing for 2019-20 was cancelled due to COVID-19. Testing for 2020-21 was optional.


Distance from Standard (DFS) and Student Group Results

Figures 8 and 9 below represent the Charter School’s average Distance from Standard (“DFS”) on the ELA SBAC assessment over the course of the charter term. While average proficiency rates illustrate the percentage of students scoring at or above the “Standard Met” threshold on the SBAC assessment, average DFS measures how far, on average,

student results deviate from the “Standard Met” threshold, providing a more granular analysis. As shown in Figure 8 below:

- Average DFS for the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged and Hispanic student groups remained relatively steady between 2021-22 and 2023-24.
- Average DFS for the Black/African American and English Learner student groups increased in 2022-23 but decreased in 2023-24.
- Average DFS for the Students with Disabilities student group increased significantly in both 2022-23 and 2023-24.

Figure 8: Aspire GSP ELA DFS Over Time*




Source: Downloadable CAASPP Research Files

*Testing for 2019-20 was cancelled due to COVID-19. Testing for 2020-21 was optional.

Figure 9 below again shows the average DFS, both schoolwide and for key student groups, over the course of the charter term, but also compares these results with the OUSD average for each corresponding group. Please note, despite the comparisons below, students within the same group may be quite different from one another (e.g. severity of disability for special education students, progress levels for English Learners). As shown below:

- Average DFS for Aspire GSP’s Hispanic and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged student groups have been consistently higher than the respective District average.
- Post-pandemic, average DFS for Aspire GSP’s Black/African American student group initially increased before declining about 36 points in 2023-24.

Figure 9: ELA DFS Over Time for Aspire GSP and OUSD schools serving grades 6-12*



Source: Downloadable CAASPP Research Files

*Testing for 2019-20 was cancelled due to COVID-19. Testing for 2020-21 was optional.

B. SBAC Performance Summary – Mathematics

The below section represents a summary of the results from the Math SBAC assessment at the Charter School including schoolwide average proficiency rates disaggregated by grade span and average Distance from Standard (“DFS”) results disaggregated by student group. Results for the California Alternate Assessments (“CAAs”) were not included as Aspire GSP did not surpass the required threshold of tested students and, therefore, no data is available. While a more detailed analysis can be found below, a summary of these data is below:


- **Schoolwide Trends:** Aspire GSP’s Math proficiency and average DFS have remained somewhat steady, however remain significantly lower than their ELA proficiency and average DFS.
- **Grade Span Trends:** From 2021-22 to 2023-24, both Aspire GSP’s 6-8 and 9-12 proficiency rates continue to be lower than the respective District average.
- **Student Group Trends:** Between 2021-22 and 2023-24, average DFS for all student groups decreased slightly except for the Students with Disabilities student group which increased significantly in 2022-23.

Average Proficiency Rates and Grade Span Results

To supplement the information provided in the California School Dashboard, additional analyses of the results from the Math SBAC assessment are provided in this and subsequent sections. Below, Figure 10 represents the charter school’s average proficiency rates on the Math SBAC over the course of the charter term, or the percentage of students who have met or exceeded the “Standard” threshold for this exam. The results have been disaggregated by grade span and the figure additionally includes average proficiency rates for the corresponding grade spans at OUSD for further context. As shown below:

- In 2023-24, Aspire GSP's 6-8 proficiency rate declined about 4 percentage points and was about 14 percentage points below the District average. Aspire GSP's 6-8 grade proficiency rates have been consistently lower than the District average.
- Pre-pandemic, Aspire GSP'S 9-12 grade proficiency rate was above the District average. Post-pandemic, the 9-12 proficiency rate decreased and was lower than the District average. In 2023-24, the 9-12 proficiency rate was approximately 9 percentage points lower than the District average.
- Across all grades, Math proficiency rates are significantly lower than the ELA proficiency rates.

Figure 10: Schoolwide Math SBAC Proficiency Rates Over Time – Aspire GSP and OUSD*



Source: Downloadable CAASPP Research Files

*Testing for 2019-20 was cancelled due to COVID-19. Testing for 2020-21 was optional.


Distance from Standard (DFS) and Student Group Results

Figures 11 and 12 below represent the Charter School's average Distance from Standard ("DFS") on the Math SBAC assessment over the course of the charter term. While average proficiency rates illustrate the percentage of students scoring at or above the "Standard Met" threshold on the SBAC assessment, average DFS measures how far, on average, student results deviate from the "Standard Met" threshold, providing a more granular analysis. As shown in Figure 11 below:

- Average DFS for each student group decreased in both 2022-23 and 2023-24 with the exception of the Students with Disabilities student group which had a significant increase in average DFS in 2022-23.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 11: Aspire GSP Math DFS Over Time*




Source: Downloadable CAASPP Research Files

*Testing for 2019-20 was cancelled due to COVID-19. Testing for 2020-21 was optional.

Figure 12 again shows the average DFS, both schoolwide and for key student groups, over the course of the charter term, but also compares these results with the OUSD average for each corresponding group. Please note, despite the comparisons below, students within the same group may be quite different from one another (e.g. severity of disability for special education students, progress levels for English Learners). As shown below:

- Post-pandemic, average DFS for all student groups was below the respective District average.

Figure 12: Math DFS Over Time for Aspire GSP and OUSD*



Source: Downloadable CAASPP Research Files

*Testing for 2019-20 was cancelled due to COVID-19. Testing for 2020-21 was optional.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

C. College and Career Readiness Measures


The below section represents a summary of the results from various college and career readiness measures, including results from the California School Dashboard College/Career Indicator (“CCI”) and graduation metrics.

Graduation Metrics

The figures below compare the four-year cohort graduation⁸ and A-G graduation rates⁹ between OUSD and Aspire GSP. As shown below:


- Aspire GSP’s four-year cohort graduation rate has been higher than OUSD’s for all years of the charter term.
- Aspire GSP’s A-G graduation rates declined significantly during the pandemic. Most recently, Aspire GSP’s A-G graduate rate has been increasing and is above the District A-G rate.
- In 2023-24, Aspire GSP’s four-year cohort graduation and A-G graduation rates were higher than its respective OUSD rate for all key student groups.

Figure 13: Four-Year Graduation Rate – Charter School and OUSD



Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

Figure 14: 2023-24 Four-Year Graduation and A-G Rate – Charter School and OUSD




Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

⁸ The four-year cohort graduation rate is the number of students who graduate from high school in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class.

⁹ The A-G graduation rate refers to the percentage of high school graduates who successfully complete the A-G course sequence with a grade of "C" or better, making them eligible to apply to the University of California (UC) or California State University (CSU) systems.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 15: Four-Year A-G Graduation Rate – Charter School and OUSD




Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

CCI Indicator Summary

The figure below represents the percentage of students in various student groups who were considered “Prepared”¹⁰ on the CCI Indicator in the 2023-24 school year. As shown below:

- Aspire GSP’s English Learner student group had the lowest rate of “Prepared” on the CCI Indicator.

Figure 16: 2023-24 CCI Indicator “Prepared” Rate by Student Group



Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

F. English Learner Progress


In the past four years with available data, Aspire GSP tested 108, 80, 92, and 107 students on the Summative English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPAC), respectively. The figure below shows the percentage of these students who progressed at least one English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) level, maintained ELPI level 4, maintained lower ELPI levels, and decreased at least one ELPI level. As shown below:

- From 2022-23 to 2023-24, the percentage of English Learner students making progress towards proficiency increased about 22 percentage points, with approximately 57.9% of English Learner students at Aspire GSP making progress.

¹⁰ For more information on how graduates can meet the CCI “Prepared” Criteria, please see <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/documents/ccicollege.pdf>

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 17: Summative ELPAC Results









Source: California School Dashboard

G. Differentiated Assistance Eligibility

Differentiated Assistance (“DA”) is a system of targeted technical assistance to support school districts and charter schools improve student outcomes and address equity gaps. Eligibility for DA¹¹ is based on student group results on the California School Dashboard. Prior to the 2023-24 school year, charter schools were not eligible to be identified for DA. Charter schools became eligible for DA beginning with the 2023 California School Dashboard results.

Based on the results of the 2023 and 2024 California School Dashboards, Aspire GSP was identified for Differentiated Assistance in both 2023-24 and 2024-25. Specifically, Aspire GSP qualified for the student group(s) that received the lowest status level in two or more state priority areas as outlined in the figures below.

Figure 18: 2023-24 Differentiated Assistance Eligibility Criteria for Aspire GSP








	Priority 4			Priority 5	Priority 6	Priority 8
	ELA	Math	English Learner Progress	Chronic Absenteeism	Suspension	Career/ College
African American		 Red		 Red		
English Learner		 Red			 Red	
Hispanic		 Red			 Red	

Source: Alameda County Office of Education

¹¹ Detailed criteria for differentiated assistance can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/leaproposedcrit.asp>.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 19: 2024-25 Differentiated Assistance Eligibility Criteria for Aspire GSP

	Priority 4			Priority 5	Priority 6	Priority 8
	ELA	Math	English Learner Progress	Chronic Absenteeism	Suspension	Career/ College
African American	 Red	 Red			 Red	
Students with Disabilities	 Orange	 Red		 Red	 Red	

Source: Alameda County Office of Education

In both years, the Alameda County Office of Education (“ACOE”) provided the Differentiated Assistance to Aspire GSP. In the 2023-24 year, Aspire GSP, with ACOE staff, selected Chronic Absenteeism as the indicator of focus for Differentiated Assistance. Per ACOE staff, Aspire GSP developed a 2023-2024 attendance plan that used quarterly “watchlists” to identify students at risk of chronic absenteeism. Staff met monthly to review data and implemented interventions such as increased family communications, new incentive systems, and improved SART/SARB procedures. Although ACOE staff emphasized in a report summary that Differentiated Assistance is not about “quick fixes” in a six-month period, but is rather an ongoing process of planning supports and system changes, chronic absenteeism rates at Aspire GSP did decline by 9.6% for all students and by 9.5% for African American students per the 2023-24 California School Dashboard.

In the 2024-25 school year, Aspire GSP, with ACOE staff, continued to work on Chronic Absenteeism as the indicator of focus for Differentiated Assistance. Per ACOE staff, Aspire GSP continued to refine its systems for reducing chronic absenteeism by setting specific attendance engagement goals, designing IEP goals around attendance, piloting incentive systems that linked improved attendance with family communication. Although 2024-25 chronic absenteeism rates at Aspire GSP have not yet been released by the CDE, preliminary data in ACOE’s report suggest rates in December 2024-March 2025 were lower than the 2023-24 average for Students with Disabilities (the only student group for which chronic absenteeism data was provided by ACOE).

H. Renewal Site Visit Summary

School Quality Review Rubric Report

Charter school renewal site visits are guided by the District’s School Quality Review (SQR) process. The process is based on a rubric¹² which describes three key domains (Mission and Vision, Quality Program Implementation, and Collective Leadership and Professional Learning) which are further broken into three threads (Instruction, Culture, and Systems and Structures). In order to gather evidence for each of these domains, the OUSD Review Team conducted classroom observations, document reviews, an interview with Charter School leadership, and focus groups with students, families, and teachers. Following the renewal site visit, the OUSD Review Team rated each domain and sub-domain collaboratively using the SQR Rubric Ratings range from 1 (low) to 4 (high): 1 = Emerging, 2 = Developing, 3 = Implementing, and 4 = Sustaining.

¹² The School Quality Review Rubric can be found here: <https://www.ousd.org/officeofcharterschools/for-charter-school-staff/charter-petitions#renewal>

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 20: Renewal Site Visit Summary

Aspire GSP Renewal Site Visit, September 15, 2025			
OUSD Review Team: Kelly Krag Arnold (OCS Director), Madison Thomas (OCS Deputy Director), Guadalupe Nuño (OCS Community Liaison), Marwa Doost (OCS Compliance Specialist), Jason Yamashiro (Academic Consultant)			
SQR Domains and Threads	Domain 1: Mission and Vision	Domain 2: Quality Program Implementation	Domain 3: Collective Leadership and Professional Learning
Thread A: Instruction	2.8	2.9	2.9
Thread B: Culture	3.5	2.7	3.2
Thread C: Systems and Structures	2.7	3.5	3.1

Within each Domain and Thread in the SQR Rubric, there are multiple “sub-domains”. The following represent the three highest rated and the three lowest rated sub-domains for Aspire GSP.

Figure 21: Highest and Lowest Rated SQR Sub-Domains

Highest Rated Sub-Domains		
Score	Sub-Domain	Description of Sub-Domain
4.0	2C.5 Special Education Policies and Procedures, including IEPs	Special Education Case Managers write timely, student-centered, and data-driven IEPs that are individualized to support student growth and educational benefit. Special Education Department policies and procedures are followed for initial assessments, student discipline, and change of least restrictive environment (LRE) determinations.
3.8	2C.2 Safety	The school has a comprehensive safety plan that is focused on building and implementing systems and structures to ensure a physically safe campus. The plan includes an articulated crisis plan to respond to immediate and acute emergencies. All members of the school community know what to do in case of emergency and report feeling safe on the campus.
3.8	1B.1 Core Values	The school has shared values that serve as guiding principles for the actions of its leaders, teachers, staff, students, and families. These values were collaboratively developed with stakeholders, can be referred to easily, and are used to inform decision-making and practices of the school.
Lowest Rated Sub-Domains		
Score	Sub-Domain	Description of Sub-Domain
2.0	1C.3 Annual Site-Based Planning Process	The school uses the annual site-based planning process to identify a clear set of long-term priorities and plans that contain measurable student goals, key strategies, and sufficient resources. This plan is reviewed and adjusted annually using relevant school data.
2.4	2A.1 Quality Standards-Based Curriculum and Instruction	High quality instructional materials are consistently used to provide daily standards-based instruction, with a focus on differentiation and equity. Curriculum is grade-level appropriate, language rich, well-sequenced, and coherently builds student understanding within and across grade levels/disciplines. School has clear expectations for implementation of the standards-aligned, high quality curriculum, including integrated and designated ELD, and systems to support teachers and hold them accountable for implementation.
2.4	1A.3: Ambitious Student Learning Goals	The school has an ambitious set of long and short term student outcomes for cognitive and social-emotional growth and achievement. These outcomes can be measured using available standards-aligned state and local assessments and/or other relevant measures of student success.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Renewal Site Visit Strengths and Areas for Improvement

The OUSD Review Team noted the following strengths and areas for improvement based on the evidence collected throughout the site visit.

Strengths:

1. **Core Values:** The Aspire GSP core values are present in the classrooms and in the minds of all key stakeholders. Students and teachers were able to articulate them and connect them to classroom and schoolwide practices.
2. **Special Education Policies and Procedures:** In addition to meeting IEP timelines, the special education team collaborates with core classroom teachers to make sure that student learning modifications and accommodations are met in the classroom. Teachers expressed appreciation for special education leadership and support.
3. **Safety:** Site systems work well to create physical safety on the site, and students expressed not only feelings of physical and psychological safety, but that most students had a trusted adult they could talk with about serious issues.

Areas for Improvement

1. **Ambitious Student Learning Goals:** While there is intention to level up math instruction and the overall goal of raising student achievement is clear, there needs to be more opportunities within lessons, units, and course opportunities (more AP, etc.) that challenges students and accelerates their learning.
2. **Annual Site Based Planning Process:** There appeared to be little understanding or involvement in the site-based planning process from key stakeholders and there was minimal reference to annual and long term plans.
3. **Quality Standards Based Curriculum and Instruction:** While there was evidence of standards-based curriculum in a number of classrooms, the combination of instructional pacing and inconsistency in standards-based lesson design demonstrated that there needs to be more attention to this area.

I. Additional Verified Data Provided by the School¹³

Verified Data Background

For schools in the Middle Renewal Tier, Education Code requires that the District consider clear and convincing evidence, demonstrated by verified data, showing either of the following:

- The school achieved measurable increases in academic achievement, as defined by at least one year's progress for each year in school; or
- Strong postsecondary outcomes, as defined by college enrollment, persistence, and completion rates equal to similar peers.

The California State Board of Education ("SBE") adopted a list¹⁴ of academic progress indicators and postsecondary indicators that met the established criteria outlined in Education Code Section 47607.2 and that may be used in the renewal process. Assessments or data sources that are not on this list may not be used as verified data. To be eligible for inclusion as verified data, a data source must include the results of at least 95 percent of eligible students.

The Charter School did not provide the district with additional verified data, as defined above, and thus none will be considered here for the purpose of renewal.

¹³ Pending renewal of Ed Code §47607.2(b)(5) beyond January 1, 2026

¹⁴ A full list of the adopted academic progress and postsecondary indicators can be found here: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/ch/verifdataacadprogress.asp>

II. Renewal Criteria II: Is the Charter School Demonstrably Likely to Successfully Implement the Proposed Educational Program?

In order for a charter school’s renewal petition to be approved, it must be demonstrably likely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.¹⁵ Evidence considered for this criterion include an analysis of the Charter School’s operations, financial condition, enrollment, enrollment demographics, compliance with regulatory elements (Notices of Concern), board health and effectiveness, and staffing and credentialing.


A. Enrollment

Total Enrollment by Year – Actual and Projected

The figure below includes the total enrollment of the Charter School over the charter term, the 2025-26 enrollment as of August 28, 2025, and the projected enrollment included in the Multi-Year Projection (“MYP”). As shown:

- Post-pandemic, Aspire GSP’s total enrollment significantly declined; most notably, in 2022-23, total enrollment decreased about 30%. Following the decrease, enrollment was stable in 2023-24 before declining again.
- The 2025-26 enrollment total reported as of August 28, 2025, is less than the 2026-27 projected enrollment total.


Figure 22: Total Enrollment Over Time, Actual and Projected



Source: CDE Downloadable School Enrollment Data Files; August Enrollment Submission to OCS, MYP

Enrollment by Grade Level

Figure 23: 2024-25 Enrollment by Grade Level



Source: CDE Downloadable School Enrollment Data Files

¹⁵ EC §47605(c)(2)


Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Chronic Absenteeism

The figure below shows the percentage of students at the Charter School who were chronically absent, which is defined as students who were absent for 10 percent or more of the instructional days they were enrolled. As shown below:

- In 2023-24, chronic absenteeism decreased for each student group, with the exception of Students with Disabilities.

Figure 24: Chronic Absenteeism Rate by Student Group



Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

B. Financial Condition

Summary

The Charter School’s financial condition is fair based on its fiscal health indicators, audit results, and multi-year budget projections. Although the Charter School continues to have a relatively high fund balance, the enrollment projections on which the multi-year budget projections are based are higher than historical trends. Further, the CMO’s most recent audit report contained two material weaknesses.

Fiscal Health

The figure below summarizes key fiscal indicators throughout the current charter term. As shown below:

- The Charter School’s fund balance grew significantly from \$4.8 million in 2018-19 to a peak of \$7.6 million in 2022-23 but has since declined by \$2.6 million over the past two years due to operating deficits, ending at approximately \$5.0 million according to the 2024-25 unaudited actuals.
- Although the debt ratio increased from 0.06 to 0.60, it remains below 1.0, indicating assets still exceed liabilities and the school retains borrowing capacity if needed.
- The Charter’s cash reserves exceeded FCMAT’s recommended 5% floor for the whole charter term.¹⁶
- The CMO’s ending fund balance grew 52% over the course of the charter term, while its debt ratio averaged 0.70.¹⁷

¹⁶ Financial Crisis and Management Assistance Team

¹⁷ Appendix C. Charter Management Organization’s Key Fiscal Indicators

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 25: Fiscal Health Summary

Financial Indicator	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25 2 nd Interim
Annual Surplus or (Deficit) <i>Indicates whether the school spent more or less than it received in revenue during the year. Deficits are shown in parentheses.</i>	96,601	178,640	1,724,100	727	899,276	(1,278,981)	(1,324,067)
Ending Fund Balance <i>Typically represents unrestricted funds, although in some cases, restricted funds that were not fully spent in previous years may be included.</i>	4,779,563	4,958,203	6,682,303	6,683,030	7,582,306	6,303,325	4,979,258
Debt Ratio <i>A ratio less than 1 indicates the school has lower debts than assets, representing a lower level of financial risk.</i>	0.06	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.11	0.60	Unavailable
Budgetary Reserve <i>Given the school's ADA, FCMAT¹⁷ prescribes a minimum 4% reserve (calculated as Unrestricted Net Assets / Total Expenditures) as a set aside to prepare for potential liabilities. Reserve rates below this rate indicates poor financial condition.</i>	55%	59%	79%	66%	60%	51%	42%
Cash Reserve <i>FCMAT recommends 5%+ cash reserve of the total of all budgeted expenditures (calculated as Unrestricted Cash / Total Expenditures). Below 5% is indicative of a poor financial condition.</i>	12%	14%	17%	29%	35%	17%	21%

Source: 2018-19 through 2023-24 Annual Audit Reports and 2024-25 2nd Interim Budget Report

Annual Financial Audit Reports

Education Code requires charter schools to submit annual audits by December 15 of each year.¹⁸ As shown below:

- The Charter School’s CMO received unmodified audit opinions throughout the charter term, with no statutory compliance findings specific to the Charter in the most recent audit reports, and the most recent two audit reports were submitted by December 15th.
- The latest audit report identified two material weaknesses: a \$2.6 million overstatement of prepaid expenses and accounts payable, and \$2.9 million understatement of federal awards. The CMO reported these had minimal net impact on overall financial statements. OCS sent the CMO a Notice of Concern and the CMO provided a response, including plans for corrective action. See Appendix D for full response.

Figure 26: Annual Financial Audit Reports Summary

Indicator	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Timely Audit Submission <i>State law requires annual audits to be submitted by December 15.</i>	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Audit Opinion <i>“Unmodified” indicates the financial statements fairly represent the school’s financial position in accordance with accounting standards. “Modified, qualified” opinion indicates a material issue or insufficient evidence in a specific area of the financial statements, while the remainder are considered reliable.</i>	Unmodified	Unmodified	Unmodified	Unmodified	Unmodified	Unmodified

¹⁸ Education Code 47605(m), 41020(h)

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Material Weakness(es) <i>A material weakness is a deficiency in internal controls that creates a reasonable possibility that a material error in the financial statements could occur and go uncorrected.</i>	Number of Findings	-	-	-	1	-	2
	Initial Year of Finding(s)	-	-	-	2021-22	-	2023-24
Significant Deficiency <i>A significant deficiency is a flaw in internal controls that is less severe than a material weakness, but still merits attention.</i>	Number of Findings	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Initial Year of Finding(s)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Statutory Compliance <i>Statutory compliance is adherence to specific state and federal laws and regulations that govern operations, funding, and program requirements within the scope of the audit.</i>	Number of Findings	-	-	-	1	1	-
	Initial Year of Finding(s)	-	-	-	2021-22	2022-23	-

Source: 2018-19 through 2023-24 Annual Audit Reports

Attendance and Enrollment in Multi-Year Budget Projections

The enrollment and attendance rate assumptions underlying the Charter School’s Multi-Year Budget Projections (“MYP”) included with the renewal petition are aligned to the projected enrollment listed in Element 1 of the charter petition and are shown in the figure below. As shown below:

- *Aspire GSP’s forecasted enrollment appears unrealistic when compared with historical trends.*
- *Projected attendance rates are generally consistent with the Charter School’s historical patterns.*

Figure 27: MYP Summary: Projected Enrollment and Attendance Rates

	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
Projected Enrollment	403	432	442	456
Projected Attendance Rate	90.5%	91.0%	91.5%	91.5%

Source: Multiyear Budget Projections submitted with renewal petition

Enrollment Over Time

As shown in the Figure 22 above, Aspire GSP’s total enrollment decreased by 28.9% from 2020-21 to 2022-23, stabilized, and then fell an additional 7% from the 2023-24 to 2024-25 school years. The figure below illustrates the projected and actual enrollment over the course of Aspire GSP’s current charter term in order to illustrate the CMO’s historical accuracy in projecting and achieving enrollment targets.

Figure 28: Projected Enrollment vs. Actuals

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Enrollment							
Projected	619	622	605	563	500	445	441
Actuals	618	611	608	561	432	436	405
Difference	+1	+11	-3	+2	+68	+9	+36
Year over Year % Change							
Projected		0.5%	-2.7%	-6.9%	-11.2%	-11.0%	-0.9%
Actuals		-1.1%	-0.5%	-7.7%	-23.0%	0.9%	-7.1%
Difference		1.6%	-2.2%	0.8%	11.8%	-11.9%	6.2%

Source: 2018-19 through 2024-25 Enrollment – CDE Downloadable School Enrollment Data Files, 2018-19 through 2024-25 FCMAF LCFE Calculators

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

The figure below illustrates the enrollment underlying the Charter School’s Multi-Year Budget Projections included in the renewal petition and the corresponding enrollment growth rates. Although the Charter School’s assumed rate of decline for 2025-26 aligns with the declines that occurred over the current charter term, the 2026-27, 2027-28, and 2028-29 school years have growth rates that exceed the greatest annual growth rate the charter realized during the current charter term. Since the highest enrollment growth rate of 0.9% occurred in 2023-24 after several years of declines and enrollment continued to decline in 2024-25, growth rates of 7.2%, 2.3%, and 3.2% appear unlikely to materialize.

Figure 29: MYP Summary: Projected Enrollment and Attendance Rates

	2025-26 ¹⁹	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
Projected Enrollment	403	432	442	456
Year over Year % Change	-1.5%	7.2%	2.3%	3.2%

Source: Multiyear Budget Projections submitted with renewal petition

C. Enrollment Demographics

Per California Education Code Section 47605(c)(5)(G), a charter school must include in the renewal petition a reasonably comprehensive description of “the means by which the charter school will achieve a balance of racial and ethnic pupils, special education pupils, and English learner pupils, including redesignated fluent English proficient pupils, that is reflective of the general population residing within the territorial jurisdiction of the school district to which the charter petition is submitted”. This description is included on page 203 of the charter petition. The current section includes a summary of the school’s enrollment demographic data for further context.

As of the 2025-26 school year, Aspire GSP **does** participate in an Oakland-wide common charter enrollment system, Oakland Enrolls. OCS strongly encourages all OUSD-authorized charter schools to coordinate participation in an Oakland-wide common charter enrollment application system. OCS believes that a unified charter enrollment approach supports educational equity by reducing barriers that can disproportionately affect families whose primary language is not English, have limited technology access, or lack the time and resources to navigate many application processes with different deadlines, websites, and requirements.

Enrollment Demographics Comparison

Enrollment demographics for the 2024-25 school year are included in the table below. Although Education Code specifies that a charter school should aspire to achieve a demographic balance which is reflective of the *entire* District, the average enrollment demographics of the District schools which serve a similar grade span and are located in the High School Attendance Area (HSAA) in which the majority of the Charter School’s students reside, Castlemont/CCPA/Madison, is included for reference.

Figure 30: 2024-25 Enrollment Demographics

Student Group Type	Student Group	Charter School	OUSD schools in Comparison HSAA ²⁰	OUSD
Race/ Ethnicity	Hispanic/Latino	77.5%	76.5%	48.3%
	Black/African American	16.0%	15.7%	19.2%
	Asian	0.7%	1.5%	9.5%
	White	0.7%	1.7%	11.6%
	Two or More Races	0.2%	1.1%	6.8%
	Other Race/Ethnicity	0.5%	2.2%	1.7%
	Not Reported	4.2%	1.4%	2.9%

¹⁹ The 2025-26 year over year percentage change measures the percentage change between projected 2025-26 enrollment and 2024-25 actual enrollment.

²⁰ Includes 6 OUSD-operated schools serving students in Grades 6-12 located in the Castlemont/CCPA/Madison HSAA. Specifically, Castlemont, Coliseum College Prep, Elmhurst United, Frick, Greenleaf, and Madison Park Upper.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Other Student Groups	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	95.3%	98.7%	81.4%
	Homeless Youth	1.0%	10.0%	6.6%
	Foster Youth	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%
	English Learners	25.9%	48.9%	32.2% (6-12 only: 29.6%)
	Special Education	17.5%	17.1%	17.2% (6-12 only: 17.9%)

Source: Ethnicity/English Learners – CDE Downloadable Data Files (School Enrollment, English Learners); Socioeconomically Disadvantaged/Special Education – CDE DataQuest School Enrollment by Subgroup Report

English Learner Enrollment

As shown previously, during the 2024-25 school year, 25.9% of Aspire GSP’s total enrollment were English Learners. The following tables are included to further disaggregate this data to give a fuller context of the English Learners served at Aspire GSP and their level of need. As a note, this data does not provide any indication as to how well the Charter School is serving these students. The English Learner Progress Indicator on the California School Dashboard is a more appropriate metric for evaluating the strength of the English Learner program. As shown below:

- *The Charter School has a larger percentage of English Learner students who were placed in a higher ELPAC level compared with OUSD in the same grade span.*
- *The Charter School has a smaller proportion of students who have been English learners between 0-3 years compared to OUSD, which may suggest fewer recent newcomer students. The Charter School does a larger percentage of English Learners classified as Long-Term English Learners than OUSD.*

Figure 31: 2023-24 ELPAC Levels – Charter School vs. OUSD (Grades 6-12 only)

ELPAC Level	Charter School	OUSD (Grades 6-12 Only)
Level 4 – Well Developed	18.6%	8.9%
Level 3 – Moderately Developed	35.4%	22.9%
Level 2 – Somewhat Developed	27.4%	22.6%
Level 1 – Minimally Developed	18.6%	45.6%

Source: 2023-24 Summative ELPAC Results

Figure 32: 2024-25 Enrollment by English Language Acquisition Status and Grade

Grade	English Only (EO)	Initial Fluent English Proficient (IFEP)	English Learner (EL)	Reclassified Fluent English (RFEP)	To Be Determined (TBD)
6	40.0%	9.2%	26.2%	24.6%	0.0%
7	27.0%	1.6%	36.5%	34.9%	0.0%
8	44.7%	0.0%	21.3%	34.0%	0.0%
9	20.0%	1.8%	27.3%	50.9%	0.0%
10	19.7%	0.0%	26.2%	54.1%	0.0%
11	9.8%	0.0%	29.5%	60.7%	0.0%
12	24.5%	1.9%	11.3%	62.3%	0.0%

Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 33: 2024-25 English Learner Breakdown by Grade Span and Category

	EL 0-3 Years	At-Risk 4-5 Years	LTEL 6+ Years	EL 4+ Years Not At-Risk or LTEL
Charter School	14.3%	1.0%	50.5%	34.3%
OUSD (6-12 Only)	36.3%	7.1%	41.7%	14.9%

Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

Special Education Enrollment

As shown previously, during the 2024-25 school year, 17.5% of Aspire GSP’s total enrollment were Students with Disabilities. The following figures are included to further disaggregate this data to give a fuller context of the Students with Disabilities served at Aspire GSP and their level of need. As shown below:

- Throughout the charter term, the majority of Students with Disabilities at Aspire GSP have had a specific learning disability as the primary disability.
- In both 2023-24 and 2024-25, over 90% of Students with Disabilities at Aspire GSP were in a regular classroom setting for 80 percent or more of the school day compared to approximately 60% at the District in both years.
- However, over 35% of Students with Disabilities in 2023-24 and over 25% in 2024-25 received more than 450 weekly service minutes.


Figure 34: Special Education Enrollment by Disability Type

Disability Type	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Autism	4%	5%	4%	5%	10%	7%	8%
Deaf-Blindness	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Deafness/Hearing Impairment	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Emotional Disturbance	3%	7%	5%	8%	4%	7%	4%
Established Medical Disability	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hard of Hearing	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%
Intellectual Disability	5%	8%	11%	11%	13%	10%	6%
Multiple Disabilities	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Orthopedic Impairment	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Health Impairment	20%	18%	13%	17%	17%	20%	13%
Specific Learning Disability	62%	59%	62%	55%	51%	52%	63%
Speech or Language Impairment	5%	1%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%
Traumatic Brain Injury	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Visual Impairment	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Source: CALPADS End-of-Year SELPA 16.12 Report - Students with Disabilities – Education Plan by Primary Disability (EOY 4)

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 35: Special Education Enrollment by Program Setting vs. OUSD (Grades 7-12 Only²¹)



Source: CDE Downloadable Data Files

Figure 36: Special Education by Placement and Weekly Service Minutes

	2023-24	2024-25
Percentage of students with IEPs receiving fewer than 450 ²² service minutes weekly	64.8%	74.6%
Percentage of students with IEPs receiving more than 450 service minutes weekly	35.2%	25.4%
Percentage of students with IEPs in nonpublic school (NPS) placement	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Charter School Performance Report

D. Notices of Concern and/or Notices to Cure and Correct

If credible evidence suggests that a charter school has violated state or federal law or the terms of its charter petition, the Office of Charter Schools will send the school, charter school board, or charter management organization a Notice of Concern regarding the issue, which includes remedies the charter school must implement to rectify the issue and resolve the Notice of Concern.²³ Aspire GSP and its CMO, Aspire Public Schools, have collectively been issued 1 Notice of Concern during the current charter term (0 issued to the Charter School and 1 issued to the CMO) as of August 1, 2025.

²¹ The SPED Data by Program Setting report on CDE Dataquest only disaggregates data into P-3, 4-6, 7-8, and 9-12. Therefore, a combination of 7-8 and 9-12 was chosen as the most similar comparison point to Aspire GSP.

²² The 450 minute threshold was chosen as a conservative estimate of the point at which a student may be considered to have moderate needs.

²³ If, after sending a Notice of Concern, the Office of Charter Schools determines based on the school's response that the violation listed in the notice did not occur, the notice may be rescinded.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 37: Notices of Concern and/or Notices to Cure and Correct

School Year	Notices of Concern	Area(s) of Concern	Remedy
2018-19	0	-	-
2019-20	0	-	-
2020-21	0	-	-
2021-22	0	-	-
2022-23	0	-	-
2023-24	0	-	-
2024-25	1	23-24 Audit Finding	CMO acknowledged the audit finding of a “Material Weakness in Internal Controls,” explained the material weakness, and outlined corrective steps to prevent recurrence.

Source: OUSD Office of Charter Schools Notice of Concern documentation

E. Board Health and Effectiveness

A charter school governing board’s decisions have a significant impact on the health and viability of its schools, as well as the quality of education students receive. Governing boards are responsible for decisions on the operations, vision, and policies of the charter school. Most importantly, governing boards are also responsible for ensuring that the charter school and its charter management organization (if applicable) is serving the best interest of students. The below table provides an overview of the Aspire Public Schools Governing Board and its composition.

Figure 38: Charter School Governing Board Overview and Composition

Aspire Public Schools Governing Board Overview			
Schools Overseen	36	Total Enrollment of all Schools Overseen	15,495 students
Required Minimum # of Members	4	Current # of Members (as of August 1, 2025)	4
Regular Meeting Frequency	Monthly	Brown Act Committees	Audit, Executive
Virtual Meeting Access	Yes	Minutes and Board Packet Posted Publicly	Yes
Aspire Public Schools Governing Board Composition			
Name, Role	Time on Board	Name, Role	Time on Board
Beth Hunkapiller, Board Chair	25 years	Lorea Martínez, Board Member	4 years
Ay'Anna Moody, Board Member	5 years	Veleta Savannah, Board Member	2 years

Source: Charter School Board Self-Evaluations submitted to OUSD, CDE Dataquest

As part of the renewal process, Staff evaluates the governing board’s overall health and effectiveness using the Charter School’s performance report, a governing board interview, governing board audits, a board self-evaluation tool, the governing board’s meeting agendas, minutes, and related documentation, and Element 4 of the charter renewal petition (along with any supporting documentation). These components are used as evidence in order to evaluate the Charter School governing board on the “Board Effectiveness Core Competencies” found below. The scale used for rating is aligned with the SQR Rubric Ratings, where the scores range from 1 (low) to 4 (high): 1 = Emerging, 2 = Developing, 3 = Implementing, and 4 = Sustaining.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 39: Board Core Competency Ratings

Core Competency	Description	Score
Board Composition	Board members possess a diversity of backgrounds and an array of appropriate and relevant skills with which to oversee the school/CMO.	3.0
Mission Alignment	Board members have a shared understanding of and commitment to the school’s mission and vision.	3.7
School Familiarity	Board members are knowledgeable about the school’s operations, successes, and challenges.	3.3
Role Familiarity	Board members demonstrate an understanding of their role in providing oversight to the charter school.	3.7
Community Engagement	Board members actively engage with school staff, families, and community members in order to govern effectively.	3
Accessibility	All governing board meetings are accessible to the community and the decision-making process is clear and transparent.	3.7
Compliance	The board complies with (and has systems in place to ensure compliance with) its own board policies and bylaws as well as with applicable state and federal laws regarding governance. The board is free of real or perceived conflicts of interest.	4
Effectiveness	The governing board is an effective decision-making body which is active and meets its governance obligations.	3

Source: Staff evaluation of Charter School performance report, Charter School renewal petition, Charter School board member self-evaluations, Charter School board member interview, Charter School board observations

F. Staffing and Teacher Credentialing

Education Code sections 47605(l)(1) and 47605.4 require all charter school teachers to hold the credential required for their assignment. Pursuant to Education Code Section 44258.9, all charter schools must participate in annual teacher assignment monitoring through the California Statewide Assignment Accountability System (“CalSAAS”). The OUSD Office of Charter Schools acts as the “Monitoring Authority” for all charter schools authorized by OUSD, which requires the annual review of educator assignments. The figures below represent the CalSAAS results for educator assignments in the 2023-24 school year, the most recent year for which data is available. As shown below:

- During the 2023-24 school year, only 24% of assignments were considered “Ineffective”, or were authorized by an emergency credential, variable term waiver, or substitute permit, which is below the OUSD average.
- During the 2023-24 school year, there were 32 total misassignments at Aspire GSP out of 150 total assignments. Of these 32, approximately 1/3rd were in elective subject settings.


Figure 40: 2023-24 Educator Credentials by Type

	Charter School	OUSD
Clear <i>Authorized by clear or preliminary credential or by local assignment option</i>	64.6%	52.8%
Intern <i>Authorized by intern credential</i>	5.5%	2.9%
Out-of-Field <i>Authorized by GELAP, SELAP, short-term waiver, emergency EL permit, or Local Assignment Option</i>	5.2%	2.5%
Ineffective <i>No legal authorization or authorized by emergency credential (PIP, STSP), variable term waivers, or substitute permits</i>	24.4%	39.6%
Incomplete <i>Missing or incorrect information was reported to CALPADS about the assignment</i>	0.0%	1.9%

Source: CDE Teaching Assignment Monitoring Outcomes by FTE Report

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 41: 2023-24 California Statewide Assignment Accountability System (“CaSAAS”) Results



Source: 2023-24 CaSAAS Monitoring Audit Report

In addition to the CaSAAS results, the Charter School submitted information regarding educator retention as part of its Renewal Performance Report. As shown below:

- The Charter School has retained the majority of its educators every year of the charter term.
- The Charter School had 4 early separations in 2022-23, but only had 1 per year in both 2023-24 and 2024-25.

Figure 42: Educator Retention Over Time (Self-Reported)

	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Percent of Educators Retained from Prior Year	93%	100%	83%	72%	74%	79%	61%
Early Separations	3/30	3/34	2/30	4/28	1/27	1/25	-

Source: Charter School Renewal Performance Report

III. Renewal Criteria III: Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?

In order for a charter school’s renewal petition to be approved, the petition must include all of the following, which are described in detail in this section:

- Reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all 15 required elements
- All other information required by the Ed Code
- All OUSD-specific requirements

Evidence considered for this criterion includes a review of the corresponding sections of the charter petition, including changes made from the prior petition, as well as checks for any additional requirements enacted since the charter was last approved.

A. The Required Fifteen Elements

All charter petitions must include a “reasonably comprehensive” description of 15 required elements related to the school’s operation.²⁴ The following table summarizes staff findings related to whether this standard was met for each element.

²⁴ EC §47605(c)(5)

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Figure 43: Petition Element Analysis

Element	Reasonably Comprehensive?
1. Description of the educational program of the school, including what it means to be an “educated person” in the 21st century and how learning best occurs.	Yes
2. Measurable student outcomes	Yes
3. Method by which student progress is to be measured	Yes
4. Governance structure	Yes
5. Qualifications to be met by individuals employed at the school	Yes
6. Procedures for ensuring health and safety of students	Yes
7. Means for achieving a balance of racial and ethnic, English learner, and special education students	Yes
8. Admission policies and procedures	Yes
9. Manner for conducting annual, independent financial audits and manner in which audit exceptions and deficiencies will be resolved	Yes
10. Suspension and expulsion procedures	Yes
11. Manner for covering STRS, PERS, or Social Security	Yes
12. Attendance alternatives for students residing within the district	Yes
13. Employee rights of return, if any	Yes
14. Dispute resolution procedure for school-authorizer issues	Yes
15. Procedures for school closure	Yes

Source: Ed Code §47605(c)(5) subsection (A) thru (O) and staff analysis of the charter renewal petition

B. Other Required Information

In addition to the required 15 elements, the Education Code also requires all charter petitions to include the following information.

Figure 44: Other Required Information

Required Information	Included in Petition?
An affirmation of each of the conditions described in EC §47605(h).	Yes
A declaration of whether or not the charter school shall be deemed the exclusive public employer of the employees of the charter school for purposes of Government Code §3540 through 3540.2 (California’s public school collective bargaining law).	Yes
Information regarding the proposed operation and potential effects of the charter school on the authorizer, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The facilities to be used by the charter school, including specifically where the charter school intends to locate. • The manner in which administrative services of the charter school are to be provided. • Potential civil liability effects, of the charter school on the authorizer. 	Yes
Financial statements that include the annual operating budget and 3-year cashflow and financial projections, backup and supporting documents and budget assumptions (i.e. anticipated revenues and expenditures, including special education, and projected average daily attendance).	Yes
If the school is to be operated by, or as, a nonprofit public benefit corporation, the petitioner shall provide the names and relevant qualifications of all persons whom the petitioner nominates to serve on the governing body of the charter school.	Yes

Source: Ed Code §47605(c)(4), §47605(c)(6), and §47605(h); staff analysis of the charter renewal petition

C. OUSD-Specified Requirements

Figure 45: OUSD-Specified Requirements

OUSD-Specified Requirement	Included in Petition?
District Required Language	Yes

Source: Staff analysis of the charter renewal petition

IV. Renewal Criteria IV: Is the Charter School Serving All Students Who Wish to Attend?

In order for a charter school’s renewal petition to be approved, the school must be serving all students who wish to attend.²⁵ By State law, evaluation of this criteria is limited to consideration of two sources of information (1) State-provided enrollment data and (2) any substantiated complaints related to noncompliance with suspension/expulsion requirements included in law and/or the charter school’s procedures. Denial under this criterion may only occur if (1) there is sufficient evidence in the abovementioned information sources demonstrating that the charter school is not serving all students who wish to attend and (2) the school has been given a reasonable opportunity to cure the violation. Therefore, evidence considered for this criterion includes:

- State-provided enrollment data
- Substantiated complaints and notices of concern related to noncompliance with suspension/expulsion requirements

A. State-Provided Enrollment Data

State law mandates that, upon request, the State provide charter school authorizers with certain aggregate data, specified in the law, reflecting student enrollment patterns for authorized charter schools. The State does not provide any guidance regarding how this data should be interpreted. This data includes the following for each year of the charter term²⁶:

- **Data Set 1 (Mid-Year Exits):** The percentage of students enrolled at any time between the beginning of the school year and the census day who were not enrolled at the end of the same school year, and the average State test results for these students from the prior school year, if available.
- **Data Set 2 (Year-to-Year Exits):** The percentage of students enrolled during the prior school year who were not enrolled as of the census day of the school year in question (excluding students who completed the highest grade served by the school), and the average State test results for these students from the prior year, if available.

The tables below summarize the data provided by the State. Additionally, it is important to note the data provided is limited in that it can only show correlation, *not causation*. Therefore, while an analysis is included below, the data, on its own, cannot definitively show whether or not the school is serving all students who wish to attend. With this limitation in mind, the analysis is below:

- **Data Set 1 (Mid-Year Exits):** For the first set of data, students who left the Charter School performed significantly below the Charter School’s schoolwide average pre-pandemic while they generally performed above the schoolwide average post-pandemic. The differences do not appear to be substantial or consistent enough to suggest that the school is not serving all students who wish to attend, particularly given the small number of students tested with scores.

²⁵ EC §47607(e)

²⁶ At the time of this report, the State provided data for 2016-17 through 2019-20 and 2022-23 through 2023-24. Due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, there was insufficient data available for the 2020-21 and 2021-22 school years.

- Data Set 2 (Year-to-Year Exits):** For the second set of data, students who left the Charter School performed below the Charter School’s schoolwide average in 2019-20, 2022-23, and 2023-24. In 2023-24, however, students who left the Charter School performed well above the Charter School’s schoolwide average in ELA and approximately the same in Math. Again, the differences do not appear to be substantial or consistent enough to suggest that the school is not serving all students who wish to attend.

Figure 46: Charter School Enrollment Data – Education Code Section 47607(d)(1)(B)

Data Set 1: Mid-Year Exits	2018-19	2019-20	2022-23	2023-24
Percent of students enrolled at the Charter School between start of the school year and census day who were not enrolled at the end of the school year	4.78% (30 of 628)	7.31% (46 of 629)	6.51% (31 of 476)	8.19% (38 of 464)
Number of these students with State test results from the prior year	ELA: 13 Math: 12	ELA: 28 Math: 27	ELA: 12 Math: 11	14
ELA: Difference between average DFS of unretained students and schoolwide average	-72.15 Unretained = -86.15 School = -14	-36.77 Unretained = -73.57 School = -36.8	+7.28 Unretained = -59.92 School = -67.2*	+4.8 Unretained = -54 School = -58.8
Math: Difference between average DFS of unretained students and schoolwide average	-60.17 Unretained = -122.67 School = -62.5	-50.51 Unretained = -143.11 School = -92.6	+5.09 Unretained = -128.91 School = -134	-19.73 Unretained = -157.43 School = -137.7

Source: Aggregate enrollment-pattern data provided by the State

*Reflects the average DFS at the school without the penalty applied for not meeting the required 95% Participation Rate.

Figure 47: Charter School Enrollment Data – Education Code Section 47607(d)(1)(C)

Data Set 2: Year-to-Year Exits	2018-19	2019-20	2022-23	2023-24
Percent of students enrolled at the Charter School during the prior school year who were not enrolled as of the census day for the specified year (excluding graduating students)	8.87% (55 of 620)	12.10% (76 of 628)	17.99% (100 of 556)	10.71% (51 of 476)
Number of these students with State test results from the prior year	25	ELA: 41 Math: 40	ELA: 58 Math: 56	27
ELA: Difference between average DFS of unretained students and schoolwide average	-4.04 Unretained = -18.04 School = -14	-25.93 Unretained = -62.73 School = -36.8	-22.64 Unretained = -89.84 School = -68*	+21.95 Unretained = -36.85 School = -58.8
Math: Difference between average DFS of unretained students and schoolwide average	-34.38 Unretained = -96.88 School = -62.5	-35.65 Unretained = -128.25 School = -92.6	-9.77 Unretained = -143.77 School = -134	-6.89 Unretained = -- 144.59 School = -137.7

Source: Aggregate enrollment-pattern data provided by the State

*Reflects the average DFS at the school without the penalty applied for not meeting the required 95% Participation Rate.

B. Substantiated Complaints and Notices of Concern Related to Noncompliance with Suspension / Expulsion Requirements

During the current charter term, the Office of Charter Schools did not receive any substantiated complaints related to noncompliance with suspension and/or expulsion requirements for the charter school.

V. Recommendation Summary

To determine if the Charter School has adequately met each renewal criteria, Staff considered evidence gathered from the school’s petition and supporting documentation, the site visit, and the school’s performance during its previous charter term. The following section outlines the Charter School’s identified strengths and challenges related to each renewal criteria, as well as a determination of whether the Charter School adequately met the criteria for purposes of renewal.

A. Renewal Criteria I: Has the Charter School Presented a Sound Educational Program?

Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very high percentage of English Learners made progress in 2023-24, with Blue status on the ELPI Dashboard indicator. • High CCI rate, with Blue status on the most recent Dashboard. • High school ELA proficiency has increased over the last three years. • Students with Disabilities showed significant increases in both ELA and Math DFS between 2021-22 and 2023-24. • The school has high graduation rates with an upward trajectory. • A-G completion rates have shown an upward trajectory over the last three years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schoolwide Math proficiency and DFS declined over the course of the charter term, with current proficiency at 6.9% and DFS at -145, resulting in a Red status on the Math Dashboard indicator. • Schoolwide ELA proficiency and DFS was below the District average in 2023-24. • Middle school ELA proficiency declined in the most recent year, despite several years of prior increases. • A-G rates declined significantly during the charter term, though improved over the last three years. • Aspire GSP was identified for Differentiated Assistance in 2023-24 and 2024-25 based on the African American, English Learner, Hispanic, and Students with Disabilities student groups receiving at least one Red color on the Dashboard • The site visit revealed inconsistent implementation of standards-based instruction and pacing, with limited academic rigor across classrooms.

Determination: Based on this analysis, staff believes the findings in this Report can support a conclusion that Aspire GSP has presented a sound educational program.

B. Renewal Criteria II: Is the Charter School Demonstrably Likely to Successfully Implement the Proposed Educational Program?

Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school remains at a sustainable enrollment size despite enrollment decline over the charter term. • The school appears to be in adequate fiscal condition, with an ending fund balance that appears sufficient. • The school has a low percentage of teaching assignments considered “Ineffective”. • Although the CMO received one Notice of Concern regarding audit findings, the school received zero throughout the course of the charter term. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrollment has declined over the course of the charter term, although has stabilized in recent years. • Recent audit findings identified two material weaknesses in financial controls. • Enrollment projections appear overly optimistic, potentially leading to overestimated budget projections and revenue.

Determination: Based on this analysis, Aspire GSP is demonstrably likely to successfully implement the proposed educational program.

C. Renewal Criteria III: Is the Petition Reasonably Comprehensive?

Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charter petition contains reasonably comprehensive descriptions of the required 15 elements. OUSD-specified requirements are included in the petition. 	N/A

Determination: Based on this analysis, the petition for Aspire GSP is reasonably comprehensive.

D. Renewal Criteria IV: Is the School Serving All Students Who Wish to Attend?

Strengths	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence in State-provided enrollment data that suggests the school is failing to serve all students who wish to attend. There have been no substantiated complaints or Notices of Concern related to noncompliance with suspension/expulsion requirements. 	N/A

Determination: Based on this analysis, Aspire GSP is serving all students who wish to attend.

E. Analysis of Other Public School Options if Renewal is Denied

When determining whether to recommend denial, OCS Staff consider other public-school options available to the Charter School’s current students, and denial findings for a Middle Tier school must demonstrate, in part, that closure is in the best interest of students²⁷. The following provides an overview of the attendance areas where Aspire GSP students live, where students who have transferred from the school enroll in the subsequent year, and how nearby schools serving middle and high school students perform relative to Aspire GSP.

Aspire GSP Students Attendance Areas

Students attending Aspire GSP in 2024-25 lived in 14 different OUSD attendance areas. Additionally, 17 of its students reside outside of Oakland. The table below shows all middle and high school attendance areas where at least 5% Aspire GSP of students lived.

Figure 48: 2024-25 Charter School Enrollment by Attendance Area and Grade Span

Attendance Area Grade Level	Attendance Area	Number of Aspire GSP Students Living in Attendance Area (Percent of Total Enrollment)
Middle	CCPA/GREENLEAF/LIFE 6-8	65 (16.1%)
	FRICK	51 (12.6%)
	ELMHURST UNITED	40 (9.9%)
High	CASTLEMONT/CCPA/MADISON	193 (47.7%)
	FREMONT	23 (5.7%)

Source: OUSD Department of Research, Assessment, and Data Live/Go Dashboard

²⁷ Ed Code 47607.2(b)(6)

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Performance Comparison with Nearby Schools/Target Student Population Area

In order to evaluate the performance of Aspire GSP relative to other public-school options available to the Charter School’s current students, the following list of comparison schools was created to include (A) any schools serving similar grade spans within the Middle School Attendance Area (“MSAA”) or High School Attendance Area (“HSAA”) for which at least 5% of students currently live and (B) any schools serving similar grade spans within the MSAA or HSAA for which the school is located. The figure below summarizes 2023-24 State test outcomes (in terms of Distance from Standard (DFS)) and 2023-24 Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates for these schools, comparing outcomes to Aspire GSP. The table also includes some demographic information from that same year for additional context. As shown in Figure 49:

- **Middle School Performance**
 - **ELA:** Aspire GSP Grades 6-8 had a DFS which was greater than 4 of 8 comparison schools.
 - **Math:** Aspire GSP Grades 6-8 had a DFS which was greater than 3 of 8 comparison schools.
- **High School Performance**
 - **ELA:** Aspire GSP Grades 9-12 had a DFS which was greater than 8 of 16 comparison schools.
 - **Math:** Aspire GSP Grades 9-12 had a DFS which was greater than 8 of 16 comparison schools.
 - **Graduation Rate:** Aspire GSP had a higher graduation rate than 16 of 16 comparison schools.

Figure 49: 2023-24 Performance Comparison of Nearby Schools Serving Grades 6-8

MSAA (Percent of Total Enrollment)	School	Grade Span	% SED	% EL	% SWD	ELA DFS	Math DFS
CCPA/GREENLEAF/ LIFE 6-8 (16.1%)	Aspire GSP	6-12	95%	28%	16%	-69.8	-144.6
	Coliseum College Prep Academy	6-12	98%	43%	21%	-68.9	-133.6
	Greenleaf	K-8	96%	63%	11%	-75.5	-89.3
	Oakland Unity Middle	6-8	98%	36%	14%	-13.8	-27.7
ELHURST UNITED (12.6%)	East Bay Innovation Academy	6-12	38%	10%	19%	9.2	-45.4
	Elmhurst United Middle	6-8	98%	44%	16%	-94.7	-148.7
FRICK (9.9%)	Francophone Charter School of Oakland	K-8	35%	17%	8%	26.2	-6
	Frick United	6-8	99%	57%	17%	-160.2	-207.5
	Independent Study, Sojourner Truth	K-12	98%	26%	22%	-204.9	-234.4

Source: English Learners – CDE Downloadable Data Files (School Enrollment, English Learners); Socioeconomically Disadvantaged/Special Education – CDE DataQuest School Enrollment by Subgroup Report; OUSD Special Education/Distance From Standard/CORE Growth Percentile – OUSD Department of Research, Assessment, and Data

Figure 50: 2023-24 Performance Comparison of Nearby Schools Serving Grades 9-12

HSAA (Percent of Total Enrollment)	School	Grade Span	% SED	% EL	% SWD	ELA DFS	Math DFS	Grad Rate
CASTLEMONT/CCPA/ MADISON (47.7%)	Aspire GSP	6-12	95%	28%	16%	-69.8	-144.6	99%
	Alternatives in Action	9-12	95%	54%	17%	-107.6	-183.1	67%
	Aspire Lionel Wilson	6-12	87%	21%	16%	-26.8	-126	92%
	Castlemont High	9-12	99%	47%	18%	-188.1	-193.9	68%

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

	Coliseum College Prep Academy	6-12	98%	43%	21%	-68.9	-133.6	92%
	Sojourner Truth	K-12	98%	26%	22%	-204.9	-234.4	58%
	Lighthouse High	9-12	93%	29%	15%	-44.7	-154.1	90%
	Lodestar	K-12	90%	45%	13%	-83.9	-99.9	89%
	LPS Oakland R & D Campus	9-12	71%	37%	15%	-89.1	-191.1	94%
	Madison Park Academy 6-12	6-12	100%	40%	16%	-93.9	-162.3	89%
	Oakland Unity High	9-12	68%	13%	19%	50.3	-48.9	94%
	Rudsdale Continuation High	9-12	99%	71%	9%	-326.3	-344.3	66%
Fremont (5.7%)	ARISE High	9-12	88%	33%	17%	-1.3	-102.5	90%
	Bay Area Technology	6-12	84%	26%	18%	-56	-111.4	93%
	Fremont High	9-12	99%	54%	14%	-155.9	-235.7	81%
	Latitude 37.8 High	9-12	66%	26%	23%	-11.6	-103.4	92%
	LIFE Academy	6-12	98%	37%	22%	-18.8	-73.2	95%

Source: English Learners – CDE Downloadable Data Files (School Enrollment, English Learners); Socioeconomically Disadvantaged/Special Education – CDE DataQuest School Enrollment by Subgroup Report; OUSD Special Education/Distance From Standard/CORE Growth Percentile – OUSD Department of Research, Assessment, and Data

F. Recommendation

Based on the analysis outlined therein, **Staff recommend Option A, approving the renewal petition for Aspire GSP for 5 years, beginning July 1, 2025, until June 30, 2031, to serve students in Grades 6-12, with the benchmarks detailed below.** However, Staff has determined that there are multiple legally compliant options.

Option A:

If the Board, after considering both the schoolwide and subgroup performance on the state and local indicators of the Dashboard, providing greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance, and considering any verified data submitted by the Charter School, determines that the Charter School's renewal petition has met all renewal criteria and should be renewed, the Board may adopt the resolution to approve the Charter School's renewal petition for five years, beginning July 1, 2025, with the following benchmarks:

1. **Performance Benchmark:** In each year of the charter term, the Charter School shall demonstrate academic growth in Math for All Students, African American students, English Learners, Hispanic students, Long-Term English Learners, Socioeconomically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities as reported on the California School Dashboard Math Performance Indicator by achieving a Distance from Standard (DFS) that has Increased or Increased Significantly from the prior year as measured by Change Level; or achieved a 4 or 5 on the California Growth Metric; or achieved "High" CORE growth of 70% or above.

As part of ongoing oversight, if the Charter School fails to meet any of the above benchmarks beginning with the 2026 Dashboard, the Charter School is expected to provide a written report to the OUSD Board within 2 months of the release of the Dashboard, and a verbal report scheduled at the discretion of Board leadership. Furthermore, the Charter School's progress towards meeting the Benchmarks will be considered upon submission of a renewal petition at the end of the term of the charter as part of the "performance of all subgroups of pupils served by the charter school in the state and local indicators," and whether "the Charter School has achieved measurable increases in academic achievement."

2. **Fiscal Benchmark:** If any Material Weakness, exception, or deficiency is identified in ACA's or Aspire's annual audit report during the new charter term, the Charter School's governing board shall : a) provide a written remediation plan to the OUSD Board addressing the root cause of the finding, b) Upon completing the remediation plan, provide a written report to the OUSD Board documenting the implementation. At the discretion of OUSD Board leadership, verbal reports on these items may be scheduled to the OUSD Board.

Option B

If the Board, after considering both the schoolwide and subgroup performance on the state and local indicators of the Dashboard, providing greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance, and considering any verified data submitted by the Charter School, denies the charter renewal petition, the Board must make written findings, setting forth specific facts to support the findings, that determine the following:

1. The charter school has failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward meeting standards that provide a benefit to the pupils of the school; **and**
2. Closure of the charter school is in the best interest of students; **and**
3. The Board's decision provided greater weight to performance on measurements of academic performance.

The Board may use the data and conclusions in this Staff Report as its findings in support of either of the above options.



VI. Appendices

Appendix A. Additional California School Dashboard Analyses – including Local Indicators

Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on California School Dashboard Indicators

Typically, the California School Dashboard displays colors for each indicator (see below) which are assigned based on two factors: the current year’s data and the difference between the current year’s data and the prior year’s data, or “Change”. Due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on statewide testing and accountability systems, there was insufficient data to calculate “Change” for the 2022 California School Dashboard, and thus the 2022 California School Dashboard displayed “Status levels” (Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low) in place of colors. For purposes of the Renewal Tier Analysis and the School Performance Analysis, these Status Levels were used as proxies for color as shown below.

Figure 51: 2022 and 2023 California School Dashboard Indicator Levels

Year	Dashboard Indicator Levels				
2022	<p>Very Low LOWEST PERFORMANCE</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Very High HIGHEST PERFORMANCE</p>
2023	<p>Red LOWEST PERFORMANCE</p>	<p>Orange</p>	<p>Yellow</p>	<p>Green</p>	<p>Blue HIGHEST PERFORMANCE</p>

Source: California School Dashboard

The only exceptions to the categorization rules above are the Chronic Absenteeism and Suspension Indicators for which the 2022 scale is reversed such that “Very High” corresponds to the lowest performance, or the “Red” color.

Additionally, there was insufficient data to assign a status level to the College and Career Readiness indicator for the 2022 California School Dashboard, so the indicator is not available for the 2022 California School Dashboard and is categorized using a status level, not a color, for the 2023 California School Dashboard. For more information about the California School Dashboard, please visit the CDE’s support page at www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/index.asp.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

California School Dashboard Local Indicators

Charter schools are required to report annually on five State Board of Education (SBE)-approved local indicators aligned to State priority areas where other State data is not available. In order to meet each local indicator, the SBE requires charter schools to (1) annually measure their progress based on locally available data, (2) report the results at a public charter school board meeting, and (3) report the results to the public through the California School Dashboard. The school uses self-reflection tools included within the California School Dashboard to report its progress on the local indicators. If a charter school does not submit results to the California School Dashboard by the given deadline, including completing the self-reflection tool, the school’s California School Dashboard will reflect *Not Met* for the indicator by default. Earning a performance level of *Not Met* for two or more years for a given local indicator may be a factor in being identified for differentiated assistance, provided by an outside agency (typically the county office of education) as required by State law.²⁸

Figure 52: California School Dashboard Local Indicators




Local Indicator	2018	2019	2022	2023	2024
Basics: Teachers, Instructional Materials, Facilities	Met	Met	Not Met	Met	Met
Implementation of Academic Standards	Met	Met	Not Met	Met	Met
Parent and Family Engagement	Met	Met	Not Met	Met	Met
Local Climate Survey	Met	Met	Not Met	Met	Met
Access to a Broad Course of Study	Met	Met	Not Met	Met	Met

Source: California School Dashboard

2023-24 California School Dashboard Indicators Determined for “Informational Purposes Only”

The 2023-24 California School Dashboard included three additional Indicators which are to be used for “informational purposes only”. While OCS Staff did not consider these indicators as part of the analysis to determine the renewal recommendation included in this report, the results have been included below for informational purposes only.

Figure 53: California School Dashboard Indicators – “Informational Purposes Only”

ELA Growth	Math Growth	Science
		
<p>Students at Aspire GSP generally scored 21 points below the typical growth of students with similar test scores in the previous grade level.</p>	<p>Students at Aspire GSP generally scored 27 points below the typical growth of students with similar test scores in the previous grade level.</p>	<p>Students at Aspire GSP had an average DFS of 32.4 points below standard, a 3.4 point decrease from the prior year, on the California Science Test.</p>

Source: California School Dashboard

²⁸ Detailed criteria for differentiated assistance can be found at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/cm/leaproposedcrit.asp>.

Appendix B. Additional Program Implementation Information

Proposed Charter School Projected Student Enrollment and Grade Levels Served (as outlined in petition)

In its renewal petition (pg. 40), Aspire GSP is proposing to serve a projected student enrollment at each grade level, and at all grade levels combined, in each of the years of the term of the Charter as follows:

Figure 54: Projected Enrollment

Projected Student Enrollment for Each Year by Grade Level and Total Enrollment					
Grade Level	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
6	62	64	66	66	66
7	62	64	66	66	66
8	62	64	66	66	66
9	62	64	66	66	66
10	62	64	66	66	66
11	62	62	64	64	64
12	60	60	62	62	62
Total	432	442	456	456	456

Source: Aspire GSP renewal petition

Admissions Preferences

In the event of a public random drawing, the Aspire GSP admissions preferences are as shown below:

Figure 55: Aspire GSP Admissions Preferences

#	Admissions Preference
1	All students who seek to continue their preparation and readiness for college from other Aspire schools, including those matriculating from an Aspire elementary school to an Aspire secondary school.
2	Children of Aspire Regular, Full-time employees.
3	Siblings of students already admitted to the Charter School.
4	Children of founding families of the Charter School.
5	Children residing within the District.
6	All other students who reside in the state of California.

Source: Aspire GSP renewal petition

Charter School Enrollment Demographics Over Time

Figure 56: Aspire GSP Enrollment Demographics

Student Group Type	Student Group	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Ethnicity	Hispanic/Latino	82.5%	81.7%	81.4%	79.5%	81.3%	78.7%	77.5%
	Black/African American	16.3%	17.2%	16.9%	17.8%	15.0%	15.6%	16.0%
	Asian	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.7%
	White	0.2%	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.7%	0.7%
	Two or More Races	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
	Other Race/Ethnicity	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%	0.7%	1.1%	0.5%
	Not Reported	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	1.2%	2.1%	3.7%	4.2%

Other Student Groups	Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	91.6%	92.8%	84.7%	73.8%	86.3%	95.0%	95.3%
	Homeless Youth	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	1.6%	1.0%
	Foster Youth	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%
	English Learners	22.0%	21.9%	24.2%	25.5%	24.5%	27.8%	25.9%
	Special Education	9.9%	11.0%	12.2%	12.3%	14.1%	16.3%	17.5%

Source: ETHNICITY/SOCIOECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED/ENGLISH LEARNERS/SPECIAL EDUCATION – CDE Dataquest (School Enrollment by Subgroup Report)

Stability Rate

The figure below shows the Charter School's stability rate as reported by the California Department of Education. For this metric, students are determined to have a "stable" enrollment during the academic year if the enrollment record is a minimum of 245 consecutive calendar days at the same school without a disqualifying exit.

Figure 57: Annual Student Stability Rate

	2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24	
	Stability Count	Stability Rate	Stability Count	Stability Rate	Stability Count	Stability Rate	Stability Count	Stability Rate	Stability Count	Stability Rate
Schoolwide	591	94.0%	601	97.4%	521	93.7%	427	89.7%	414	89.2%
African American	97	89.0%	103	98.1%	94	94.0%	64	82.1%	59	74.7%
Hispanic or Latino	488	95.3%	488	97.2%	412	93.6%	346	92.0%	332	92.2%
English Learners	126	92.6%	148	98.7%	132	89.2%	112	90.3%	117	88.6%
Students with Disabilities	72	90.0%	74	97.4%	69	93.2%	64	88.9%	72	88.9%
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	552	94.5%	510	97.7%	401	94.1%	371	90.9%	396	91.2%

Source: CDE DataQuest

Charter School Educator Credentials

Figure 58: Educator Credentials by Type Over Time

	2021-22	2022-23
Clear <i>Authorized by clear or preliminary credential or by local assignment option</i>	49.8%	51.0%
Intern <i>Authorized by intern credential</i>	0.0%	1.9%
Out-of-Field <i>Authorized by GELAP, SELAP, short-term waiver, emergency EL permit, or Local Assignment Option</i>	6.2%	0.0%
Ineffective <i>No legal authorization or authorized by emergency credential (PIP, STSP), variable term waivers, or substitute permits</i>	40.5%	37.3%
Incomplete <i>Missing or incorrect information was reported to CALPADS about the assignment</i>	0.7%	7.5%

Source: CDE DataQuest

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

2025-26 Charter School Educator Demographics

Figure 59: 2025-26 Educator Demographics

Race / Ethnicity	2025-26
Hispanic/Latino	10%
Black/African American	10%
Asian	5%
White	75%
Other Race/Ethnicity	0%

Source: Charter School Performance Report

Charter School Complaints to OUSD

The OUSD Office of Charter Schools logs the complaints it receives for OUSD-authorized charter schools. However, unless the allegations identify a potential violation of their charter petition or of local, state, or federal law, the Office of Charter Schools typically refers the complainant to school leadership, who is ultimately responsible for addressing the complaint in compliance with its adopted complaint policy. Therefore, complaints included in the table below may not necessarily have been substantiated. Instead, the table is a record of what has been reported to the Office of Charter Schools staff. Additionally, some complainants may not know that they can submit complaints to the Office of Charter Schools. Therefore, the absence (or a low number) of complaints does not necessarily mean that other complaints were not reported directly to the school or charter management organization. During the current seven-year charter term, the Office of Charter Schools received 3 complaints regarding Aspire GSP and 0 complaints regarding the Charter School’s CMO.

Figure 60: Aspire GSP Complaints to OUSD

School Year	Complaints	Areas of Concern
2018-19	0	
2019-20	0	
2020-21	0	
2021-22	1	Bullying/Student Health and Safety
2022-23	1	Grading/Communication
2023-24	0	
2024-25	1	Communication
2025-26	0	

Source: OUSD Office of Charter Schools Complaint Records as of August 1, 2025

*Complaint was substantiated by the Office of Charter Schools and led to the issuance of a Notice of Concern

Charter School English Learners by Language

Figure 61: 2024-25 Language Group Data

Language	English Learners (EL)	Fluent English Proficient (FEP) Students	Percent of Total Enrollment that is EL and FEP
Spanish; Castilian	98	184	69.63%
Arabic	2	6	1.98%
Uncoded languages	3	2	1.23%
Mayan languages	1	1	0.49%
Southern Altai	1	0	0.25%
Undetermined	0	1	0.25%

Source: CDE Dataquest

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District

Appendix C. Charter Management Organization’s Key Fiscal Indicators

Financial Indicator	2018-19 Audited	2019-20 Audited	2020-21 Audited	2021-22 Audited	2022-23 Audited	2023-24 Audited
Annual Net Surplus or (Deficit) <i>Indicates whether the school spent more or less than it received in revenue during the year. Deficits are shown in parentheses.</i>	(10,014,593)	(9,731,501)	33,256,941	4,962,938	35,033,374	(18,965,452)
Ending Fund Balance <i>Typically represents unrestricted funds, although in some cases, restricted funds that were not fully spent in previous years may be included.</i>	84,871,238	75,139,737	108,396,678	113,359,616	148,392,990	129,427,538
Debt Ratio <i>A ratio less than 1 indicates the school has lower debts than assets, representing a lower level of financial risk.</i>	0.68	0.71	0.69	0.73	0.68	0.70
Budgetary Reserve <i>Given the school’s ADA, FCMAT prescribes a minimum 4% reserve (calculated as Unrestricted Net Assets / Total Expenditures) as a set aside to prepare for potential liabilities. Reserve rates below this rate indicates poor financial condition.</i>	31%	28%	45%	37%	32%	27%
Cash Reserve <i>FCMAT recommends 5%+ cash reserve of the total of all budgeted expenditures (calculated as Unrestricted Cash / Total Expenditures). Below 5% is indicative of a poor financial condition.</i>	16%	11%	16%	21%	34%	25%

Source: 2018-19 through 2023-24 Annual Audit Reports

Appendix D. Charter School Response to Notice of Concern re: 2023-24 Audit Findings

Please see following page.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

March 13th, 2025

To Whom it May Concern:

On behalf of Aspire Board President Beth Hunkapiller, we write to respond to the attached "Notice of Concern" that was sent to us on February 14th, 2025 related to Audit Finding #2024--001.

As an initial matter, we wish to reiterate that Aspire Public Schools ("Aspire") takes seriously its responsibility to meet and exceed all laws and best practices when it comes to financial controls and reporting. Aspire has been operating charter schools for 25+ years, and during that time has proudly earned a reputation for the strength and integrity of its Fiscal Operations. We appreciate your questions in this regard and welcome the opportunity to share how we are addressing these concerns in an effort to continuously improve our systems.

Corrective Action Plan ("Title 2 CFR Section 200.302"): This pertains to an accidental recognition of a prepaid expense, which was offset by a mirrored line item in our Accounts Payable. This error had an immaterial impact on Aspire's overall financial statements, and net asset balance (~\$24k net asset impact, which equates to less than 0.02% of Aspire's total net assets as of 6/30/2024). To prevent a reoccurrence of this error, we have instituted an additional check and review step to our regular prepaid expense review process, which will ensure that we correctly account for the timing of prepaid expenses entries, especially as it pertains to year-end timing. We are confident that this systemic corrective measure fully addresses this concern.

Corrective Action Plan ("Title 2 CFR Section 200.510(b)"): This pertains to an accidental misclassification of a funding source between federal and state funding when manually preparing the Schedule of Federal Awards. Please note that expenses were properly coded and allocated in our system of record at a resource code/funding source level, as well as at a State and Federal level. As a result, there was no impact to Aspire's overall financial statements. In order to prevent a reoccurrence of this error, going forward Aspire will clearly tag the funding source of resources codes in its financial system of record in a way that allows automated reporting to produce the Schedule, which will reduce the risk of human/manual error. We are confident that this systemic corrective measure fully addresses this concern.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide the explanations and solutions outlined above. We welcome the opportunity to answer any further questions you may have regarding the above.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Wimbish".
E449FDCC53B647D...

Michael Wimbish

Chief Financial Officer, Aspire Public Schools

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org
June 19th, 2025

VIA EMAIL:

timothy.ryan@ousd.org
kelly.kragarnold@ousd.org

Timothy Ryan-Conner, Accounting Manager
Oakland Unified School District
1011 Union Street, Site #947

Oakland, California 94607

Dear Mr. Ryan-Conner:

Aspire Public Schools (“Aspire”) submits this response to the Oakland Unified School District’s (“OUSD’s”) letter dated May 20, 2025 (the “May Letter”), which includes “follow-up inquiries and commentary” concerning Aspire’s March 13, 2025 response (the “Aspire Response”) to OUSD’s Notice of Concern dated February 14, 2025 (the “Notice.”). For reference, the May Letter, Aspire Response, and Notice are attached as Exhibits A, B, and C, respectively. The Notice and May Letter relate to Aspire Audit Findings #2024-001 and #2024-002.

Aspire remains committed to promptly and fully responding to all reasonable inquiries from OUSD, including those regarding its financial records, consistent with Education Code Section 47604.3. We emphasize that independent audits—such as those conducted for both Aspire and OUSD—are essential tools in identifying and correcting financial reporting issues. In Aspire’s case, these audits have effectively led to meaningful corrective actions recommended by our independent auditors, which Aspire has consistently implemented.

That said, we are concerned by certain aspects of the May Letter, particularly the inclusion of unsubstantiated commentary. For example, the assertion that Aspire’s audit findings “cast doubt over Aspire’s ability to prevent fraudulent reporting and misappropriation of assets” is not only inconsistent with the Independent Auditor’s report, but also excessive.

Such commentary contradicts the professional assessment of Aspire’s independent auditor, who is best positioned to evaluate the significance of audit findings. If OUSD’s position is that the existence of a material weakness automatically implies an inability to prevent fraud or misappropriation, that logic would appear to apply equally to OUSD’s own repeated findings, as well as to those of other LEAs. This conclusion is neither accurate nor reasonable. Furthermore, it is unclear how Aspire could reasonably refute a conclusion that is stated as a subjective perception of doubt.

We are also concerned about the potential implications of the Notice of Concern in the context of upcoming charter renewal proceedings. As explained in further detail below, whether Aspire’s audit findings raise doubt

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

about future financial reporting is a matter for the qualified auditors to determine. We strongly object to the use of unsupported and alarming terms such as “fraudulent financial reporting” or “misappropriation of assets” in connection with Aspire’s schools when there is no basis for use of that terminology, especially given that the audit findings at issue are similar to those found in OUSD’s own audits.

To be clear, Aspire’s independent auditor has not concluded, suggested, or implied that Audit Findings #2024-001 and #2024-002 jeopardize the fiscal health of Aspire’s charter schools or rise to the level of a substantial fiscal factor. If OUSD intends to characterize them as such, now or at any time in the future, we respectfully request a meeting before July 11th so our respective financial teams can review the findings together, discuss the corrective measures Aspire has implemented in partnership with our auditor, and place these findings in context with those commonly observed in OUSD and other LEAs. This collaborative review will help ensure a shared understanding of the nature and implications of the findings going forward.

Resolving these issues before charter renewal is essential, given the high stakes for Oakland families who deserve to choose the schools that best serve their children. If OUSD believes this response does not fully address the concerns raised in the Notice and the May Letter, please inform us as soon as possible, so we may collaboratively address any remaining issues in a timely and transparent manner.

Additional Responses to Statements and Inquiries in the OUSD May Letter

Concerning Title 2 CFR Section 200.302:

OUSD Statement: GAAP prohibits the netting of assets and liabilities.

Aspire Response: Aspire’s financial statements plainly do not net assets and liabilities in violation of GAAP. The Aspire Response merely described the negligible *net financial effect* of a one-time accidental error in order to provide context and perspective essential to a fair understanding of the facts.

OUSD Inquiry #1: What is the nature and extent of the incremental, and/or modified, control attributes reviewer(s) now perform to detect balance sheet gross-ups in Aspire’s accounts payable and prepaid expenses?

Aspire Response to OUSD Inquiry #1: This inquiry relates to Aspire’s internal control attributes instituted to prevent the accidental overstatement of balance sheet accounts, specifically in relation to accounts payable and prepaid expenses. As detailed in the Aspire Response, this issue involved the inadvertent recognition of a prepaid expense due to incorrect payment date information—a timing issue. In response, Aspire has implemented incremental and modified control attributes designed to strengthen the detection and prevention of such misstatements:

- Layered Review of Prepaid Expense Entries. Aspire has instituted an additional check-and-review control step within its prepaid expense recognition process. Once initial invoice reviews are completed and a determination has been made regarding prepaid treatment, the Assistant Controller is now required to perform a secondary review specifically focused on verifying the actual payment date associated with

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

each prepaid item. This step is designed to detect misalignments between the payment date and the accounting period of expense recognition.

Following this, the Controller independently reviews and confirms the Assistant Controller's entries as part of a second-level control. This two-tiered review structure ensures that no prepaid item is inappropriately classified based on incorrect timing assumptions.

Aspire has already implemented this new process, as described in the January 13th, 2025 Accounting Team Check Meeting Notes attached as Exhibit D.

- **Enhanced Reconciliation and Tracking Tool.** Aspire now utilizes an updated Prepaid Expense Reconciliation Document, including tracking of the timing of recognition of each pre-paid expense. This tool enables reviewers to easily compare recognition periods and confirm the accuracy of classification. By making the recognition timeline more transparent and traceable, the tool reduces the risk of duplicate entries or erroneous balance sheet impact. The updated reconciliation format is already in use and is included as Exhibit E.
- **Targeted Focus on Gross-Up Risk.** The revised control activities were developed with the specific risk of "gross-up" in mind, i.e., the risk that both accounts payable and prepaid expense accounts reflect the same obligation, thereby overstating liabilities and assets. The new procedures are designed to flag this scenario and require reconciliation prior to close, ensuring accurate financial statement presentation.

Concerning Title 2 CFR Section 200.510(b):

OUSD Inquiry #2: What control activities has Aspire implemented or modified to ensure that all resource codes are tagged with the funding sources and that the tagging is accurate and appropriate?

Aspire Response to OUSD Inquiry #2: This inquiry pertains to an inadvertent misclassification of a funding source during the manual preparation of the Schedule of Federal Awards. As detailed in the Aspire Response, Aspire has instituted the following:

- **System-Based Tagging Controls.** Aspire has fully transitioned to a system-generated Schedule of Federal Awards. All resource codes within Aspire's financial system of record are now configured with mandatory tags that classify each resource as either State or Federal. These tags are based on the applicable audit guide, and cannot be overridden manually without administrator review.
- **Validation and Reporting Logic.** The financial system now includes validation logic that cross-checks resource codes against predefined federal and state program lists and based on the audit guide. This allows for checks for inconsistencies prior to finalization of the Schedule. This ensures both completeness and appropriateness in classification.
- **Staff Training and Accountability.** To support successful implementation of these system enhancements, Aspire conducted targeted training for relevant accounting personnel on the updated tagging and

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

reporting procedures during the Accounting Team Check meeting held on January 13th, 2025. (See Exhibit D.) This training emphasized proper use of tagging functionalities, the critical importance of accurate classification, and how to use built-in system prompts and reports to verify data integrity.

- **Audit Trail and Review.** The automated process now generates an audit trail documenting all resource code assignments and any modifications. Aspire’s financial leadership reviews these audit logs periodically to ensure continued compliance and to identify any anomalies that may warrant follow-up.
- **Sample.** A sample screenshot from our accounting system is included below to illustrate this functionality. Aspire’s financial system uses coded indicators—such as “(F)” for Federal—to clearly identify funding sources at the resource code level. In the example provided, the “(F)” next to Title I confirms its proper designation as a federal funding source.



Through these layered controls—system enhancements, process validations, team training, and oversight—Aspire has taken a comprehensive approach to ensure compliance, accuracy, and reliability in its reporting of funding classifications.

OUSD Inquiry #3: What control activities has Aspire implemented or modified to ensure that the financial statement reviewer(s) confirms the completeness, accuracy, and appropriateness of the report parameters or database queries used to generate automated reports that underlie the footnotes and supplemental schedules accompanying the financial statements?

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

Aspire Response to OUSD Inquiry #3: This inquiry likewise concerns the accidental funding source misclassification addressed in OUSD Inquiry #2 above. In response to that issue, Aspire has implemented targeted control activities to ensure that the parameters and queries used to generate automated reports, particularly those that inform the footnotes and supplemental schedules accompanying the financial statements, are complete, accurate, and appropriate.

- **Development and Use of Standardized Report Protocols.** Aspire has created an instructional guide that specifies the correct reports, data sources, filters, and parameters to be used when compiling financial statement data. This instructional guide (attached as Exhibit F), establishes uniform protocols for generating automated reports and minimizes the risk of variation or human error during data extraction. Additionally, all financial disclosures and footnotes are reviewed by the Controller and Chief Financial Officer for accuracy and completeness.
- **Required Review of Report Parameters and Query Criteria.** Prior to the inclusion of any report data in financial statements, Aspire's financial reviewers must now perform a parameter and query review to verify the completeness and appropriateness of the data sets used. Reviewers confirm that the correct codes, timeframes, funding classifications, and report settings are applied, with cross-references to the standardized guides and checklist. This step ensures that automated reports reflect the intended data scope and structure, and that nothing is inadvertently omitted or misclassified.
- **Training and Internal Communication.** Aspire's finance and accounting teams have been trained on these protocols and the importance of report parameter verification as part of Aspire's internal training processes, with reinforcement during ongoing accounting team meetings. Reviewers understand that confirming the accuracy of database queries is a required control step—not a discretionary task.

These enhancements were specifically designed to address the risk of data misclassification or omission at the report generation stage. By standardizing report procedures, assigning clear review responsibilities, and documenting completion, Aspire ensures that the financial disclosures are based on data that is not only accurate, but also appropriately derived and fully supportable.

OUSD Inquiry #4: What control activities has Aspire implemented, or modified, to ensure that manual manipulation procedures of data sourced ERP system reports for the presentation of financial reporting is appropriate and accurate.

Aspire Response to OUSD Inquiry #4: This inquiry pertains to the same issue addressed in OUSD Inquiry #2—an isolated, unintentional misclassification of funding source data arising during manual handling of financial information. In response, Aspire has implemented a series of targeted control activities:

- **Restriction of Manual Manipulation to Formatting Only.** As set forth in the checklist and instructional guides, Aspire has instituted a policy limiting manual edits of ERP-exported data to formatting and presentation adjustments only (e.g., column alignment, font consistency, visual layout). No manual reclassification, reallocation, or recalculation of data is permitted outside the ERP system.



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

- Side-by-Side Data Comparison and Totals Reconciliation. As part of the review process, preparers are required to retain a copy of the original ERP system report and compare it side-by-side with the formatted version used in the financial statements. Totals, subtotals, and key line items are checked to confirm they match exactly, ensuring the integrity of the underlying data remains intact. This reconciliation is now a required step in Aspire's reporting workflow.
- Reviewer Training and Oversight Emphasis. Aspire has emphasized this control during internal trainings, reinforcing that manual edits are not to be used for data manipulation, and that all financial reporting data must originate from source systems unless formally adjusted and documented through approved journal entries within the ERP.

These safeguards ensure that manual handling of financial statement components does not introduce errors or distortions into Aspire's financial disclosures. Aspire's control structure now provides clear boundaries on acceptable manual actions, mandates verification of data integrity, and documents each step of the process for accountability.

OUSD Statement: A material weakness of this nature (i.e., raised by a lapse in the segregation of duties) casts doubt over the Aspire's ability to prevent fraudulent financial reporting and misappropriation of assets and the sufficiency of financial management's oversight.

Aspire Response: Aspire respectfully disagrees with OUSD's commentary and choice of charged words. This statement is both inconsistent with the independent auditor's findings and conclusions, and mischaracterizes the nature of the audit findings. The terms "fraud" and "misappropriation" are very serious, and this type of loaded phrasing introduces unnecessary alarm without any evidentiary support.

- No Finding of Lapse in Segregation of Duties. Contrary to OUSD's assertion, neither Audit Finding #2024-001 nor #2024-002 concluded that there was a lapse in the segregation of duties. The independent auditor did not raise any concerns about management override or internal collusion. Rather, the finding stemmed from the absence of documented review by someone not involved in the preparation of the schedule. This error was promptly corrected prior to the final submission of the audit to applicable authorities.

Importantly, the final independent audit includes Aspire's implementation of the corrective actions recommended by the auditor. These actions, as described in both Aspire's formal response and this letter, have been put in place to prevent recurrence and strengthen review procedures.

- The Auditor's Characterization of the Finding. As clearly stated in the independent auditor's report:

"In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements, we considered Aspire's internal control over financial reporting...but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of Aspire's internal control. Accordingly, *we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of Aspire's internal control.*" (emphasis added)

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

The report further explains that a “material weakness” represents a situation where there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement might not be prevented or detected in a timely manner. It does not constitute a conclusion that fraud or misappropriation has occurred, is likely to occur, or that Aspire lacks effective financial oversight.

- OUSD’s Commentary Is Unsupported and Misleading. Aspire acknowledges that oversight bodies, such as OUSD, may reasonably rely on audit findings to guide future monitoring. However, that reliance must be rooted in the actual content of the audit, not in speculative or conclusory interpretations that extend beyond the auditor’s own language.

OUSD’s characterization of the material weakness as suggestive of Aspire’s inability to prevent fraud or misappropriation is not only unsupported by the audit itself, it also fails to acknowledge the corrective measures Aspire has implemented. Notably, the audit report does not question Aspire’s present ability to produce accurate financial statements after implementing these reforms. Rather than objectively assessing those measures, OUSD has issued a public-facing statement that casts unwarranted doubt on Aspire’s financial integrity, without additional evidence or auditor corroboration.

- Bond Market Context. Aspire is particularly concerned that OUSD’s statement, omitting reference to the corrective actions already taken, could mislead municipal bond investors. Aspire participates in the same public financing markets as OUSD, and statements of this nature can reasonably be expected to influence the judgment of current and prospective bondholders.

We would expect OUSD to understand, in light of its own obligations under Securities and Exchange Commission Rules 10b-5 and 15c2-12, that accurate, balanced, and complete statements are critical for market integrity. Because authorizer Notices and school responses can be expected to reach bond investors, we have a duty to be clear that we cannot acquiesce in OUSD’s provocative interpretation of the auditor’s findings. There is no aspect of the legitimate charter school oversight process that warrants such provocations.

- Comparison to OUSD’s Own Audit History. While Aspire does not seek to deflect responsibility by comparison, it is relevant that OUSD has experienced multiple and recurring material weaknesses in its own audits, including audit adjustments in the millions of dollars. For instance, OUSD’s 2021–2022 audit concluded that:

“Management personnel responsible for financial accounting and reporting did not consider all applicable accounting standards for governmental entities.”

This was repeated from finding 2020-006. Four out of OUSD’s five most recent years’ audits contain material weakness findings.

Aspire’s audit history, in contrast, reflects timely correction of a non-recurring issue and the absence of similar conclusions. Indeed, the most recent audit concluded:

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

“In our opinion, Aspire complied, in all material respects, with the compliance requirements...that could have a direct and material effect on each of its major federal programs for the year ended June 30, 2024.”

Once again, there is no basis for OUSD’s assertion that Aspire’s audit findings implicate fraud or misappropriation risk. No such findings or recommendations were made by the independent auditor, nor does the independent auditor’s report support such a perilous assertion. Aspire has responded diligently and transparently, implemented all corrective actions, and provided documentation to OUSD throughout this process.

OUSD Inquiry #5: What are the financial qualifications of the members serving on the Audit Committee?

Aspire Response to OUSD Inquiry #5: This inquiry requires some background and context. As a charitable organization operating primarily as an educational institution, Aspire is not required by law to have an audit committee. (Government Code, §§ 12583 and 12586(e)(2).) Nevertheless, consistent with our Bylaws, Aspire has voluntarily adopted and maintained an Audit Committee as part of its strong commitment to financial transparency, independent oversight, and governance best practices.

Even when an audit committee is legally required, there is no statutory mandate for a CPA or financial professional to serve on the audit committee. Rather, general financial literacy and/or a working understanding of financial reports is encouraged.

Current members of the Audit Committee and a summary of their financial qualifications are as follows:

- Beth Hunkapiller, Board Chair – Ms. Hunkapiller is a seasoned educator and public school administrator. Her background includes nearly two decades of service on the San Carlos School District Board of Trustees and leadership positions within California’s charter school system, such as founding the San Carlos Charter Learning Center. Ms. Hunkapiller was the Director of the Charter Schools Division at the California Department of Education and served ten years on the California Advisory Commission on Charter Schools, including two years as chair. While she does not hold formal accounting or financial certifications, Ms. Hunkapiller’s long-standing oversight of public education budgets and her leadership roles in educational organizations and state agencies have provided her with substantial experience in financial governance of California LEAs. Her expertise aligns with nonprofit audit committee best practices, which emphasize the importance of members being financially literate and having a strong understanding of the organization’s operations and governance policies.
- Velela Allen (Savannah) – Ms. Allen is a seasoned accounting professional who previously served as Aspire’s Controller from 2010 to 2013. Ms. Allen’s experience spans both public and private sectors. She currently serves as Vice President of Finance and Human Resources at CodePath.org, an organization that is reprogramming higher education to create the most diverse generation of engineers, CTOs, and founders. Ms. Allen serves as a voice for the underserved and to support financial literacy in marginalized communities. She brings deep familiarity with nonprofit financial management, fund accounting, and federal and state compliance standards.

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

- Kevin Lowry – Mr. Lowry is an accounting professional at a Big Four accounting firm, serving as Director in Advisory, Regulatory & Compliance. Mr. Lowry's background includes financial risk management and audits. Mr. Lowry's expertise contributes to the Audit Committee's ability to oversee Aspire Public Schools' financial reporting and compliance processes effectively.

This committee structure reflects Aspire's proactive approach to audit oversight, bringing together individuals with both institutional knowledge and independent financial expertise. Aspire will continue to uphold a high standard of fiscal accountability through the active engagement of this committee and its alignment with best practices in nonprofit governance.

OUSD Inquiry #6: What policies, procedures, and/or actions is the Aspire Board taking to ensure that the Board is routinely exercising financial oversight of financial reporting management?

Aspire Response to OUSD Inquiry #6: Aspire's Board of Directors maintains robust financial oversight through multiple, formal mechanisms.

- Quarterly Reviews of Aspire's Consolidated Financial Statements. The full Board reviews Aspire's consolidated financial statements at least quarterly, including revenue and expense trends, balance sheet metrics, and budget-to-actual variances. These reviews include discussion with management and opportunities for Board questioning and follow-up, giving Board members the opportunity to assess financial reporting processes and challenge assumptions or variances when needed.
- Audit Committee. The Board appoints the independent Audit Committee, which has two Board member seats. The Audit Committee meets at least twice annually to review internal controls, external audit results, and financial compliance matters. The Audit Committee also confers with Aspire's finance leadership and external auditors to assess reporting accuracy, control effectiveness, and audit follow-up actions. The full Board receives summaries and recommendations from the Audit Committee.
- Standardized Financial Reporting Package. Reports are delivered in a consistent, comprehensive format designed to facilitate informed Board discussion and financial governance. This format supports informed analysis and allows the Board to monitor trends, detect anomalies, and evaluate financial reporting quality over time.
- Board Materials and Pre-Meeting Reviews. All Board members receive financial reports in advance of meetings, enabling thoughtful preparation and analysis. This practice reinforces Board accountability in reviewing and overseeing financial reporting. Financial reports are prepared and reviewed to ensure timely oversight aligned with budget adoption, interim financial reporting, annual audit cycle, and tax reporting compliance deadlines.
- Board Approvals. The Board formally reviews and approves Aspire's annual budget prior to the start of each fiscal year. It also reviews and approves Aspire's fiscal control policy, including internal controls, authorized approvers, and approval limits. The Board also approves Aspire's annual audit and tax filings

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

(the IRS Form 990 and CA Form 199, each of which is also reviewed by the Audit Committee). Each of these is a foundational component of financial reporting and internal control oversight.

OUSD Inquiry #7: What control activities has Aspire implemented and/or modified to ensure the control environment is regularly assessed to detect gaps in the segregation of duties and to design and implement control activities to address such lapses?

Aspire Response to OUSD Inquiry #7: As explained above, it is important to clarify that the error mentioned in the audit was not caused by a lapse in the segregation of duties. Notwithstanding, Aspire has implemented a layered system of control activities designed to proactively assess the control environment and mitigate risks, including those related to segregation of duties. The organization continuously monitors for potential vulnerabilities and regularly enhances its internal controls in numerous ways.

- **Periodic Policy and Procedure Reviews.** Aspire's finance leadership team conducts periodic reviews of fiscal policies and procedures to evaluate whether financial controls remain robust and appropriately segregated, including those governing approval authority, financial reconciliations, and role assignments. These reviews include reassessment of staff roles as needed.
- **Codified Segregation of Duties Policy.** Aspire's Fiscal Control Policy & Procedures explicitly outlines segregation of duties as a foundational control principle. The policy prohibits any individual from initiating, approving, and reviewing the same transaction, and requires separation between accounting/reconciliation functions and asset custody functions. This principle is applied consistently across Aspire's financial processes.
- **Design Authority for Segregation of Duties.** The Chief Financial Officer and Controller are specifically responsible for designing and enforcing segregation of duties across departments. These leaders implement structural safeguards to separate incompatible functions and continuously assess whether changes in staffing, technology, or procedures affect those safeguards.
- **System Access and Role-Based Controls.** Aspire's financial systems (e.g., MIP, Coupa, and Ultipro) enforce role-based permissions and dual custody to ensure that no user has unilateral access to critical financial workflows, such as cash disbursements, payroll modifications, or bank transfers.
- **Internal Audit and Independent Review Functions.** Aspire maintains an internal audit function under the Director of Operations, who conducts periodic school-site audits and control testing. This function provides a feedback loop to management on the effectiveness of segregation and oversight controls, independent of daily financial operations.
- **ERP Access and Role-Based Controls.** Aspire enforces role-based access controls across its financial and HR systems (MIP, Coupa, and Ultipro), ensuring that users can access only the functionality necessary for their role. Aspire's finance and IT teams review system access permissions and approval workflow configurations periodically, including ensuring dual control for high-risk processes such as wire transfers,



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

payroll approvals, and journal entry postings. These controls help preserve appropriate segregation of duties and system integrity.

- Training and Reassignment When Risks Are Detected. If a role conflict is identified—whether through internal review or staffing change—Aspire adjusts workflows or reassigns duties immediately to preserve control integrity. Such adjustments are reviewed by senior finance staff.

These control activities demonstrate Aspire’s proactive, system-wide approach to ensuring that segregation of duties is maintained and that the control environment is regularly evaluated and continuously strengthened.

OUSD Inquiry #8: What control activities has Aspire implemented and/or modified to ensure all footnotes and schedules accompanying the financial statements are within the scope of the financial statement reviewer’s review?

Aspire Response to OUSD Inquiry #8: Aspire has implemented layered control activities to ensure that all footnotes and supplemental schedules accompanying the financial statements are fully reviewed, verified, and fall within the scope of Aspire’s financial statement review protocols. These controls include:

- Multi-Level Review by Key Financial Officers. All financial statement footnotes and supplemental schedules are reviewed and approved by three senior finance officials:
 - The Chief Financial Officer,
 - The Controller, and
 - The Assistant Controller.

Each reviewer examines the materials independently for completeness, accuracy, and alignment with the underlying financial data.

- Source Report Cross-Referencing. Each footnote and schedule is supported by source documentation from Aspire’s ERP systems (e.g., MIP for accounting data), ensuring that reported figures are tied directly to system-generated financials. This includes reconciliations for items such as prepaid expenses, federal awards, and internal allocations.
- Review Prior to Audit Submission. Prior to submission to the auditor or chartering authorities, Aspire’s Chief Financial Officer and Controller perform a final scope review to ensure that all required footnotes and schedules—including those related to compliance, allocations, and organizational structure—are properly included and internally validated.
- Audit Committee Oversight. Aspire’s Audit Committee reviews the full audited financial statements, including footnotes and schedules, prior to approving submission.



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

Together, these control activities ensure that Aspire's financial footnotes and supplemental schedules are consistently within the scope of formal financial review procedures, synced to Aspire's internal controls in our financial policies.

OUSD Inquiry #9: What control activities has Aspire implemented and/or modified to ensure the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards is complete and accurate?

Aspire Response to OUSD Inquiry #9: In addition to the system-level enhancements and tagging controls described in Aspire's Response to OUSD Inquiry #2, above, Aspire has implemented a series of cross-check and reconciliation procedures designed to ensure the completeness and accuracy of the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA).

- Automated SEFA Generation with Embedded Resource Tagging. Aspire now uses its financial system (MIP) to automatically generate the SEFA using resource codes that are system-tagged as federal. This eliminates reliance on manual reporting and ensures that federal expenditures are pulled directly from the ledger using accurate parameters. These codes are aligned to the audit guide classifications, and tagging cannot be modified without elevated system access. (See Inquiry #2 for additional detail.)
- Cross-Classification Reconciliation of Revenue and Expenditures. As an additional layer of control, Aspire's finance team performs a cross-check of revenues and expenditures by funding classification—Federal, State, Local, and Other—against total recorded revenues and expenditures. This reconciliation ensures that all federal transactions are captured and appropriately classified in the SEFA. Discrepancies are investigated and corrected prior to submission.
- Three-Level SEFA Review and Certification. Aspire's Assistant Controller, Controller, and CFO participate in the preparation and review of the SEFA, ensuring consistency with general ledger data, proper classification of federal awards, and alignment with supporting documentation. Each reviewer contributes to confirming the SEFA's completeness and readiness for audit submission.
- Quarterly Federal Grant Reconciliation Procedures. As documented in the Time & Effort Policy and federal grant reconciliation procedures in Aspire's Fiscal Control Policy & Procedures, Aspire's finance team performs quarterly reconciliations of federal program expenditures, comparing the Personnel Activity Reports to the actual payroll expenditure ledger to confirm reported time activity agrees to the budgeted funding distribution. Reconciliation occurs quarterly in July, October, January and April, to coincide with each budget or actuals reporting period. Variances are flagged and corrected during quarterly reconciliation. These reconciliations ensure that grant expenditures align with allowable use categories and are properly reflected in financial reporting and SEFA preparation.

These control activities provide a layered system of automated data integrity, manual verification, and leadership review, ensuring the SEFA is both complete and audit-ready in alignment with federal reporting expectations.

OUSD Statement: Please note that failure to comply with the above remedies, or repeated violations of a similar nature, may result in the District issuing a Notice of Violation under Education Code § 47607(d) [sic].

Staff Report from Oakland Unified School District



1001 22nd Avenue, Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94606
tel 510.434.5000 fax 510.434.5010
www.aspirepublicschools.org

Aspire Response: Education Code Section 47607(d) is about aggregate pupil enrollment patterns at a charter school, and appears to be the wrong citation. We believe OUSD may have intended to cite Education Code section 47607(g) regarding revocation of a charter being preceded by a Notice of Violation. We respectfully remind OUSD that a charter may be revoked only if the chartering authority finds, through a showing of substantial evidence, that the charter school did any of the following: (1) committed a material violation of any of the conditions, standards, or procedures set forth in the charter; (2) failed to meet or pursue any of the pupil outcomes identified in the charter; (3) failed to meet generally accepted accounting principles, or engaged in fiscal mismanagement; (4) violated any law. None of these applies to Aspire's Audit Findings #2024-001 and #2024-002. Such findings plainly do not violate the charter or law and have no impact on pupil outcomes. As for meeting GAAP, notwithstanding the presence of audit findings, the Aspire audit report confirms that "[t]he accompanying consolidated financial statements (financial statements) have been prepared in accordance with accounting principals generally accepted in the United States of America (U.S. GAAP)." The auditor's report on whether the financial statements audited were prepared in accordance with GAAP was "Unmodified," with "No" noncompliance material to financial statements noted. The auditor did not identify any concerns of "fiscal mismanagement" whatsoever, instead recommending Aspire enhance its close process to ensure all transactions are accounted for and implement procedures to accurately capture all federal award expenditures expended during the audited period. Aspire has done so.

A Notice of Violation would be unwarranted, and Aspire will invoke its due process rights in the event Aspire receives a Notice of Violation.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide the responses set forth above. We appreciate our collaborative relationship with OUSD and we welcome the opportunity to answer any further questions you may have regarding the above. We believe Aspire's response fully addresses your concerns. We will consider the statements and inquiries in the May Letter to be resolved unless we hear otherwise from your team before fiscal year-end.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

Michael Wimbish

E449FDCG53B647D
Michael Wimbish

Chief Financial Officer, Aspire Public Schools