

This document was provided, as is, to the California Department of Education (CDE) by **California Innovative Career Academy** for the Advisory Commission on Charter Schools October 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.

Charter School Written Opposition to District Appeal,
submitted by California Innovative Career Academy

Attachment 4
Page 1 of 31

Docusign Envelope ID: 5EA5742E-1634-8933-8153-338558C13AB3



California State Board of Education
C/O Charter Schools Division,
California Department of Education
1430 N Street, Room 5111
Sacramento, CA 95814

via e-mail at Charters@cde.ca.gov

Re: Opposition to Twin Rivers Unified School District's Appeal of the Sacramento County Board of Education's Reversal of the Revocation of the Charter for California Innovative Career Academy

Dear Members of the California State Board of Education:

On June 18, 2026, the Twin Rivers Unified School District Board of Trustees ("TRUSD" or the "District" or "District Board" submitted an appeal to the California State Board of Education ("SBE") of the Sacramento County Board of Education's ("SCBOE") reversal of TRUSD's decision to revoke the charter of California Innovative Career Academy ("CICA" or the "Charter School"), an all-adult charter school operated by Highlands Community Charter and Technical Schools ("HCCTS" or "Highlands"). HCCTS, and CICA, now timely submit this opposition to TRUSD's appeal, pursuant to Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.5(d). SCBOE did not err in its decision to reverse TRUSD's revocation of CICA—which was mired in procedural defects by TRUSD that negatively impacted CICA's ability to refute and/or remedy the alleged violations.

I. Summary of the Procedural and Substantive Facts in the Administrative Record

a. Background

From August 2014 to the present, HCCTS has served approximately 60,000 students across its two schools—Highlands Community Charter School ("HCCS") and California Innovative Career Academy. CICA's students are, by design, exclusively adults, many of whom are immigrants to the United States who are attending the school to learn English while pursuing a high school diploma and at the same time gaining valuable career skills to make themselves employable. CICA serves a large, underserved immigrant population and is crucial to helping these vulnerable students and their families succeed in Sacramento County. It benefits not only the immigrant community, but the rest of our local community as well, to ensure that these families have a pathway to learn English, access resources, and gain the skills needed to become employable in this country. CICA has also served numerous local residents who needed a second chance to get a high school education, including single parents and people who have faced homelessness and other significant life challenges. Highlands' two schools are often the only viable option for these students because they are too old to attend a traditional high school program, and their need for robust support services makes other adult education options inaccessible.



The Twin Rivers Unified School District (“TRUSD”) is the charter authorizer for CICA under Education Code section 47604.32 and has been the authorizer since August of 2014. In June 2025, the California Office of the State Auditor issued an audit report accusing CICA of various compliance violations, including issues related to alleged fiscal mismanagement by members of CICA’s prior leadership team. Notably, the State Audit report does not allege fraud—rather, it alleges unwise use of funds and various other compliance issues such as problems with attendance tracking processes and improper use of Adult Education Teaching Credentials. The State Auditor also accused TRUSD of failing in its oversight responsibilities as CICA’s authorizer, which contributed to the compliance issues that CICA faced. The issues raised in the State Audit had not previously been raised by the professional auditing firm that HCCTS had retained to conduct its annual audit for the 2022-2023 audit year, although the State Auditor claimed the issues were present during that timeframe. As a result of the school’s independent audit not raising these concerns, the Highlands Board at the time was therefore not put on notice about these concerns—it had reasonably relied on the professionals it had hired to assess for compliance. Moreover, the issues pertaining to both credentialing and attendance accounting had not been raised in any of the independent audit reports, all of which were conducted by independent auditors on the State Controller’s list of approved education audit firms and all of these audits were accepted by the Controller.

The current CICA leadership team, which began working at the school in July of 2025, and the new Board of Directors members see these charter schools as valuable assets to the community and have been working tirelessly to correct any deficiencies caused by the prior executive director and team.

Jonathan Raymond, Executive Director

Jonathan Raymond is a nationally respected education leader known for helping institutions navigate moments of deep crisis and emerge stronger, more accountable, and more student-centered. He most recently served as Senior Vice President and Superintendent in Residence at City Year, a national youth development and education nonprofit, where he oversaw education policy and provided strategic guidance to local and national systems working at the intersection of education, equity, and workforce development. As the Superintendent of the City School District of New Rochelle, he led the district through the final stages of the COVID-19 pandemic, investing in whole-child supports, accelerating learning recovery, and strengthening school-community partnerships. His leadership prioritized mental health, expanded after-school and summer enrichment, and delivered resources to students most impacted by the Pandemic.

Prior to that, Raymond served as Superintendent of Sacramento City Unified School District, where he guided one of California's largest urban districts through historic budget deficits, deep structural reform, and the early stages of a statewide shift toward equity-driven education. Under his leadership, the district raised graduation rates, introduced whole-child support, launched early learning and summer programs, and transformed some of its most



underserved schools into high-performing campuses - all while navigating one of the toughest fiscal climates in California history.

Raymond's crisis-tested leadership is grounded in a lifelong commitment to public service. He previously served as Executive Director of the Massachusetts COVID-19 Relief Fund, Chief Accountability Officer of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools in North Carolina, and President of the Stuart Foundation, California's largest K-12 education philanthropy. He began his career as a labor law attorney and brings legal, nonprofit, and philanthropic expertise to every challenge. He is a graduate of the Broad Superintendents Academy, and holds a JD from George Mason University School of Law, an MA from The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, and a BA from Tufts University. He also completed the Executive Management Program at Harvard Business School.

Throughout his work, Raymond has earned a reputation for putting students first, building trust in fractured environments and helping systems rise from instability to renewal. As the newly appointed Executive Director of Highlands Community Charter, he brings that same steady hand to a school community that is ready to rebuild and thrive.

Teresa Cummings, Ph.D., Deputy Director/Chief Operating Officer

Teresa is a seasoned systems-level leader with over three decades of experience transforming education through strategy, accountability, and innovation. She has served as Chief of Staff and Chief Accountability Officer, bringing clarity, alignment, and execution to large-scale organizational priorities. Holding a Ph.D. from the University of Illinois, Chicago, Teresa's career spans the full spectrum of education—from PreK-12 classrooms to community colleges and universities—where she has excelled as a teacher, administrator, and author of mathematics curricula.

Her leadership portfolio includes extensive executive-level district administration, where she has shaped policy, accountability systems, and instructional improvement at scale. Beyond the district level, Teresa has advanced research and development efforts for non-profits, the Riverside County Office of Education, and the Stuart Foundation, where she co-developed an organizational health review now used to strengthen institutional performance. Across every role, Teresa has been recognized for her ability to integrate research, practice, and policy into sustainable systems that drive student achievement and organizational excellence.

Eric Chapman, Deputy Director/Chief Academic Officer

Eric Chapman holds a Master of Education from California State University, Sacramento, and has dedicated more than 25 years to the field of education. He began his career as a classroom teacher and instructional coach in the Del Paso Heights School District before moving into school leadership, serving as principal at four sites within the Sacramento City Unified School District. In these roles, he led transformative turnaround efforts in literacy, family



engagement, and community school models, while guiding schools through continuous improvement cycles, professional learning, and student-centered restructuring initiatives. Since 2008, his leadership has focused on building systems that foster equity, innovation, and academic achievement. Eric now serves as Chief Academic Officer for Highlands Community Charter and Technical Schools, where he directs efforts in career technical education, workforce alignment, and equity-driven systems that expand opportunities for adult learners. Recognized as a mentor and collaborator, he is deeply committed to advancing student success and harnessing the power of schools to strengthen communities.

Bindy Grewal, Ed.D. Director of Human Resources

Bindy Grewal is an accomplished educational leader and human resources executive with more than three decades of experience serving California public schools. She holds an Ed.D. in Educational Administration and Foundations from the University of the Pacific and a Master's in Educational Leadership from California State University, East Bay. Over the course of her distinguished career, she has held roles spanning classroom teaching, school administration, district leadership, and senior-level human resources management.

Bindy most recently served as the Assistant Superintendent for Elk Grove Unified School District, where she oversaw 43 schools serving more than 30,000 students. In this role, she provided strategic leadership as part of the Superintendent's Cabinet, guided principals and directors, managed complex operational and instructional systems across multiple school calendars, and played a key role in districtwide initiatives including COVID-19 distance-learning transitions, school closures during environmental crises, early learning program enhancements, and major facilities planning. She was also an active member of the district bargaining team, addressing negotiations, compliance matters, and board-level issues with professionalism and clarity.

Prior to her executive leadership role, Dr. Grewal served as Director of Certificated Human Resources, where she led all aspects of certificated HR operations, including recruitment, employee relations, policy interpretation, staffing, investigations, and labor compliance. Her earlier administrative career included serving as a principal for nine years, earning the California Distinguished School Award, and as a vice principal for four years, where she strengthened school cultures, improved academic performance, and supervised comprehensive instructional programs.

Despite this, in the public perception, HCCTS remains associated with the mistakes of its past. It is important to note that although CICA has moved to best practices in its operations in order to avoid any doubt about compliance on a going-forward basis, some of the contentions of the State Auditor related to attendance accounting and credentialing are not correct as a matter of law. This is the subject of two appeals filed with the Education Audit Appeals Panel by CICA and its sister school, HCCS.



b. Notice of Violation

On June 17, 2025, the TRUSD District Board approved issuance of a Notice of Violation (“NOV”) alleging that CICA committed material violations of the conditions, standards, and procedures of its Charter, failed to meet generally accepted accounting principles and/or engaged in fiscal mismanagement, and violated the law. CICA ultimately refuted and cured all of the violations to the satisfaction of both District staff and the District’s legal counsel.

Alleged Violations of the Charter:

- Grade Level Changes – adding grades 9 and 10 without first requesting a material revision of the charter and notifying the District, where the school’s charter only included grades 1, 2, and 12.
- Location Changes – adding additional locations which were not previously approved without first providing notice and requesting a material revision, and without providing fully executed copies of lease agreements.

Alleged Violations of the Law:

- Failure to Submit Annual Audit Report – failing to complete and submit a 2023-24 annual independent audit report to the District, violating Education Code sections 47604.33 and 47605.
- Credential Misassignments – using instructors with Adult Education Credentials to teach adults in its K-12 program, which the District contends violates Education Code section 47605(l).
- Failure to Track Minimum Instructional Minutes
- Violation of WIOA Exclusive Partnership Agreement – allowing individuals who were not enrolled students to participate in the school’s Career Technical Education (“CTE”) Truck Driving program.

Alleged Fiscal Mismanagement:

- San Diego Administrative Location – improper expenditure of public funds on luxury office condominiums.

All of these claims allege conduct that either predated the current CICA executive leadership team or relate to claims of failure by the current team to resolve issues that originated with prior leadership to the District’s satisfaction.

The NOV provided a response period up to and including September 26, 2025. CICA timely responded, per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.2, with a letter addressing each of the alleged violations and explaining how each had been refuted or remedied. CICA also provided



documentary evidence to either refute the claims or, where applicable, demonstrate that a remedy or remedy plan had been implemented. (See CICA Response dated 9/26/26 and Exhibits A-BB, CICA AR 005107 - 005119). Contrary to later assertions by the District Board, CICA did submit exhibits to the District on September 26, 2025. Then, after the fact, the District contacted CICA and communicated that it was unable to access the exhibits (due to technical issues on the District's end), resulting in CICA re-providing the exhibits a few days later in a different format. (CICA AR 005280.)

The District also communicated multiple times that Highlands would have more time, beyond the original deadline from the NOV, to provide evidence and demonstrate resolution of the issues. This makes sense, as the original date of September 26, 2025 did not provide a reasonable opportunity to remedy some of these issues, especially those that would require a material revision of the charter (which would need to be approved by the District Board) and those that would require addressing existing leases and other complicating financial factors. For example, on December 3, 2025, TRUSD staff member Sharilyn Warta e-mailed the following to Highlands staff:

As part of the District's efforts to ensure a fair and thorough review during the Notice of Intent to Revoke process, **we are working to remain as flexible as possible regarding how your school submits evidence in response to the identified violations.** At the same time, the District is required to comply with the timelines established in the California Education Code and with the legally mandated Brown Act posting deadlines for Board materials. To meet these statutory obligations and to ensure that all evidence is evaluated with the care and thoroughness required, the District must establish a firm deadline for evidence submission. **Accordingly, any evidence submitted after January 2nd will not be accepted or considered as part of this process.** This deadline ensures that District staff have sufficient time to review, analyze, and prepare materials for Board consideration.

(See CICA AR 007224, *Emphasis added*.) TRUSD's Board echoed this assertion that Highlands would have more time beyond the original September 26, 2025 date from the NOV. TRUSD's minutes from the November 4, 2025 District Board meeting contain the following comment from Trustee Baker:

Trustee Baker commented that Highlands Community Charter had been issued several violations and remains out of compliance. **The school will be given additional time to correct these violations or provide demonstrative evidence of progress toward compliance.** He noted that the process allows multiple opportunities for Highlands to address the issues through detailed plans and documented steps toward resolution.

(CICA AR 007090, *Emphasis Added*.) This is further confirmation that the District Board itself



communicated to HCCTS that it would have additional time beyond the original September 26, 2025 deadline to correct the violations and/or provide evidence.

Following the June 2025 Notice of Violation, the District's staff asked HCCTS to submit a material revision request to address additional site locations and grade levels (as applicable to each school), which CICA did submit on September 26, 2025. (CICA AR 006030.) CICA indicated that HCCTS's plan to cure these issues all along was to submit a material revision to bring the charter into alignment with its current practices on both site locations and grade levels (as applicable for each school¹), but that it would align both sites and grade levels with the existing charter language if the material revision was denied by the District Board. Thus, HCCTS did identify two distinct paths to fully remedy the District's concerns – one that required approval by the District Board of new sites and/or grade levels and one that could be implemented without any further action by the District Board (full compliance with existing charter provisions).

c. Notice of Intent to Revoke and Continuation of the Revocation Process

Notwithstanding CICA demonstrating an appropriate and lawful response, the District Board voted to issue a Notice of Intent to Revoke ("NIR") on November 4, 2025. A public hearing on the issue of revocation was held on December 2, 2025, along with public hearings on the issuance of the material revisions for both CICA and HCCS at the same meeting.

District staff had reviewed the material revisions and recommended approval, but the District Board denied them anyway. This denial was in bad faith, since the District Board had been presented the Charter School's plan to cure these issues and at no time expressed a concern about approving a material revision. It was fully aware that its staff was meeting regularly with CICA staff to get to mutual agreement on material revision language. District staff then asked CICA to revise the material revision to remove grade levels and related educational program changes so that these could be studied further, which the school did. CICA then resubmitted the material revision request on January 2, 2026 related only to site locations. The District Board ultimately denied the request for a material revision for just site changes on January 13, 2026. (CICA AR 007385².) This demonstrates additional bad faith on the part of the District that prevented the charter school from being able to immediately remedy through complying with the existing charter language. If CICA had known that the District had no interest in approving a material revision from the outset, it could have saved hundreds of hours of time and just immediately complied with the site locations as identified in the current charter. The District,

¹ The language in CICA's charter is different from the language in HCCS' charter in that CICA was allowed to serve all grade levels, so CICA did not have the same grade levels concern. Although the grade levels issue was raised in CICA's NOV and CICA proposed a material revision to clarify this even further, District staff later confirmed that it had been refuted on the basis of the existing charter language on grade levels.

² SCOE's Analysis of HCCS and CICA Charter Revocation Appeals was included in TRUSD's administrative record as to TRUSD's appeal of the reversal of the revocation for HCCS, but not for CICA. CICA has provided an augmented record with this and other missing documents, labeled CICA AR 007372 – 007443.



however, led CICA down a path that suggested they were willing to approve the change. The District cannot now argue, after granting additional time and leading the charter school down this path, that the charter school had to cure before the original remedy date.

Notwithstanding the District Board's bad faith denial of the material revisions recommended by its own staff after an extensive negotiation process, CICA still fully cured the site issue by going to extraordinary lengths to vacate all non-approved sites prior to the revocation date in accordance with the plan previously outlined to the District Board. This was an extremely fast timeline and posed numerous operational challenges, but CICA ensured that no non-approved sites remained prior to the revocation vote.

d. TRUSD Board Vote for Revocation, Against the Recommendation of TRUSD's Own Staff

On January 27, 2026, the District Board met to consider a recommendation from District staff and District legal counsel that the charter not be revoked based on a finding by District staff and legal counsel that the school had fully cured all issues in the Notice of Violation.

The minutes from the January 27, 2026 District Board meeting confirm that TRUSD's staff and counsel presented staff findings and recommendations regarding the revocation of the charter of CICA. (CICA AR 007111.) The minutes summarize their review as follows:

This review found that CICA has successfully refuted or remedied all violations; providing evidence that grade levels were approved in the original petition, submitting plans to return to authorized locations, submitting the overdue audit report with plans to change audit firms, improving credentialing practices, the implementation of attendance compliance monitoring systems, terminating external partnerships and the CTE Truck Driving program, and adopting or revising board policies to address fiscal mismanagement. District staff recommended that the Board decline to revoke the charter. (CICA AR 007112.)

By a vote of 6-1, the District Board rejected the recommendation to not revoke the charter, but took no further action to revoke CICA at that meeting. The District Board then convened on January 30, 2026, on which date it voted to revoke the Charter of CICA.

e. CICA and HCCTS Appeal of TRUSD's Revocation Decision to SCBOE

CICA and HCCTS then appealed the revocation to SCBOE because neither the law, the facts, nor substantial evidence supported revocation under California law or under SCBOE's relevant Board Policy. At its May 19, 2026 meeting, SCBOE voted to overturn TRUSD's revocation of CICA's charter. This was accompanied by a corresponding SCBOE Resolution. (CICA AR 007367-007368.) TRUSD then appealed SCBOE's reversal of the revocation of CICA's charter to the State Board of Education.



II. Summary of Arguments in Support of Position that the County Board of Education Did Not Err in Its Decision, with Specific Citations to the Administrative Record

a. Standard of Review

i. The State Board of Education Must Uphold the Reversal if the County Board's Findings Support Its Decision Reversing the Revocation of CICA's Charter.

Education Code Section 47607(h) states, in relevant part, "The chartering authority shall not revoke a charter, unless it makes written factual findings supported by substantial evidence, specific to the charter school, that support its findings." (Ed. Code, § 47607(h).) If a school district revokes a charter, the charter school may appeal to the county board of education. (Ed. Code, § 47607, subd. (i)(1).) The county board may reverse the revocation if it determines that the chartering authority's findings under subdivision (h) are not supported by substantial evidence, and the school district may then appeal that reversal to the State Board. (Ed. Code, § 47607, subd. (i)(2).)

If the county board does not act within ninety days or upholds the revocation, the statutory appeal process provides specifically for an appeal by a charter school. (Ed. Code, § 47607, subd. (i)(3).) The State Board may reverse a revocation if it determines the chartering authority's findings under subdivision (h) are not supported by substantial evidence, or alternatively, it may uphold a revocation if it determines those findings are supported by substantial evidence. (Ed. Code, § 47607, subd. (i)(3) and (4).) The statute does not set a specific standard in a situation where the district appeals an adverse county decision to reverse a revocation decision not supported by substantial evidence.

Before reversing a revocation on appeal by the charter school under subdivision (i)(2), the county board of education must consider whether the chartering authority provided the charter school with a Notice of Violation, a reasonable opportunity to remedy, a Notice of Intent to Revoke, and a Final Decision. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.4, subd. (b).) It must further determine whether any procedural deficiency impaired the charter school's ability to refute or remedy the alleged violations. (*Ibid.*) In submitting an appeal to the State Board, the appellant must then support "the appellant's position that the chartering authority and/or the county board of education erred in its decision." (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.5, subd. (c)(2).)

When an agency seeks to revoke a license or otherwise deprive a private party of a desired status, the agency must bear both the burden of production and the burden of persuasion. (*Daniels v. Department of Motor Vehicles* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 532, 536.) While the burden of proof may shift, the burden of persuasion remains all along with the party on which it is placed by law. (*Farr v. County of Nevada* (2010) 187 Cal.App.4th 669, 682.) When appealing a decision enjoining revocation, an appellant school district "has the burden on appeal" to show that the decision constitutes an abuse of discretion. (*American Indian Model Schools v. Oakland Unified*



School Dist. (2014) 227 Cal.App.4th 258, 278.) “Under the substantial evidence test...we do not reweigh the evidence and are bound to indulge all presumptions and resolve all conflicts in favor of the administrative decision.” (*Napa Valley Unified School Dist. v. State Bd. of Education* (2025) 110 Cal.App.5th 609, 625.)

TRUSD’s Written Argument in Support of Appeal to the State Board of Education asks that the SBE “find that the SCBOE erred [sic] when it reversed the District Board’s decision to revoke HCCS’ Charter and uphold the revocation on appeal.” Essentially, its appeal demands that the SBE perform an independent review of the underlying decision “de novo,” reaching past the decision at issue in this review.

Here, however, there *is* no revocation to “uphold,” because SCBOE reversed that decision. Therefore, the scope of review defined by Education Code section 47607, subdivision (i)(4), does not apply. TRUSD, as the party appealing SCBOE’s reversal, bears the burden of persuasion on appeal to show that SCBOE erred in its findings and decision. It has no basis for demanding that SBE review the evidence presented by the district and reach past SCBOE to “uphold” a decision that was found invalid and unsupported. Under the substantial evidence test, SBE may not reweigh the evidence. Instead, it “must indulge all presumptions and resolve all conflicts in favor of the administrative decision under appeal.”

The decision under appeal here is SCBOE’s administrative decision to reverse the revocation, *not* TRUSD’s original revocation decision. SCBOE has authority grounded in statute to issue a final decision on the matter of HCCS’s revocation. As such, in reviewing this appeal, SBE must uphold the decision of SCBOE that *reversed* the revocation unless it finds that SCBOE abused its discretion. In other words, the same presumption of deference inherent in the substantial evidence standard now applies to the decision of SCBOE for the purposes of this appeal. SBE must review SCBOE’s decision based on this standard.

ii. SCOE Was Tasked with Determining Whether the District’s Revocation Decision Was Supported by Substantial Evidence.

Education Code Section 47607(i) states as follows:

- (1) If a school district is the chartering authority and it revokes a charter pursuant to this section, the charter school may appeal the revocation to the county board of education within 30 days following the final decision of the chartering authority.
- (2) The county board of education may reverse the revocation decision if the county board of education determines that the findings made by the chartering authority under subdivision (h) are not supported by substantial evidence. The school district may appeal the reversal to the state board.
- (3) If the county board of education does not issue a decision on the appeal within 90 days of receipt, or the county board of education upholds the revocation, the



charter school may appeal the revocation to the state board.

(4) The state board may reverse the revocation decision if the state board determines that the findings made by the chartering authority under subdivision (h) are not supported by substantial evidence. The state board may uphold the revocation decision of the school district if the state board determines that the findings made by the chartering authority under subdivision (h) are supported by substantial evidence.

(Emphasis added.) The statute uses the phrase “are not supported by substantial evidence,” present tense. *(See id.)* This supports that the State Board may make its own determination of whether the findings by the chartering authority are supported by substantial evidence—vs. relying on the school district’s prior determination.

Education Code Section 47607(h) states, in relevant part, “The chartering authority shall not revoke a charter, unless it makes written factual findings supported by substantial evidence, specific to the charter school, that support its findings.” (Ed. Code, § 47607(h).) TRUSD’s revocation decision needed to meet this standard in order survive legal challenge.

Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.5 states that a respondent’s opposition to an appellant’s appeal of a County Board of Education’s decision to reverse a charter revocation shall include submitting the following to the State Board of Education:

- (1) a summary of the procedural and substantive facts limited to matters in the record as submitted to the chartering authority and the county board of education, as appropriate;
- (2) a summary of the arguments in support of the respondent's position that the chartering authority and/or the county board of education did not err in its decision; and
- (3) specific citations to the administrative record in support of each argument presented.

(Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.5(d).)

iii. The County Board of Education Did Not Err in Its Decision to Overturn the Revocation of CICA’s Charter.

Education Code Section 47607(i)(2) states, in relevant part, “The county board of education may reverse the revocation decision if the county board of education determines that the findings made by the chartering authority under subdivision (h) are not supported by substantial evidence.” *(See Ed. Code, § 47607(i)(2).)* Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.4(b)



states, in relevant part:

(1) In determining whether the district chartering authority's factual findings are supported by substantial evidence, the county board of education shall consider whether the district chartering authority provided the charter school's governing body as described in the school's charter a Notice of Violation, a reasonable opportunity to remedy the identified violation(s), a Notice of Intent to Revoke, a public hearing, and Final Decision, pursuant to Articles 2 and 2.5 and Education Code sections 47607(f) through (h), inclusive.

(2) If the charter school submits a response to the Notice of Violation pursuant to section 11968.5.2(c), the county board of education shall, in determining whether the district chartering authority's factual findings are supported by substantial evidence, consider whether the charter school complied with the procedures set forth in that section.

(3) The county board of education shall also consider whether an alleged procedural deficiency negatively impacted the charter school's ability to refute or remedy the alleged violation or the chartering authority's ability to comply with its procedural obligations or authorizing duties.

Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.4.

Notably, neither the statute nor the regulation states that the County Board of Education must accept the school district's substantial evidence determination as true. Quite the opposite, Education Code Section 47607(i)(2) states "The county board of education may reverse the revocation decision if the county board of education determines that the findings made by the chartering authority under subdivision (h) are not supported by substantial evidence," explicitly empowering the County Board to second guess the school district's decision and make its own determination of whether the District's decision was supported by substantial evidence on the record. (*See* Ed. Code, § 47607(i)(2).)

The regulation applying this statute also requires the County Board of Education to consider whether the chartering authority had complied with its procedural obligations, as part of the County Board's determination of whether the chartering authority's decision was based on substantial evidence. (*See* Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.4(b).) Not only is this mandatory under the regulation, it is crucial because a chartering authority's failure to comply with its procedural obligations can negatively impact whether or not the Charter School is able to refute or remedy the alleged violations. In those instances, this regulatory scheme provides safeguards so that a charter authorizer, like TRUSD, cannot shirk its procedural obligations, interfere with a charter school's ability to respond by a certain date, then revoke the school's charter by claiming substantial evidence exists that the school failed to refute or remedy by that date.



Unlike TRUSD, which was required by law to make “written factual findings supported by substantial evidence, specific to the charter school, that support its findings” in order to revoke the charter, SCBOE’s review of TRUSD’s decision does not require SCBOE make written factual findings. (*See* Ed. Code, § 47607(h)-(i).) Education Code Section 47607(i) states, in relevant part, “The county board of education may reverse the revocation decision if the county board of education determines that the findings made by the chartering authority under subdivision (h) are not supported by substantial evidence.” (*See* Ed. Code, § 47607(i).) SCBOE needed only assess TRUSD’s revocation decision and determine whether TRUSD’s findings are supported by substantial evidence.

Here, SCBOE’s decision reversing TRUSD’s revocation of CICA states, in relevant part:

WHEREAS, on May 19, 2026, within 90 days of receiving CICA's charter revocation appeal, the County Board held a public hearing, reviewed and considered CICA's charter revocation appeal, SCOE's Analysis of the appeal, and arguments presented by CICA and the District. At the hearing, CICA and District representatives had equivalent time and procedures to present their positions regarding the appeal and respond to SCOE's Analysis;

WHEREAS, on May 19, 2026, following review of the appeal and the public hearing noted above, the County Board considered and deliberated upon CICA's charter revocation appeal;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that having reviewed CICA's appeal, conducted a public hearing, and considered and deliberated upon the appeal, the County Board adopts SCOE's Analysis of the CICA charter revocation appeal and further finds that the findings made by the Twin Rivers Unified School District Board of Trustee's to revoke the Highlands Community Charter School are not supported by substantial evidence.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that having determined that the Twin Rivers Unified School District Board's findings are not supported by substantial evidence, the decision to revoke the charter of the Highlands Community Charter School is hereby reversed.

(CICA AR 007367-007368.) SCBOE’s decision complies with its obligations under Ed. Code, § 47607(i), as it confirms that SCBOE has determined that the TRUSD Board’s findings were not supported by substantial evidence.

TRUSD’s appeal of SCBOE’s decision claimed that SCBOE erred in various ways. However, these contentions by TRUSD are not supported by the facts or the law.

TRUSD claims that SCBOE was charged with determining “whether substantial evidence in the record exists to demonstrate that CICA remedied the violations at issue in the Notice of



Violation by the close of the remedy period.” This is an inaccurate description of the legal standard because it leaves out the requirement that the remedy period has to be reasonable. SCBOE was not simply tasked with determining whether substantial evidence existed on the record that CICA had cured all of the violations by whatever remedy date the District had chosen. Education Code Section 47607(g) is clear: “Before revocation, the chartering authority shall notify the charter school of any violation of this section and give the school a reasonable opportunity to remedy the violation, unless the chartering authority determines, in writing, that the violation constitutes a severe and imminent threat to the health or safety of the pupils.” (*See* Ed. Code, § 47607(g).)

Further, SCBOE’s Board Policy 2400 defines substantial evidence for these purposes as evidence that:

- a. Demonstrates that the violation was material.
- b. Supports revocation when viewed as a whole, in light of all relevant information.
- c. Demonstrates that the violation actually occurred.
- d. Was not cured by the charter school during its reasonable opportunity to remedy the violation.

(*See* Sacramento County Office of Education Board Policy 2400.) This policy was originally adopted on April 20, 2004 and was most recently revised on August 11, 2020. Under this definition, SCBOE was tasked with determining whether the evidence “Supports revocation when viewed as a whole, **in light of all relevant information.**” (*See id.*, *emphasis added.*) TRUSD’s analysis both disregards the fact that SCBOE was tasked with considering whether the evidence supports revocation when viewed as a whole, in light of all relevant information, and minimizes the fact that the amount of time given to remedy the violations must have been reasonable. The law, and SCBOE’s relevant policy, do not support revocation simply based on failure to remedy by “the remedy period” without taking reasonableness into account.

Using the legal revocation process, as codified in the relevant laws and regulations, would not render the revocation process “unworkable,” as TRUSD claims. A school district would not be required to consider every action taken by a charter school in response to an NOV regardless of when that action occurred. However, a school district already is required to give the charter school a reasonable opportunity to cure and to consider actions taken within that reasonable opportunity. Here, there is ample evidence in the record that SCBOE reviewed to support that September 26, 2025 was not a reasonable date by which to fully remedy all of the alleged violations. (*See* CICA AR 007204 – 007368.)

TRUSD contends that SCBOE erred by reversing the revocation decisions while not also finding that the District Board was required to consider remedies implemented after the September 26th deadline. This contention by TRUSD adds additional legal requirements that SCBOE did not have when making its determination. As discussed, Education Code Section



47607(i) states, in relevant part, “The county board of education may reverse the revocation decision if the county board of education determines that the findings made by the chartering authority under subdivision (h) are not supported by substantial evidence.” (*See* Ed. Code, § 47607(i).) The statute does not require SCBOE’s decision to specify why it found that TRUSD’s findings were not supported by substantial evidence. The relevant law and regulations and the record provide many reasons that SCBOE could have lawfully come to that conclusion, including a consideration of procedural errors by TRUSD, but the statute does not specify that these need to be listed in SCBOE’s written decision/Resolution. (*See id.*)

SCBOE was well within its authority to determine that TRUSD’s findings were not supported by substantial evidence, especially given that TRUSD’s own staff determined the violations had all been sufficiently refuted and/or remedied, the TRUSD Board’s revocation decision did not cite any specific facts to back up its assertion to the contrary, and the record is filled with evidence of TRUSD’s procedural violations that impact the substantial evidence analysis.

iv. The Charter Schools Act Does Not Allow Revocation Based on Past Violations Alone—A Reasonable Opportunity to Remedy is Mandatory.

Multiple times in the District’s appeal, TRUSD argues that a subsequent remedial action does not change the fact that the violation happened in the first place (or arguments to that effect). However, this contention ignores the fundamental framework around charter revocation, established by the Charter Schools Act.

Pursuant to California Education Code § 47607(g), before revocation, the chartering authority shall notify the charter school of any violation of this section and ***give the school a reasonable opportunity to remedy the violation***, unless the chartering authority determines, in writing, that the violation constitutes a severe and imminent threat to the health or safety of the pupils. (*Emphasis added*). If the existence of a previous violation means that it can never truly be remedied, then the entire charter revocation process would be rendered pointless.

Additionally, to supplement what constitutes a “reasonable opportunity to remedy”, the State Board of Education developed a set of regulations designed to govern the obligations of the chartering authority and the charter school during the revocation process. Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.2 states:

(c) Upon receipt of a Notice of Violation, the charter school's governing body as described in the school's charter, if it chooses to respond, shall take the following actions:

(1) Submit to the chartering authority a detailed, written response addressing each identified violation which shall include the refutation, remedial action taken, **or proposed remedial action** by the charter school specific to each alleged violation. **The written response** shall be due **by the end of the remedy period** identified in the Notice of Violation.



(2) Attach to its written response supporting evidence of the refutation, remedial action, **or proposed remedial action**, if any, including written reports, statements, and other appropriate documentation. (*Emphasis added*).

Here, the District provided the NOV on June 18, 2025 and granted a period up to and including September 26, 2025 to refute, remedy, or propose a remedy to the alleged violations. (CICA AR 000001 - 000009.) The District continues to maintain that “The District Board is not required to accept assurances of future compliance in place of evidence of actual remediation.” This flies in the face of the very law and regulations that control the chartering authority’s obligations. (*See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.2(c).*) Proposed remedial actions are explicitly included as a sufficient response to a NOV in the regulation that controls the revocation procedures.

The intent of the drafters is clear; there would be no language included in the regulations relating to “proposed remedial actions” if the chartering authority was not required to consider them. There was also never a severe and imminent threat to the health or safety of the pupils (and TRUSD never alleged there was), thus, the District was required to allow a reasonable opportunity to remedy violations, including via proposed remedial actions as allowed by law. In some instances, like in the instant case, considering proposed remedial actions are necessary where an actual remedy is not logistically possible by the response date set forth in the NOV. Failing to acknowledge this reality that some remedies take longer than an arbitrary remedy period established by TRUSD amounts to failure to provide a reasonable opportunity to remedy, which is a legal requirement.

b. The District’s Revocation Decision Was Not Supported by Substantial Evidence

i. The District’s Revocation Decision Does Not Cite Any Specific Evidence to Support its Conclusions

The District Board’s final decision to revoke CICA is included in the administrative record at CICA AR 001435 - 001437. In its decision, the TRUSD Board did not cite any specific evidence to support its conclusion that revocation was warranted. The extent of the District Board’s comment on the topic is as follows:

The violations set forth in the NOV and Notice of Intent to Revoke, have not been sufficiently remedied by CICA, and attempts at further corrective actions taken by CICA, although considered by the Board, failed to sufficiently remedy the violations identified in the NOV and substantiated in the Notice of Intent to Revoke, and/or promised unsubstantiated and unreliable future performance and resulting uncertainty regarding future compliance.

This is akin to saying the violations have not been remedied because the violations have not been remedied, and the proposed corrective action is insufficient to ensure future compliance because it is insufficient to ensure future compliance. A conclusory statement that the violations have not



been remedied, without identifying any specific facts to back it up, is per se not supported by substantial evidence. The statute would not have specified that the District needed to make written factual findings, supported by substantial evidence, if a conclusion alone was sufficient. (*See* Ed. Code, § 47607(h).)

ii. The District's Revocation Decision Was Not Supported by Substantial Evidence.

The District's revocation decision was not supported by substantial evidence, as discussed in detail in the appeal to SCBOE regarding the revocation of CICA's charter. (*See* CICA AR 007204 – 007368.) Crucially, *no* evidence was presented on the record to support the idea that CICA had failed to refute or remedy all of the alleged violations within the reasonable amount of time provided by the District. In fact, TRUSD's staff report concluded that *all* of the alleged violations were sufficiently refuted and/or remedied. (CICA AR 007112.) TRUSD's Board then, against the recommendation and findings of its staff, chose to revoke CICA's charter anyway, citing no specific facts whatsoever to justify its decision. Not only was this recommendation not supported by substantial evidence, it was not supported by any evidence at all (as discussed above). (CICA AR 001435 - 001437.) Moreover, it was arbitrary and capricious because it "was not supported by a fair and substantial reason." (*See Abshear v. Teacs' Retirement Board* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 1629, 1639.)

Grade Levels Not Approved – Refuted

District staff's report presented the following findings indicating why this issue was remedied:

- CICA's petition differs from HCCS' petition regarding grade levels.
- The CICA petition says the school may serve students in grade 9-12 and 8th grade and below.
- With this evidence, CICA has refuted the violation

This claim was therefore, undisputably, refuted.

Locations Not Approved – Remedied

District staff's report presented the following findings indicating why this issue was remedied:

- HCCTS Board has been taking action to terminate or buy-out leases.
- CICA is moving to locations that are approved by the District and will not add any new locations without prior approval by the District through the Material Revision process.



- HCCTS has adopted or revised multiple Board Policies, including BP 7150.5 “School Site Opening and Closure Policy”

In her presentation on behalf of CICA at the December 2, 2025 TRUSD Board Meeting, Teresa Cummings confirmed that CICA had moved to only approved site locations prior to the revocation vote. (CICA AR 007370, presentation starts at approximately 2 hours and 33 minutes.) This was uncontroverted on the record. (See CICA AR 007370).

Further, the June 17, 2025 Notice of Violation stated: “The MOU Amendment No. 3 includes the express requirement for CICA to **submit a written request**” to the District if the “Charter School seeks to establish operations at one or more additional locations(s) or move any of its existing location(s), including satellite facilities or resource centers...” and “To date, no **material revision request** has been submitted for these locations and CICA continues to operate at these locations in violation of the MOU Amendment No. 3 and Education Code section 47605(a)(4).” (*Emphasis added.*) Education Code 47605(a)(4) states:

After receiving approval of its petition, a charter school that proposes to expand operations to one or more additional sites or grade levels **shall request** a material revision to its charter and **shall notify** the chartering authority of those additional locations or grade levels. The chartering authority shall consider whether to approve those additional locations or grade levels at an open, public meeting. If the additional locations or grade levels are approved pursuant to the standards and criteria described in subdivision (c), they shall be a material revision to the charter school's charter. (*Emphasis added.*)

CICA had both **notified** the District of the additional sites and **requested** the material revision during the cure period of up to and including September 26, 2025. (*See* CICA AR 005107 – 005119, including exhibits.) All of the evidence before the District Board confirms that these events occurred, and the fact that the District Board refused to approve the material revision has no bearing on whether CICA had notified the District and requested the revision. By notifying the District and requesting the revision by September 26, 2025, CICA remedied the issue.

Additionally, CICA has provided the requested copies of lease agreements, which the District claims that it had requested in an April 23, 2025 Notice of Concern/Request for information.

Failure to Submit Audit Report – Remedied

District staff’s report presented the following findings indicating why this issue was remedied:

- On 01/02/2026 HCCTS submitted the 2024 Annual Independent Audit report.



- HCCTS has committed to submitting future reports in a timely manner.
- HCCTS is pursuing a different audit firm to ensure this issue is not perpetuated.

Further, it is important to emphasize that the audit report for the 2023-2024 audit year was delayed because the independent auditing firm that HCCTS had hired to conduct the audit refused to release its report after it learned about the State Audit in the summer of 2025. (See CICA AR 000629, 000633, 000644, 000652, 000667, and 000671.) It is not the case that CICA or HCCTS failed to retain an auditing firm to conduct the audit, nor is it the case that CICA was in possession of the final audit report and simply failed to provide it to the District. CICA was in possession of a draft audit report from the independent auditor, which it had provided to the District. The auditor substantially modified the draft report following the State Audit report and this was provided to the District as noted by District staff in their findings that this issue had been fully remedied.

Credential Misassignment – Remedied

District staff's report presented the following findings indicating why this issue was remedied:

- TRUSD has verified evidence that HCCTS has changed staffing practices.
- HCCTS staff have become more knowledgeable about credentialing compliance.
- HCCTS' subsequent actions show a credible shift towards compliance.

Further, the November 2025 Notice of Intent to Revoke, which was approved by the District Board, even confirmed that the credential misassignment issue had been remedied. Specifically, it stated, in relevant part:

The District's review of HCCTS' response, the evidence provided, and information collected through the annual oversight activities reflect clear and convincing evidence that HCCTS has changed staffing practices and reformed to comply with the law. The District staff have seen evidence that the HCCTS staff have become more knowledgeable about credentialing options to ensure compliance. HCCTS subsequent actions show a credible shift to K-12 appropriate credentialing. (CICA AR 001414 – 001415.)

The District Board unanimously voted to adopt this November 4, 2025 Notice of Intent to Revoke, which included this statement as to the credentialing issue, and no evidence was presented in the record to dispute that the credentialing issue had in fact been remedied. Therefore, it defies reason for the District Board to conclude, also unanimously, that "The violations set forth in the NOV and Notice of Intent to Revoke, have not been sufficiently remedied by CICA" in the District's January 30, 2026 "Final Decision to Revoke" letter. This could only be an arbitrary and capricious decision that is unsupported by substantial evidence.



Failure to Track & Meet Instructional Minutes – Remedied

District staff's report presented the following findings indicating why this issue was remedied:

- CICA has taken corrective actions to improve attendance policies and procedures as evidenced by the student calendar, staff trainings, student engagement logs, and class rosters.
- Serious efforts to improve practices related to student attendance enforcement and engagement have been made.
- Collaborating with Charter Impact to support with attendance monitoring and reporting.

There was no evidence entered into the record contravening these findings, so it was impossible for the District to revoke on the basis of this issue. (See CICA AR 7370 and 7371.)

Violation of Exclusive Partnership Agreement – Remedied

District staff's report presented the following findings indicating why this issue was remedied:

- HCCTS submitted evidence that the external partnerships have been terminated.
- Non-WIOA students were dis-enrolled.
- HCCTS has terminated the CTE Truck Driving program.
- Staff who were assigned to the Truck Driving program have been re-assigned or are no longer with the organization.

Further, it is not disputable that the Truck Driving program did not exist by September 26, 2025, therefore no non-students could have still been enrolled in it. This was proven by documentary evidence provided by CICA in its Response to the Notice of Violation (See CICA AR 005107 – 005119, including exhibits, and CICA AR 002532-002616, 001181-001183, and 001177-001188.) There was no evidence entered into the record contravening these findings, so it was impossible for the District to revoke on the basis of this issue. (See CICA AR 7370 and 7371.)

Fiscal Mismanagement – San Diego Location – Remedied

District staff's report presented the following findings indicating why this issue was remedied:

- Lease Termination/Buy-Out on 11/18/25



- Adopted or Revised Policies to Address Root Issues of Fiscal Mismanagement:
 - BP 3410 RE. Allowability of Costs
 - BP 3110 RE. Debt Management
 - BP 3310: Purchasing and Vendor Selection
 - BP 7150.5: School Site Opening and Closure Policy
- Updated the Fiscal Policies and Procedures Manual

There was no evidence entered into the record contravening these findings, so it was impossible for the District to revoke on the basis of this issue. (*See* CICA AR 7370 and 7371.)

By the January 27, 2026 Board Meeting, “District Staff [had] determined that all the violations identified in the Notice of Revocation have been refuted or remedied to the District’s satisfaction.” (*See* District Board Meeting Minutes from January 27, 2026, CICA AR 007112.) Given this, the District Board’s unsupported conclusion that the violations had not been refuted or remedied, with no explanation of which violations remained and no citations to the facts, was not supported by substantial evidence. In fact, all evidence was that CICA and HCCTS had fully remedied all violations noted in the NOV.

TRUSD’s appeal makes various claims to argue that its decision to revoke CICA’s charter was supported by substantial evidence. These claims are at times legally or factually inaccurate or otherwise involve circular arguments devoid of any supporting evidence.

For example, TRUSD’s appeal claims that removal of HCCTS Board Members, “standing alone” did not “correct the underlying operational, fiscal, and compliance factors.” However, the change of HCCTS Board Members, as well as executive leadership, did not “stand alone”—rather, it was accompanied by the adoption of numerous new policies and procedures and changes in actual operation of CICA and HCCTS. (*See* CICA AR 005107 – 005119). Further, this statement, and so many others, was never made on the record during the revocation proceedings. It cannot be raised for the first time as part of TRUSD’s arbitrary and capricious decision.

TRUSD’s appeal also claims that the fact that leases from the unauthorized sites were bought out “does not remedy the fact that unauthorized, unsupported, or unreasonable expenditures were made.” However, by this logic, a charter school could never remedy a past violation because it is impossible to undo the fact that it happened in the first place. That is not how the charter revocation process under the Charter Schools Act works. Addressing an improper lease, by negotiating a buyout and thus removing the improper lease, is an entirely reasonable remedy option. Refusing to acknowledge this type of fix as a remedy defies both law and reason. Further, this statement, and so many others, was never made on the record during the revocation proceedings. It cannot be raised for the first time as part of TRUSD’s arbitrary and



capricious decision.

Similarly, TRUSD’s appeal states that HCCTS had expressly acknowledged the violation regarding grade levels and stated that it would take responsibility for not following the proper procedures, concluding that “[t]his admission alone constituted substantial evidence supporting the District’s finding.” Again, this amounts to a misrepresentation of the relevant legal framework. Admitting that a violation occurred in the past, and taking responsibility for it having occurred in the past, does not mean there was substantial evidence that the charter school failed to cure it within a reasonable period of time provided by the chartering authority. (*See* Ed. Code, § 47607(g)-(h).) Whether the violation happened in the past, and whether it was later cured, are two different questions. TRUSD cannot rely on evidence that the violation had happened in the past to justify a conclusion that it had not been timely cured.

TRUSD’s appeal makes this contention as to multiple different alleged violations—essentially claiming that the Charter School’s admission that the violation had occurred in the past was enough to meet the substantial evidence standard, as if the TRUSD Board had only been tasked with finding whether there was substantial evidence that the violations had happened at all. This is a legally flawed analysis. Further, much of TRUSD’s argument that its decision was supported by substantial evidence relies entirely on information that predates even the September 26, 2025 remedy period.

For any information that TRUSD cites regarding alleged failure to remedy violations by September 26, 2025, it must be viewed in light of all other relevant information, including procedural violations by TRUSD that negatively impacted the charter school’s ability to refute or remedy. (*See* Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.4(b).) This was, and is, part of the determination of whether TRUSD’s revocation decision was supported by substantial evidence. There was no evidence on the record supporting a lack of a full remedy by CICA and HCCTS. (*See* CICA AR 7370 and 7371.) In fact, all evidence on the record was that CICA and HCCTS had fully cured the issues raised in the NOV. Across the board, it is uncontroverted that CICA and HCCTS had fully remedied all issues raised in the NOV. Not only did District staff and legal counsel find that all issues had been remedied, but none of the whistleblowers who raised concerns about Highlands in the first instance testified that any issues raised in the NOV remained uncured. No members of the public testified that any issues remained unremedied. (*See* CICA AR 7370 and 7371.)

c. The District Did Not Provide a Reasonable Opportunity to Remedy the Alleged Violations in the NOV, Which Was Required under Education Code Section 47607, Subdivisions (g) and (h), or a Reasonable Opportunity to Refute or Propose to Remedy the Alleged Violations, Which Was Required under Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.2.

The District failed to meet its legally mandated requirement as the chartering authority to provide a reasonable opportunity to remedy the alleged violations contained in the NOV prior to revocation.



California Education Code § 47607(g) requires that “Before revocation, the chartering authority shall notify the charter school of any violation of this section and ***give the school a reasonable opportunity to remedy the violation***, unless the chartering authority determines, in writing, that the violation constitutes a severe and imminent threat to the health or safety of the pupils.” (*Emphasis added*). Further, a chartering authority may only issue a Notice of Intent to Revoke after the charter has failed to remedy a violation after the expiration of the reasonable opportunity to remedy... (Cal. Educ. Code § 47607(h)). Crucially, the law does not state that the charter school must remedy by whatever deadline the chartering authority sets forth in the NOV, regardless of whether the specified date is reasonable.

A “reasonable opportunity to remedy” is a longstanding legal concept. While exact rules vary across contexts, the core concept remains consistent: fairness. A fair opportunity to correct mistakes, a fair chance to prevent harsh penalties, a fair timeframe to actualize remedies. The term “reasonable” also has a longstanding history across American jurisprudence. Most significantly it is situation and fact specific, not arbitrary and subject to the whim of its enforcer. In contract law, a “reasonable time” is a question of fact and depends upon the situation of the parties, nature of the transaction, and facts of a particular case. A cure period will be deemed unreasonable if it is so short that it does not allow the breaching party a fair chance to correct the breach, especially if the issue is complex, or requires external resources.

Here, multiple of the issues alleged in the NOV required actions from third parties as well as many months of time to logistically accomplish. (*See* CICA AR 005107 – 005119, including exhibits.) No single, arbitrary period of time, decided at the outset, was likely to be reasonable for all of this wide variety of types of claims.

The District was required to grant a reasonable opportunity to remedy **all** of the alleged violations contained in the NOV. If the original date the District set forth in the NOV is an unreasonable timeframe to correct any of the alleged violations, then more time must be given. Enforcing a uniform timeframe without deference to the complexity of each individualized allegation, especially when issuing blanket refusals of proposals to remedy, does not constitute a reasonable opportunity to remedy under the law.

i. The District Refused to Honor Evidence Presented by the Charter School by the District’s Refute, Remedy, or Proposed Remedy Date Listed in the Notice of Violation

TRUSD’s June 2025 NOV for CICA provided September 26, 2025 as the date by which the Charter School could:

- (1) Submit to the chartering authority a detailed, written response addressing each identified violation which shall include the refutation, remedial action taken, or proposed remedial action by the charter school specific to each alleged violation; the written response shall be due by the end of the remedy period identified in the Notice of Violation; and
- (2) Attach to its written response supporting evidence of the refutation, remedial



action, or proposed remedial action, if any, including written reports, statements, and other appropriate documentation

(CICA AR 000001 - 000009). The NOV further stated, “The District provides HCCTS with a reasonable remedy period of up to and including September 26, 2025, to provide the written response described above.” (HCCS AR 000001 - 000009). The NOV itself does not state that September 26, 2025 was a reasonable amount of time to cure all of the alleged violations—rather it specifies that this was the date by which the Charter School could provide the specified written response.

As discussed above, CICA provided the written response and supporting evidence to TRUSD by September 26, 2025. Then, only after September 26, 2025 had passed, TRUSD staff told CICA that it could not open the exhibits due to technical issues on TRUSD’s end—not on Highlands’ end, where the exhibits were fully accessible and where Highlands could not have predicted that TRUSD staff would have difficulty opening the files. After TRUSD notified Highlands staff that TRUSD was unable to open the exhibits, Highlands re-submitted the exact same exhibits for CICA that were already submitted on September 26, 2025. (CICA AR 007129.)

It is disingenuous for TRUSD to now claim, as stated in its appeal, that “at the conclusion of the remedy period, on September 26, 2025, CICA and CICA provided their response to the NOV, but the supporting evidence was not provided to the District until September 29, 2025.” TRUSD staff chose to wait until after September 26, 2025 to notify Highlands staff that TRUSD staff were having trouble opening the documents that had been submitted. The fact that Highlands later re-provided the information to SCCOE upon request does not mean CICA did not first provide it by September 26, 2025.

TRUSD has now chosen to assert that the supporting documents were not timely provided, which is false. By refusing to honor evidence presented by the Charter School by the District’s cure date, the District has denied the Charter School a reasonable opportunity to refute, remedy, and/or propose to remedy the alleged violations. Furthermore, the District specifically granted extensions of time to consider additional information all the way until at least January 2, 2026. It is a violation of due process to now attempt to assert that all information had to be received by September 26, 2025 when the District specifically granted extensions well beyond this date. In a recent case in Santa Clara County where a charter school contested revocation decisions by a school district authorizer, the Superior Court found that the school district was bound by the extended response deadline it had created and that the school district could not later hold the charter school to the original deadline from the NOV.

ii. The District Enforced a Cure Date of September 26, 2025 for Alleged Violations Which Were Not Curable by That Date and Refused to Accept a Proposed Remedial Action Which Was Timely Provided



The District refused to accept proposed remedial actions as a sufficient response to the NOV, despite the September 26, 2025 deadline being insufficient to fully cure multiple of the allegations. The NOV provided a remedy period up to and including September 26, 2025. Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.2 states:

(c) Upon receipt of a Notice of Violation, the charter school's governing body as described in the school's charter, if it chooses to respond, shall take the following actions:

(1) Submit to the chartering authority a detailed, written response addressing each identified violation which shall include the refutation, remedial action taken, or **proposed remedial action** by the charter school specific to each alleged violation. The written response shall be due by the end of the remedy period identified in the Notice of Violation.

(2) Attach to its written response supporting evidence of the refutation, remedial action, or **proposed remedial action**, if any, including written reports, statements, and other appropriate documentation. (*Emphasis added*).

The law specifically allows proposed remedial actions as viable responses to a NOV. The intent of the regulation is clear—proposed remedial actions are sufficient for the charter’s written response due by the end of the remedy period set forth in the NOV. Rejecting legally acceptable forms of responses as insufficient is not a sound argument for revocation.

When considering what constitutes a “reasonable opportunity to cure,” TRUSD was not entitled to ignore the fact that it was impossible for CICA to effectively resolve all of the alleged violations within the time frame provided in the NOV. As noted above, what constitutes a reasonable time to remedy is fact-dependent. In contract law, a cure period will be deemed unreasonable if it is so short that it does not allow the breaching party a fair chance to correct the breach, especially if the issue is complex, or requires external resources. Here, several of the alleged violations relied heavily on the participation of external parties and required expert advice.

First, the delayed 2023-2024 audit report was entirely dependent on an independent service provider. The audit was delayed because the independent auditing firm that HCCTS had hired to conduct the audit refused to release its report after it learned about the State Audit in the summer of 2025. (*See CICA AR 000629, 000633, 000644, 000652, 000667, and 000671.*) Audits are a time-consuming process and, outside of hiring the auditing firm, the process is completely out of the control of CICA staff. As of January 2, 2026, the audit was completed and was thus remedied. (*See CICA AR 000671.*)

In terms of the material revisions to address grade level changes and location changes, HCCTS labored intensively – in conjunction with District staff – to develop material revision language for each school, to be voted on by the District Board. District staff had reviewed the



material revisions and recommended approval, but the District Board denied the material revision as to the school sites anyway on January 13, 2026. (CICA AR 007385.) The District Board had been presented the HCCTS plan to cure these issues and at no time expressed a concern about approving a material revision. It was fully aware that its staff was meeting regularly with HCCTS staff to get to mutual agreement on material revision language. District staff then asked HCCTS to revise the material revision to remove grade levels and related educational program changes so that these could be studied further, which the school did and resubmitted the material revision request on January 2, 2026. To date, the District Board has still refused to approve a material revision for either of these topics—grade levels (applicable only to HCCS) and school sites. The District Board’s failure to engage cannot later become a basis for revocation when it was their own interference that prevented the remedy.

Regarding the alleged fiscal mismanagement, the San Diego site location was tied to a contract with a third party. (See CICA AR 002500 and 004420.) The legal realities of dissolving a binding contract do not support a 3-month timeframe. Once CICA was put on notice via the NOV, the school immediately began preparations for lease termination/buy-out for the lease contract that was at issue. As of November 15, 2025, the lease for the San Diego site has been terminated. The nature of this violation is such that it is unreasonable to expect a bow tied neatly around the problem within 3 months. The proper remedy here was to develop a proposed remedial action, which was done when CICA began the process to dissolve the lease agreements. On both accounts, District staff contended that the issue was remedied and no further evidence was provided to support an argument of non-remedy. (See CICA AR 004420.)

It is unreasonable, especially in light of all the relevant information, that CICA be held to a timeframe that neglects the unique set of circumstances attached to each alleged violation. CICA refuted or remedied any and all alleged violations that were capable of expedient solutions, and timely presented proposed remedial actions for those that required more time. The legal standard is not that by the end of the remedy period from the NOV all violations will be cured; the standard is that the charter’s written response, including proposed remedial actions, shall be due by the end of the remedy period specified in the Notice of Violation and that the chartering authority must provide a reasonable opportunity to remedy alleged violations before seeking revocation. CICA complied with the relevant legal obligations.

The District’s appeal relies almost exclusively on an idea that evidence of remedy from beyond September 26, 2025 should not be considered. Even disregarding the fact that the District continued to grant an extended remedy period, it is clear in the plain language of the regulation that proposed remedial actions are sufficient to satisfy the charter school’s requirements under Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11968.5.2. Thus, revocation for failure to cure by the September 26, 2025 deadline, without confirmation that this deadline was reasonable, and without allowing for proposed remedial actions, is not legally supportable.

CICA has a protected property interest and is entitled to due process under the law prior to revocation. Both the federal and state Constitutions compel the government to afford persons due process before depriving them of any property interest (See U.S. Const. amend. XIV; See



also Cal.Const. Art. 1, § 7). In *Today's Fresh Start, Inc. v. Los Angeles County Office of Education*, (2013) 57 Cal.4th 197, 215, the California Supreme Court found that once a charter has been granted, the charter school then has a property interest in its charter that is protected by due process of law. Therefore, CICA must be afforded due process prior to the revocation of its charter.

The District Board clearly erred by revoking the charter based on its strict, legally unsound assessment that all alleged violations needed to be fully cured by the September 26, 2025 deadline from the NOV. No reasonable opportunity to cure was afforded, proposed remedial changes were ignored, and communications directly from the District about extending the timeline counteracted any later emphasis placed on the original cure date. A revocation process that the District can change midway through, to the detriment of the CICA, is not due process.

By providing a cure date of September 26, 2025 for alleged violations which were not curable by that date, and refusing to accept a proposed remedial action, the District has denied the Charter School a reasonable opportunity to remedy the alleged violations.

iv. The District Communicated to the Charter School That It Had Extended the Cure Period and Later Reneged on That Assurance

As discussed above, TRUSD communicated to the Charter School that it had extended the period by which the Charter School could remedy and/or propose to remedy the alleged violations from the June 2025 NOV. In TRUSD Board Trustee Baker's words at the November 4, 2025 District Board Meeting minutes, "The school will be given additional time to correct these violations or provide demonstrative evidence of progress toward compliance." November 4, 2025 is well after the original September 26, 2025 response date. TRUSD staff then confirmed, in writing, that the extended deadline for CICA to provide this documentation was January 2, 2026 (*See* CICA AR 007224).

TRUSD's extension of the amount of time to correct the violations and/or provide evidence of progress toward correction serve as a tacit acknowledgement by TRUSD that September 26, 2025 was not a reasonable amount of time to remedy some of these issues. TRUSD later withdrew this reasonable opportunity to remedy by demanding that CICA should have cured all of the issues by September 26, 2025—even though the original NOV did not even say that (as discussed above). All of this amounts to failure to provide a reasonable opportunity to refute, remedy, or propose to remedy the claimed violations.

Additionally, CICA detrimentally relied on TRUSD's communications of the extended amount of time to remedy and provide documentation. This raises equitable issues. Detrimental reliance requires that there is 1) a clear and definite promise; 2) reasonable and foreseeable reliance; 3) actual harm or detriment; 4) injustice can only be avoided by enforcement (*See* Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 90 (1981).) The doctrines of fairness and equity compel the



reversal of any finding for revocation based on a date that was arbitrarily enforced to serve the whims of the District, especially where the District's own staff gave the Charter School contrary instructions.

Several email communications with the District illustrate that CICA had been misled to believe they had more time to cure, causing them to detrimentally rely on the District's assurances. (*See*, for example, CICA AR 007224.) These confirmed, written communications serve as a basis for CICA's well-founded belief that the District granted the Charter School an extended period to remedy. The District may not now argue that CICA did not cure the issues by the original September 26, 2025 deadline where the District repeatedly communicated to HCCTS, in writing, that it would have more time. CICA detrimentally relied on the District's communications of extended time to refute or remedy. It is a violation of CICA's right to due process for the District to extend the deadline and then, partway through the process, change the process and decide that the original deadline applied.

v. The District's Procedural Errors Negatively Impacted the Charter School's Ability to Remedy the Alleged Violations

The District's procedural errors negatively impacted CICA's ability to remedy the violations contained in the NOV. Under California Code of Regulations Title 5, section 11968.5.4, subdivision (b), the SCBOE was required to consider whether an alleged procedural deficiency negatively impacted the charter school's ability to refute or remedy the alleged violation or the chartering authority's ability to comply with its procedural obligations or authorizing duties.

Here, the District interfered with the Charter School's ability to remedy by revoking on "findings" that predated the cure period, extending the cure period and then not honoring the new timeline, delaying reporting violations, consenting to "violations" for years, and refusing to adopt material revisions relating to the same. (*See* CICA AR 007224, 007090, 007371, and 007372.)

To the extent that the District Board argues that its factual "findings" are the findings from the June 17, 2025 Notice of Violation, which the District Board incorporated by reference, this constitutes a procedural error and omission in the revocation process which negatively impacted the charter school's ability to refute or remedy the alleged violation, because findings made on June 17, 2025 did not take into account whether or not the charter school had adequately responded by September 26, 2025 or subsequent extensions granted by TRUSD. Relying on the pre-September 26, 2025 findings would, by definition, deprive CICA of an opportunity to refute or remedy the alleged violations because it would mean that, regardless of subsequent actions by CICA to refute or remedy, the District intends to revoke CICA's charter based on the June 17, 2025 information alone. Relying on the findings in the June 17, 2025 Notice of Violation would therefore also constitute a negative impact on the charter school's



ability to refute or remedy, in addition to constituting a negative impact on the District's ability to complete its procedural obligations.

Similarly, the cure period was consistently altered during communications with District staff, upon which CICA reasonably relied. By later basing revocation on CICA's failure to sufficiently remedy by the original cure date of September 26, 2025, the District substantially interfered with CICA's ability to comply with its procedural obligations and remedy violations.

Relative to the violations alleged in the NOV, the District was aware that CICA was operating additional sites and grade levels and acted such that CICA had a right to believe that CICA was permitted to utilize the additional grade levels and sites without going through the formal material revision process. And, as discussed above, CICA was correct in terms of grade levels—no material revision was required for this, per the terms of CICA's charter. CICA relied upon the District's conduct to its injury where the District later sought to revoke CICA's charter for not having requested the material revisions sooner.

Relatedly, the District Board voted to deny the material revision requests drafted in conjunction with District staff after the NOV was issued. District staff had reviewed the material revisions and recommended approval, but the District Board denied them anyway on December 2, 2025. This denial was in bad faith, since the District Board had been presented the HCCTS plan to cure these issues and at no time expressed a concern about approving a material revision. It was fully aware that its staff were meeting regularly with HCCTS staff to get to mutual agreement on material revision language. To date, the District Board has still refused to approve a material revision for either of these topics—the school sites or the grade levels. This interference and lack of good faith engagement by the District were the cause of CICA's delay in remedying the material violations of the charter applicable to CICA.

Predating the NOV, the District has made it nearly impossible for CICA to sufficiently meet its obligations under the law. From consenting to prior conduct, to revoking on unjust findings, to continually acting contrarily to what was communicated to CICA by the District's staff and Board members, the District has created procedural deficiencies that negatively impacted the charter school's ability to refute or remedy alleged violations.

d. To the Extent that the District Has Raised New Allegations and Evidence in its Appeal to the State Board of Education, the Charter School Has Been Given No Reasonable Opportunity to Refute or Remedy These Claims, and New Evidence from Outside the Administrative Record Must Not Be Considered.

Throughout its appeal, the District continuously raises new allegations and introduces new evidence into its record of appeal. For example, the following allegations are from outside the relevant timeframe and/or outside of the Notice of Violation³:

- “Furthermore, the wholesale replacement of the HCCTS Board introduces additional

³ This is not an exhaustive list.



concerns regarding institutional capacity and continuity of oversight.” (TRUSD Appeal, p. 9.)

- Claim that HCCTS has not yet submitted an audit for the 2024-25 school year. (TRUSD Appeal, p. 14)
- Allegation of violation of WIOA exclusive partnership agreement is entirely based on evidence that predates the conclusion of the original September 26, 2025 remedy period from the NOV. (See TRUSD Appeal, pp. 14-15)

It is standard legal practice that no new evidence or claims can be introduced on appeal. Only items put on the record by the District prior to revocation may be cited to by the District as support for the revocation decisions. It cannot invent new reasons after the fact.

CICA has been given no meaningful opportunity to respond to any new alleged violations raised in TRUSD’s appeal, once again denying CICA its due process rights. The only record that is acceptable for review by the State Board of Education at this juncture is the existing administrative record. Moreover, any new allegations are completely unrelated to the question of whether or not CICA sufficiently remedied the violations contained in the June 2025 NOV.

It is far past the point of the District being permitted to introduce new evidence or allegations that were not raised in the original June 2025 NOV. The SBE should therefore disregard any new factual allegations made by TRUSD in its appeal.

III. Conclusion

Under Education Code Section 47607(i), the County Board of Education was tasked with assessing whether the findings made by the chartering authority under Education Code Section 47607(h) are supported by substantial evidence. (See Ed. Code, § 47607(i).) This assessment involves consideration of multiple factors, outlined in the relevant statutes and regulations, including whether the charter school was given a reasonable opportunity to cure the alleged violations and whether any procedural deficiencies on the part of the chartering authority hindered this process.

Here, procedural deficiencies, inconsistent and contradictory communication by the District, and an unreasonable, after-the-fact demand that all issues be fully cured by September 26, 2025, all resulted in a process that negatively impacted the Charter School’s ability to remedy. Additionally, the District, in writing and via communication from its Board and staff, extended the cure period to at least January 2, 2026. The District’s later refusal to honor this extended cure period violated both the Charter School’s right to due process and the principles of basic equity. For some of the alleged violations, such as terminating certain leases, more time beyond January 2, 2026 was needed to reasonably be able to remedy.

Ultimately, the District’s staff assessed that CICA had sufficiently refuted or remedied all of the alleged violations, and presented specific facts to justify these findings. The TRUSD

Charter School Written Opposition to District Appeal,
submitted by California Innovative Career Academy

Docusign Envelope ID: 5EA5742E-1634-8933-8153-338558C13AB3



Board then issued a cursory decision stating that it disagreed, citing to no specific facts at all. Under these egregious facts and with **no** evidence on the record to support the District's contentions, SCBOE was well within its authority to determine that there was not substantial evidence to support this decision, especially when taking all relevant information into account.

CICA respectfully asks that the State Board of Education let the decision of SCBOE stand, which reversed the revocation decision of TRUSD.

Sincerely,

Signed by:

Matthew Levesque

DAA472AFBC07434...

Matthew

Levesque,

Board Chair

California Innovative Career Academy