



A Summary of AB 1505 & AB 1507

Background/Overview

This year, powerful special interests conspired to legislate charter-hostile policies so extreme, the *LA Times* called them “vindictive” and “nasty.” They were matched for eight months straight with a sustained groundswell of opposition from charter public school educators and families that forced them to the negotiating table. Despite spending over \$4 million in favor of the status quo, anti-charter special interests came up short. Instead, California’s resilient charter movement beat the odds by negotiating amendments to the Charter Schools Act, led by CCSA and Governor Gavin Newsom, that affirm high-quality charter schools are here to stay and recognize the unique value existing and future charter schools play in closing California’s chronic and persistent achievement gap.

CCSA has moved to a “neutral” position on Assembly Bill (AB) 1505 to preserve the hard-fought policy achievements we were successful in securing through extensive negotiations. These efforts restore due process rights for charters on appeal, including a limited role for state appeals; shield renewals from fiscal impact consideration; balance fiscal impact consideration against academic need for new petitions; modernize renewal criteria with a streamlined renewal path for achievement gap-closing schools and preserve academic indicators as a weighted factor for most schools; provide a five-year transition for existing non-core, non-college prep teachers to be credentialed; and provide some protections within a limited two-year moratorium on new nonclassroom-based schools.

As with any compromise, concessions were required of us but ultimately, we believe the totality of the deal we negotiated charts a bright future for a charter movement that can continue to grow, innovate, and exemplify the limitless potential of all children to learn. It’s time to move forward and work together to design strategies that usher in the next generation of great public schools. The Governor has committed to only entertaining further charter legislation in the near future related to statewide standards for authorizers and NCB reform.

Summary of Content and Changes

AB 1505 is expected to be signed by the Governor before October 12, but its requirements will not go into effect until July 1, 2020, providing schools time to adjust to the new law. This Brief provides a summary of the changes that will be enacted by AB 1505 and AB 1507, related to school locations. This overview should not be considered a replacement for the actual law, and we encourage schools to review the details of the law and discuss these changes and their implications for your school with your attorney and your board. CCSA is committed to providing more in-depth information and technical assistance related to the implementation of these bills in the coming weeks and months.

Charter Petitioning Process

AB 1505 contains a number of changes to the petitioning process which, on balance, may provide charter schools with more clarity and a more transparent process. These procedural changes will apply to all petition submittals, including new petitions, renewals, appeals and county-wide benefit charters.

AB 1505 lengthens charter review time to 60 days for hearing and 90 days for approval. Currently law allows only 60 days for charter decision, sometimes driving a bias to denial. While extending the timeline 30 days may create delays for some schools, particularly those who need to appeal, this change is consistent with a consensus recommendation of Charter Task Force (CTF). Further, the following associated changes should actually improve the decision process and timeline:

- Requires the 90-day timeline to start when the petitioner submits to the district office and certifies the petition is complete. This should reduce situations in which the authorizer restarts the clock by claiming a petition is incomplete or requires a charter only to submit at specified time or place, such as at a district board meeting.
- Requires the district to publish findings and recommendations 15 days prior to the public hearing. This will allow petitioners sufficient time to prepare written responses to rebut district findings and eliminate situations in which the charter receives no information or recommendations prior to the public hearing.
- Requires the petitioner to receive equal time and procedures at hearing to present evidence and testimony and to respond to the district's testimony. Equal time, combined with prior notice will provide more fairness in the process and better chance for a petitioner to make a strong case. It will also help to build a stronger public record if an appeal is necessary.

New Charter Evaluation Criteria (Community and Fiscal Impact)

While current law allows no consideration of local impact in chartering decisions, AB 1505 previously allowed broad and unchecked denial for fiscal impact for all new and renewing schools, with no consideration of local student need. Coupled with loss of appeal rights also in early AB 1505 text, all charter schools could have faced denial or closure with no due process.

Consideration of district impact in chartering decisions is one the most controversial pieces of the bill and was a top priority for the author and the Governor. **The final bill limits the application of the fiscal impact considerations only to new petitions or existing schools that are expanding to one or more additional sites or grade levels beyond what is already approved in the charter.** In addition, in all cases, the authorizer must consider the academic needs of the students the charter proposes to serve if it is considering denial of a petition based on fiscal impact.

Specifically, AB 1505 adds two new allowable reasons for denial of a charter school:

- *The charter school is demonstrably unlikely to serve the interests of the entire community in which the school is proposing to locate. Analysis of this finding shall include consideration of the fiscal impact of the proposed charter school. A written factual finding under this paragraph shall detail specific facts and circumstances that analyze and consider:*
 - *The extent to which the proposed charter school would substantially undermine existing services, academic offerings, or programmatic offerings.*

- *Whether the proposed charter school would duplicate a program currently offered within the school district and the existing program has sufficient capacity for the pupils proposed to be served within reasonable proximity to where the charter school intends to locate.*
- *The school district is not positioned to absorb the fiscal impact of the proposed charter school. A school district satisfies this paragraph if it has a qualified interim certification pursuant to Section 1240 and the county superintendent of schools, in consultation with the County Office Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team, certifies that approving the charter school would result in the school district having a negative interim certification pursuant to Section 1240, has a negative interim certification pursuant to Section 1240, or is under state receivership. Charter schools proposed in a school district satisfying one of these conditions shall be subject to a rebuttable presumption of denial.*

These new provisions could have a significant impact on charter growth throughout the state, but especially in districts that are deemed to be in fiscal distress. It will be critical for charter schools to build a strong case within their charter petitions for the needs of the students in the district and the benefit of the charter to counter any fiscal impact findings by a district. It will also help to build a strong public record of these issues in case of an appeal.

The interim certification of districts' financial reports that designate a district as positive, qualified or negative is updated twice per year and publicly available on the CDE website at: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fi/ir/interimstatus.asp>. As of the 2018-19 second interim certification, 6 districts have a negative certification (with Sacramento City USD being the largest), and 28 have a qualified certification (with Los Angeles USD and Twin Rivers USD being the largest). Currently, the following school districts are under state receivership: Oakland USD, Inglewood USD, South Monterey County Joint Union HSD and Vallejo City USD.

Revised and Additional Charter Petition Elements

AB 1505 makes a few changes to the actual content of a school's charter. These changes will apply to new petitions and to existing petitions at renewal.

- The petition shall more explicitly align charter goals and outcomes to all of the state dashboard priorities without regard to the nature of the program operated by the school, except priorities that are not relevant to the grade levels of the charter. This change is consistent with changes made earlier this year in SB 75, the 2019 Education Trailer Bill to the budget.
- Current law requires a petition to describe the means by which the charter will achieve a racial and ethnic student balance comparable to the district. AB 1505 adds English Learners (including re-designated students) and students with disabilities (with consideration of the impact of charter's status for special education as an independent local education agency) to this requirement.
- Petitioners will be required to include in its supplemental information, the names and qualifications of nominees to the charter's nonprofit governing body.
- Requires a charter school that is establishing one or more additional sites or grade levels to notify authorizer and submit for approval as a material revision. Currently this is only required for additional sites.

Credentialing Requirements for All Charter Teachers

Current law states legislative intent that charters be given flexibility in credentialing with regard to noncore, non-college preparatory courses. AB 1505 previously eliminated any credentialing flexibility as of January 1, 2020- an abrupt change that would have resulted in immediate and massive noncompliance and significant mid-year disruptions to many programs, their staff and students.

The final version of 1505 also removes current intent language on noncore flexibility and requires all charter teachers to be appropriately credentialed. However, a number of clarifications were included that may reduce the harm and ease transition for programs, students and teachers:

- By 12/1/20, all teachers must have “Certificate of Clearance” to teach and be subject to background checks and criminal monitoring by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). While all charter teachers are currently required to have a fingerprint screening and background check, some schools may not be using the CTC process for their non-credentialed teachers. <https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/leaflets/cl900.pdf?sfvrsn=2>
- By July 1, 2020, all newly hired teachers for the 2020 school year and beyond will need an appropriate credential for their assignment.
- By June 30, 2025 all existing teachers will have to be certified. For some specialist teachers, this may include a career technical education credential or other appropriate certification. More information is at: <https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/leaflets/cl888.pdf>
- All direct-funded charter schools will have access to the same credentialing flexibilities as districts do, including local assignment options and emergency credentials and for independent study but must meet all related laws and regulations. (Presumably locally funded charter will have similar access though their district.)
- Some existing options charter schools may consider, as appropriate, may include certifications for Career Technical Education and considerations for independent study, alternative schools and adult courses allowed under Education Code Section 44865.
- By 6/30/22, the CTC shall provide a report on existing certifications for adequacy to address noncore non-college prep assignments and consider new or modified certificates. This should provide an opportunity to establish more appropriately flexible credentials at CTC and potentially spark more innovative approaches for teacher certification.

Charter Appeals

When AB 1505 was first introduced, it would have eliminated appeals to the county and the State Board of Education for new schools, nonrenewals and revocations. Coupled with fiscal impact, all charter schools could have faced denial or closure with no due process. The final version restores full appeal rights for new schools, nonrenewals and revocations to counties, and if denied there, the school may submit an appeal to the State Board, but under a narrower standard.

Appeals to the county or state must be submitted within 30 days of the denial, and petitioners must provide a copy to the district.

The new charter petition process changes such as timeline, submittal and hearing protections that are discussed earlier will apply for both county and state appeals.

In addition, the law provides clarity that minor changes to the charter can be made to reflect circumstances due to the passage of time such as facilities, finances and law, or to reflect the change in authorizer. However, if more substantive changes are made, the county or state board will remand the petition back to the district which will have 30 days to reconsider the petition. If denied, the charter can resubmit the appeal.

In either a county or state appeal, the law allows judicial review if there is no action on an appeal within 180 days.

County Appeals: AB 1505 previously eliminated any county appeal, unless it was based only on very narrow procedural violations by the district. Now a full “de novo”, or fresh look appeal is restored at the county appeal level.

One minor exception to the full de novo appeal is if the district denied the petition based on the “fiscally distressed district” criteria discussed above, the county must also consider any fiscal impact finding of the district.

AB 1505 provides a new protection for schools denied in a county-district (e.g. San Francisco), by requiring the SBE to be appellant body for a de novo appeal. But, if approved by the SBE, it will reassign the charter to the district/county for oversight.

State Board Appeals: Currently, the state board of education (SBE) provide de novo review similar to district and county process and becomes the chartering entity and overseer if approved. AB 1505 establishes a more limited appeal than current law, which will impose a new standard of “abuse of discretion” by the district or county and eliminates state oversight of charters approved on appeal.

The standard of “abuse of discretion” is a narrower than the current “de novo” appeal at the state. While the term is not specifically defined in the bill, it is a standard used in civil lawsuits to evaluate if the school district or county board has not proceeded in the manner required by law, the decision of the school district or county board is not supported by the findings, or the findings are not supported by the evidence. The procedural changes noted earlier should result in a more balanced and robust administrative record that will give schools a stronger chance under the “abuse of discretion” standard that will apply at the state level. With a strong record, schools may have a fighting chance at overturning some local denials. The abuse of discretion standard of review at the state level may also result in districts improving their authorization process to engender greater predictability for petitioners. Other changes on a state appeal include:

- The petitioner must provide all documentary records with the appeal, and the district and COE must provide transcripts or other documents to the charter petitioner within 10 days of a request, including the evidence that supports that an abuse of discretion occurred.
- The district and COE may submit a rebuttal to the petitioners request within 30 days of appeal submittal with evidence from the documentary record.
- Current law does not guarantee a state hearing, but now all schools on appeal are guaranteed a hearing by the Advisory Commission on Charter Schools and ultimately by the SBE if the Commission recommends that a local decision should be overturned. The SBE must consider the appeal at a public meeting and hold a hearing or summarily deny the appeal if it finds no abuse of discretion occurred.

- If the SBE finds an abuse of discretion occurred, and overturns the appeal, the SBE will designate, in consultation with petitioner, either the COE or district that denied the charter as the chartering authority. This removes SBE out of its current oversight role but provides the petitioner some say to whether it goes to district or county.

County-wide Benefit Charters

Current law allows a county to approve a county-wide charter under certain criteria. A county board is provided fairly broad discretion on approvals and denials which are not appealable to the state board. Prior versions of 1505 would have completely eliminated or virtually eliminated county-wide chartering by adding significant new requirements. The final version of AB 1505 largely retains existing structure and law for county-wide charters. Restoring county-wide chartering to current law retains an option that might ultimately offer a path for growth in many cases.

AB 1505 makes only conforming amendments relative to procedural changes noted above for local petitions related to:

- Submittal timelines, procedures and equal time
- Balance of Special Education and English Learner students
- Notice of board nominees
- Credentialing
- Because countywide charter approvals already provide considerable local discretion, AB 1505 does not explicitly include the fiscal impact consideration.

State Board of Education Chartering Role

One priority of the Administration and sponsors of AB 1505 was to remove the SBE and department of education from their role of chartering authority and for overseeing charter schools of a statewide benefit and those approved on denial by a local authorizer. AB 1505 repeals the authority for a statewide benefit charter. Currently there is only one such charter, and the SBE has not considered any new ones for several years. AB 1505 requires the current statewide benefit charter and charters approved by the SBE on appeal to transfer to local authorization after their next renewal.

The prior version of AB 1505 provided no consideration for transition of existing state-approved charters to local oversight. The final version of AB 1505 provides for a reasonable transition for all existing state appeal charters and statewide benefit charters to local oversight:

- For existing SBE charters approved on appeal, at their next renewal they must go to the district (as currently required) and, if denied can go back to the SBE for appeal in accordance with current “de novo” criteria for appeals. If SBE approves the renewal, it will, in consultation with the charter, transfer oversight and subsequent authorization to either the local district or county.
- The statewide benefit charter will go to SBE for next renewal, but after renewal the SBE will, in consultation with the charter, transfer oversight and subsequent authorization to the local district where the site is located, or to the county. If they transfer to the county, they shall qualify as a county-wide benefit charter.
- Charters required to change authorizers shall be considered continuing charters for all purposes to protect funding and data.

Updated Charter Renewal Criteria and Process

AB 1505 provides a substantial reworking and updating to the renewal criteria and process for charter schools. Re-establishing predictable and reasonable renewal criteria has been a priority for CCSA since the prior Academic Performance Index accountability system was abandoned. The Administration has also sought to better align charter renewals with the new state dashboard accountability indicators. The result of these efforts is a three-tiered approach that CCSA supported that provides a different process for high, low and mid-range performing schools. The new criteria are tied more closely to the state dashboards, with an emphasis on academic indicators and provides a limited second-look process for mid-and-low-range schools where post-secondary and academic growth data will be admissible. Schools designated as Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) will not be included in the new criteria but will establish renewal targets locally. New criteria also allow more consideration of any fiscal, governance and enrollment equity issues at the charter school.

Beginning in the 2020-21 renewal cycle, high performing schools will be eligible for a streamlined renewal and a term of up to 7 years. For the first-time in state law we have established the concept that achievement gap-closing schools should be rewarded with streamlined and lengthened renewals. For very low performing schools, schools will have access to a second look for two renewal cycles and if approved, shall only be renewed for two years. For all other charter schools, except DASS schools, academic indicators must be weighted, and a second look process will also be available. The three tiers will apply as follows:

High performing charters shall be approved with streamlined renewal that only requires the charter be updated for changes in law, for 5 to 7 years, if for two years preceding the renewal the school:

- Has received the two highest levels (colors) schoolwide for all state indicators it has, or
- Has met or exceeded the statewide average¹ for all measurements of academic performance² schoolwide and has exceeded the average for a majority of underperforming subgroups³, and
- Is not in differentiated assistance under LCFF.

Low performing charters shall not be renewed if for two years preceding the renewal the school:

- Has received the two lowest levels (colors) schoolwide for all state indicators it has, or
- Is at or below the statewide average¹ for all measurements of academic performance² schoolwide and is below the average¹ for a majority of underperforming subgroups³.
- In order to approve a school not meeting the standards above, a “second look” is allowed for two renewal terms only through June 30, 2025, and a school may only be renewed if:
 - The authorizer finds the charter is addressing the factors of low performance, and
 - The school provides verifiable data from an externally validated nationally recognized source that the school has made sufficient gains or has strong postsecondary outcomes.
 - If the charter is approved, it may only be for a two-year term.

For all non-DASS charters not meeting the high or low criteria (the vast majority of charter schools) the authorizer must consider the school’s performance on all dashboard indicators schoolwide and by

¹ The statewide average is the schoolwide performance level (color) on the California School Dashboard for the entire state of California for each academic indicator.

² Measurements of academic performance are the CAASPP ELA and Math indicators, the English Learner Progress Indicator and the College/Career indicator.

³ Underperforming subgroups are defined as any numerically significant subgroup the school serves where that subgroup is performing below the state average.

subgroups and provide greater weight to academic indicators. This provision does not contain a clear threshold for approval or denial as provided in the high and low tier.

In addition to the dashboard metrics, until January 1, 2026 (but not to exceed two renewals) the authorizer shall also consider verifiable data from an externally validated nationally recognized source that the school has made sufficient gains or has strong postsecondary outcomes. The state board is directed to establish criteria for verified data and an approved list of assessments for this purpose by January 1, 2021, but until then, a renewing charter school can present data consistent with the criteria outlined in this section of education code. The phase out of the second-look is intended to provide sufficient time for the state board to adopt a viable growth metric or consider other appropriate adjustments to the new dashboard system.

An authorizer may only deny if it makes written factual findings that the charter failed to meet or make sufficient progress and that closure is in the best interest of the pupils, and the decision provided greater weight to academic indicators. As with current law, if approved, renewal shall be for 5 years.

Other Renewal and Revocation Considerations that apply to all tiers for charter renewal:

- Provides an exemption for alternative schools designated as DASS. This exemption is similar to current law for ASAM schools but requires a local process to establish an alternative process for review.
- Establishes specific process to evaluate whether a charter is discriminating in enrollment or dismissal and allows nonrenewal if the charter has violated those requirements or has substantial fiscal or governance issues. However, the authorizer is required to provide an opportunity to cure and violation noted and can only deny if the cure was unsuccessful or violation so severe a cure is unviable.
- Retains appeal of nonrenewal under revised appeal process discussed above. (Prior AB 1505 revoked appeal rights for non-renewals and revocations.)
- Fiscal and Community impact considerations for denial of a new school do not apply to a charter renewal, unless it includes a material revision to add grade levels or new sites not already approved.
- The final version of AB 1505 does not contain any changes to current revocation process and provides for appeal of revocation or non-renewal. (Prior version of AB 1505 would have revoked all appeal rights for non-renewals and revocations.)

LCFF Technical Assistance

AB 1505 revises the process and criteria for differentiated assistance under LCFF to charter schools beginning 2020-21. The changes are intended to provide greater alignment with district criteria for identification for assistance. The criteria are split into three levels:

- LCFF Level 1 available to all schools regardless of performance.
- LCFF Level 2, also known as differentiated assistance, criteria are met if school meets underperformance criteria for one or more subgroups, for two or more LCFF priority areas for two or more years. Assistance will be provided by the COE (or the geographical lead agency if COE is authorizer), and not the charter authorizer. The change of provider removes a potential conflict of interest with the authorizer objectively evaluating a school's progress for renewal.

- LCFF Level 3, known as Intensive Intervention, is now met under the same criteria as for districts. The COE, or assistance provider, may refer the charter to California Collaborative for Education Excellence (CCEE) with SBE approval, and, as in current law, the authorizer shall consider revocation if charter fails or is unable to implement CCEE recommendations. The authorizer shall consider improvement in academic achievement in deciding whether to revoke.

Because charters will not be identified for LCFF assistance until 2 years after these new criteria apply, until June 2022, schools will still be triggered for LCFF differentiated assistance and intensive intervention under the charter-specific criteria in current law.

Nonclassroom-based Charter Moratorium

Earlier this year, we defeated AB 1506 which would have imposed a permanent cap on the total number of charters in the state at the current number of charter schools and prohibited any new NCB schools, and SB 756 which would have imposed a five-year moratorium on all new charters. However, AB 1505 imposes a moratorium on the approval of a petition for the establishment of a new nonclassroom-based charters between January 1, 2020 and January 1, 2022. Given the recent high-profile indictments in the NCB community, this was one area that was non-negotiable with the Administration and sponsors. However, the two-year limit is more reasonable, and the final bill does contain some exceptions:

- The moratorium shall not apply to a nonclassroom-based charter school that was granted approval of its petition and providing educational services to pupils before October 1, 2019, under either of the following circumstances:
 - If AB 1507 is enacted and the charter school is required to submit a petition to the governing board of a school district or county board of education in an adjacent county in which its existing resource center is located in order to comply AB 1507 or to retain current program offerings or enrollment, or
 - If a charter school is required to submit a petition to a school district or county board of education in which a resource center is located in order to comply with the court decision in *Anderson Union High School District v. Shasta Secondary Home School* or other relevant court ruling, and the petition is necessary to retain current program offerings or enrollment.
- The moratorium also confirms that a charter school authorized by a different chartering authority as noted above shall be regarded by the department as a continuing charter school for all purposes.

Other Miscellaneous Changes in AB 1505

- **Waiver Prohibition:** AB 1505 prohibits state board waivers of the amended sections of the Charter Schools Act under the bill. Limited waivers are currently allowed if submitted through district authorizer and SBE approves it. While this was a non-negotiable item with the bill's author, we note that it lacks parity with districts waiver options, and while relatively rarely used, it was as critical tool in reasonable implementation of the Shasta lawsuit decision.
- **Implementation Timeline:** With the exception of the moratorium, and the phase in of new credentialing requirements, the provisions of the bill become effective July 1, 2020. AB 1505 originally would have been effective January 1, 2020 providing no transition time. Providing a 6-month delay to align with the school and fiscal year may ease the transition.

- **Research:** AB 1505 requires the CDE, with consultation of the SBE, to collect data to track implementation of the changes enacted AB 1505.

New Geographic Limitations in AB 1507

Current law allows a charter school to establish a single site outside of its authorizing district under specified circumstances and after providing notice to the district where the school will locate. It also allows nonclassroom-based, independent study resource centers, meeting spaces, or other satellite facilities to be located in the authorizing district or in adjacent counties. AB 1507 removes that flexibility in most cases for new schools and sites and requires a transition or local approval of exiting sites upon renewal.

Through the process, this bill's author strongly expressed her philosophy that no educational activity should occur within the boundaries of a school district for which the governing school board has no notice, approval and authority over. Nonetheless, the final bill provides some considerations in an emergency, reasonable transitions for existing schools and sites operating out of district and allows permission and notice, rather than full charter re-authorizing for existing multi-site operations out of district. While many schools may have to consider restructuring or reauthorizing to comply with this bill, the transition is delayed until school renewal, and all schools that reauthorize will be treated as continuing schools to protect their funding and data.

For classroom-based schools, AB 1507 requires that in order to remain in the out-of-district location, a school that located outside of its authorizing district prior to January 1, 2020 to do either of the following:

- Before submitting the request for the renewal of the charter petition, obtain approval in writing from the school district where the site is operating.
- Submit a request for the renewal of the charter petition pursuant to Section 47607 to the school district in which the charter school is located. The school shall have a right to appeal if the renewal is denied.
- For a charter school that changes its chartering authority due to this law, the department shall regard it as a continuing charter school for all purposes.

Going forward, a charter school may only locate out of district:

- If a charter schoolsite is located and operating in an area for which there is a Presidential declaration of a major disaster. The charter school, for not more than five years, may relocate with written approval of the school district where the site is being relocated. If a charter school was previously relocated, due to a disaster with a Presidential declaration, that charter school shall be allowed to return to its original campus location in perpetuity.
- If a charter school is located on a federally recognized California Indian reservation or rancheria or operated by a federally recognized California Indian tribe.
- If the charter provides instruction in accordance with existing site exemptions included in current law (Section 47605.1(f)).

For nonclassroom-based charter schools, AB 1507 limits the location of any new resource centers, meeting spaces, or other satellite facilities to only within the geographic boundaries of the chartering entity, and each site location must be approved by the authorizer. AB 1507 requires the charter school

to notify its authorizer of the name and physical location of any resource center, meeting space, or other satellite facility operated by that charter school. In addition:

- A charter school may continue at its current out-of-districts locations until the charter school submits a request for the renewal of its charter petition. To continue operating any out-of-district location, the charter shall first obtain approval in writing from each school district where the resource center, meeting space, or other satellite facility is operating. If the school is a county-wide charter it must gain its approval from the county in which the site located.
- If a nonclassroom-based charter location is operating in an area for which there is a Presidential declaration of a major disaster, the charter school, for not more than five years, may relocate with written approval of the school district where the site is being relocated.
- Charters that provide instruction in accordance with existing site exemptions included in current law (Section 47605.1(f)) are still excluded.
- The bill contains a narrow exemption for a location of a school in LAUSD authorized by an adjacent district that targets pupils who are currently or formerly on probation or were formerly incarcerated individuals.
- For a charter school that changes its chartering authority due to this law, the department shall regard it as a continuing charter school for all purposes.