



Tennessee Public Charter School Commission

Policy 3.710 – Opportunity Public Charter School Performance Framework

Policy Sections

| | |
|---|----|
| I. Academic Performance..... | 3 |
| II. Financial Performance..... | 18 |
| III. Organizational Performance..... | 25 |
| Appendix A – Mission-Specific Goal..... | i |

Acknowledgements

The Tennessee Public Charter School Commission (“Commission”) would like to acknowledge and appreciate the feedback and collaboration received from the State Board of Education, the Commission-authorized schools, and other quality authorizers and stakeholders to develop this framework.

About the Performance Framework

This document outlines the comprehensive benchmarks by which opportunity public charter schools (“OPCS”) authorized by the Commission will be measured and evaluated in alignment to the Commission’s mission. The framework addresses the academic, financial, and organizational benchmarks by which schools will be scored to indicate the overall success and health of the charter school. An opportunity charter school’s performance on these measures will be published in the annual report produced by the Commission.

Section I. Academic Performance

Pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated (“T.C.A.”) § 49-13-102, two of the purposes of a charter school are to improve learning for all students and to ensure that children have the opportunity to reach proficiency on state academic assessments. In addition, the law states that “[t]he performance-related provisions within a charter agreement shall be based on a performance framework that clearly sets forth the academic and organizational performance indicators, measures, and metrics that will guide the authorizer’s evaluation of each public charter school.”¹ For students, families, and the community, the main question that needs to be answered is: “Is this school a high-achieving school?” With increased school autonomy, a bedrock of charter school authorization, comes the expectation of high academic achievement and student growth. The following pages outline the measures by which a charter school’s academic performance will be evaluated for purposes of yearly monitoring, potential interventions and plans of correction, and renewal and revocation decisions. A school will be evaluated on each performance measure and will receive a rating for each measure as well as a composite score that encompasses the entire academic performance framework. The Commission’s Charter School Intervention Policy 3.400 lays out the possible interventions and sanctions for failure to meet the standards set forth in the performance framework.²

The Academic Performance framework is made up of [fourfive](#) key areas, which are outlined below. Additional details and explanations for these areas are included in the pages that follow.

1. Student Outcomes (15%-25%)
2. Mission-Specific Goal (20%)
3. Comparative Performance: Time in Model Analysis ~~and College and Career Readiness (“CCR”)~~ (340%)
4. Overall Tennessee Value Added Assessment System (“TVAAS”) Composite Index (15%-25%)

¹ T.C.A. § 49-13-143(a)

² For example, the governing board of any school that receives a “Falls Far Below” rating in any category will receive a Notice of Concern detailing the areas of concern on the Performance Framework. Achievement of a rating of “Falls Far Below” in multiple areas or “Does Not Meet Standard” in a significant number of ratings will result in a Notice of Deficiency being issued to the school’s governing board and a Plan of Correction being developed. Additional information regarding possible interventions and sanctions, including charter revocation, are available in the Charter School Intervention Policy 3.400.

4.5. Postsecondary Readiness (High School Only) (10%)³

³ For middle schools, this section does not apply. The 10% weight will be reallocated to the Comparative Performance: Time in Model Analysis section.

1:(a). Student Outcomes (15%-25%)

The Student Outcomes section of the Commission’s Opportunity Public Charter School Performance Framework aligns with the Tennessee Department of Education (“TDOE”)’s state accountability framework in relation to opportunity public charter schools. If the TDOE adjusts any indicators in future accountability protocols, the Commission will adjust the same within the performance framework such that this section will continue to align with the state’s accountability model, also known as the letter grade, for opportunity public charter schools.

| Measure | Description | Falls Far Below Standard | Does Not Meet Standard | Meets Standard | Exceeds Standard | Total Weight |
|---------|---|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|
| 1(a) | School academic performance, as measured by the Tennessee Department of Education | D or F | C | B | A | 15%-25%* |

Notes regarding the Student Outcomes section:

- Minus grades for schools will not influence the overall ratings category of the school. For example, a school receiving a B- will be designated as “Meets Standard.”
- For this indicator, a C letter grade qualifies as “Does Not Meet Standard.” However, a school can still achieve a meets standard for the academic section of the School Performance Framework based on its performance on the other indicators.
- *The student outcomes and TVAAS sections have a range of weights due to re-allocation of weight for schools scoring a TVAAS 4 or 5. If a school meets standard at a TVAAS 3 or earns a TVAAS 1 or 2, the allocation of weights will be 25% for student outcomes and 15% for TVAAS. If a school earns a TVAAS 4, the allocation of weights will be 20% for student outcomes and 20% for TVAAS. If a school earns a TVAAS 5, the allocation of weights will be 15% student outcomes and 25% TVAAS. This is to reward schools for having higher growth scores.
- The Commission aligns with the state’s accountability system for College and Career Readiness (“CCR”) measures. While this is included within the letter grade calculation, it is also included within the Commission’s framework for opportunity public charter schools.

In the event there is a pause of the state’s accountability system by the TDOE, the Commission shall reallocate the weight of student outcomes to other sections within the academic section of the framework. The supplemental guidance document will provide further information on other measures that the schools will be held accountable to in the event of a pause or interruption. The chart below demonstrates an example of the reallocation of weight in the event of enacting the contingency plan in the absence of a letter grade designation:

Example Contingency Weighting in Event of Pause or Interruption in the State’s Accountability System

| Area of Academic Framework | Weighting |
|---|---|
| Student Outcomes | 0% |
| Mission-Specific Goal | 25% |
| Comparative Performance | <p>Total Weight – 50% 40%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Time in Model Analysis ■ CCR Measure |
| TVAAS Composite Score | 25% |
| Postsecondary Readiness | 10% |

~~1(b)~~ Student Outcomes for New Schools (15%-25%)

If a school is scaling opening year over year and will not have state assessment data available, the school will be held to any available data it has within the framework, including the mission-specific goal. Weights will be reallocated as necessary within the framework to accommodate available data.

If a school only has a mission-specific goal as available data for this section of the framework, the school shall not earn “Exceeds Standard” on the overall academic section, but may earn only “Meet Standard”, “Does Not Meet Standard”, or “Falls Far Below Standard”.

An opportunity public charter school that is within its first year of operation is held harmless for a letter grade. The weight of the student outcomes section of the framework will be reallocated as outlined below to the other sections of the academic section of the framework. The Time in Model Analysis will also be held harmless in Year 1 as the data set is established. [The Postsecondary Readiness area’s weight will be reallocated to available indicators, like credit](#)

[attainment, and CCR data will not be available until the school has a graduating cohort.](#)

| Area of Academic Framework | Weighting |
|---|--|
| Student Outcomes | 0% |
| Mission-Specific Goal | 50% |
| Comparative Performance | <p>Total Weight – 0%</p> <p>■ Time in Model Analysis – 0%</p> <p>■ CCR – 0%0%</p> |
| TVAAS Composite Score | 450% |
| Postsecondary Readiness | 10% |

2: Mission-Specific Goal (20%)

Each school authorized by the Commission will define a mission-specific goal within its charter agreement to be evaluated within the School Performance Framework. See Appendix A for the school's mission-specific goal.

Each mission-specific goal is unique and pre-determined in collaboration with Commission staff. The inclusion of this goal offers an opportunity:

1. For schools to showcase what makes them unique based on the model described within their charter application and the population they aim to serve.
2. To include supplemental data for schools who are staggering their opening by grade level.
3. To capture additional important data aligned with their mission that schools believe are beneficial and are outside the scope of what is measured within the academic portion of the framework. This can include items such as ACT scores, postsecondary data, nationally normed internal assessment data, and curriculum rubrics.
4. For schools to outline how their innovative models best serve their unique populations.
5. To capture other important mission-aligned measures that may be outside of typical state-reported student outcomes, such as persistence, attendance, etc.

The school must adhere to the guidelines established by the Commission to develop the proposed mission-specific goal. Further information on the development and guidelines for the mission-specific goals is available in the [School Performance Framework Supplemental Guidance Manual](#).⁴ The Commission will either approve the goal as is and incorporate it within the school's accountability and reporting, or it will engage in further negotiations. A school may choose to include both short- and long-term mission-specific goals depending on the outcomes the school is looking to measure during the tenure of its charter agreement. The school may choose to make changes to its mission-specific goal during the interim review. If a school must make adjustments to its mission-specific goal at any other time during the term of the charter agreement, the school must notify Commission staff to determine materiality of the adjustments.

For an opportunity public charter school, the mission-specific goal holds more significant weight and is where much of the outcomes of the unique model addressing needs ~~of~~ the target population is captured. The mission-specific goal will be discussed with the school during site

⁴ Available on the [Commission's webpage for guidance documents and protocols](#).



visits and during interim reviews. The mission-specific goal will be included within the annual reporting for the school which is public record. The mission-specific goal will also be considered in high-stakes decisions including intervention, renewal, and revocation. The school is responsible for reporting the pre-determined and aggregated data by the specified date within the charter agreement for site visits and annual reporting. Failure to report this data will result in the charter school receiving a “Does Not Meet Standard” for the mission-specific goal.

3: Comparative Performance (~~30%~~ **340%**)

~~3(a) Time in Model Analysis (30%) or 40%~~

For middle schools without the Postsecondary Readiness section of the framework, the Time in Model Analysis will hold 40% of weight.

The Time in Model Analysis assesses how students who stayed within the school’s model from one year to the next performed in terms of proficiency and performance level. This measure reviews if the school is closing achievement gaps for students who persist within the model.

~~Schools Opting to not include CCR (40%)~~

| Measure | Description | Section Weight |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| ELA: Comparative performance of students persisting in the model – Performance Level | <p>The percentage points of students scoring in the below expectations performance level decreases across all available cohorts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Exceeds: Decreases by an average of <u>Over an average of</u> 10 percentage points or more ■ Meets: Decreases by <u>Between</u> an average between 0 and of 5 and 10 percentage points ■ Does Not Meet: <u>Increases the average between 0 and 5 percentage points</u> Less than an average of 5 percentage points - ■ Falls Far Below: <u>Increases the average by 5 percent points or more</u> The average demonstrates an increase in the percentage of students in the below expectations performance level. | 40 <u>25</u> % |

| Measure | Description | Section Weight |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| ELA: Comparative performance of students persisting in the model – Proficiency Rate | <p>The percentage points of students scoring in the meets or exceeds expectations performance levels increases across all available cohorts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <u>Exceeds: Increases by an average of 10 percentage points or more</u> ■ <u>Meets: Increases by an average between 0 and 10 percentage points</u> ■ <u>Does Not Meet: Decreases the average between 0 and 5 percentage points</u> ■ Falls Far Below: Decreases the average by 5 percent points or more <u>Exceeds: Over an average of 10 percentage points</u> ■ Meets: Between an average of 5 and 10 percentage points ■ Does Not Meet: Less than an average of 5 percentage points ■ Falls Far Below: The average demonstrates a decrease in the percentage of students scoring proficient. | <u>25</u> 10 % |

| Measure | Description | Section Weight |
|---|--|---------------------------|
| Math: Comparative performance of students persisting in the model – Performance Level | <p><u>The percentage of students scoring in the below expectations performance level decreases across all available cohorts.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <u>Exceeds: Decreases by an average of 10 percentage points or more</u> ■ <u>Meets: Decreases by an average between 0 and 10 percentage points</u> ■ <u>Does Not Meet: Increases the average between 0 and 5 percentage points</u> <p>Falls Far Below: Increases the average by 5 percent points or more The percentage points of students scoring in the below expectations performance level decreases across all available cohorts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Exceeds: Over an average of 10 percentage points ■ Meets: Between an average of 5 and 10 percentage points ■ Does Not Meet: Less than an average of 5 percentage points ■ Falls Far Below: The average demonstrates an increase in the percentage of students in the below expectations performance level. | <u>25</u> 10 % |

| Measure | Description | Section Weight |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| Math: Comparative performance of students persisting in the model – Proficiency Rate | <p><u>The percentage of students scoring in the meets or exceeds expectations performance levels increases across all available cohorts.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <u>Exceeds: Increases by an average of 10 percentage points or more</u> ■ <u>Meets: Increases by an average between 0 and 10 percentage points</u> ■ <u>Does Not Meet: Decreases the average between 0 and 5 percentage points</u> <hr/> <p>The percentage points of students scoring in the meets or exceeds expectations performance levels increases across all available cohorts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Exceeds: Over an average of 10 percentage points ■ Meets: Between an average of 5 and 10 percentage points ■ Does Not Meet: Less than an average of 5 percentage points ■ Falls Far Below: The average demonstrates a decrease in the percentage of students scoring proficient. | <u>25</u> 10 % |

High Schools Opting to include College and Career Readiness Indicator (30%)

| Measure | Description | Weight |
|---|--|-------------|
| <p>ELA: Comparative performance of students persisting in the model – Performance Level</p> | <p>The percentage points of students scoring in the below expectations performance level decreases across all available cohorts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Exceeds: Over an average of 10 percentage points ■ Does Not Meet: Less than an average of 5 percentage points ■ Meets: Between an average of 5 and 10 percentage points ■ Falls Far Below: The average demonstrates an increase in the percentage of students in the below expectations performance level. | <p>7.5%</p> |
| <p>ELA: Comparative performance of students persisting in the model – Proficiency Rate</p> | <p>The percentage points of students scoring in the meets or exceeds expectations performance levels increases across all available cohorts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Exceeds: Over an average of 10 percentage points ■ Does Not Meet: Less than an average of 5 percentage points ■ Meets: Between an average of 5 and 10 percentage points ■ Falls Far Below: The average demonstrates a decrease in the percentage of students scoring proficient. | <p>7.5%</p> |

| Measure | Description | Weight |
|---|---|--------|
| Math: Comparative performance of students persisting in the model – Performance Level | <p>The percentage points of students scoring in the below expectations performance level decreases within the longest available cohort.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Exceeds: Over an average of 10 percentage points ■ Meets: Between an average of 5 and 10 percentage points ■ Does Not Meet: Less than an average of 5 percentage points ■ Falls Far Below: The average demonstrates an increase in the percentage of students in the below expectations performance level. | 7.5% |
| Math: Comparative performance of students persisting in the model – Proficiency Rate | <p>The percentage points of students scoring in the meets or exceeds expectations performance levels increases within the longest available cohort.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Exceeds: Over an average of 10 percentage points ■ Meets: Between an average of 5 and 10 percentage points ■ Does Not Meet: Less than an average of 5 percentage points ■ Falls Far Below: The average demonstrates a decrease in the percentage of students scoring proficient. | 7.5% |

This indicator measures students who attended the school in consecutive years. The school is held harmless to this indicator in first year as the school's data set develops. Time in model comparisons are run by middle and high school grade bands.

Additional detail may be found in the Commission's supplemental guidance.⁵

3b. [Optional – High Schools Only] College and Career Readiness (“CCR”) Measure (10%)

Each school authorized by the Commission with a graduating class in the evaluated school year will have the opportunity to opt-in to including the comparative CCR rate with the resident district in which the school is located. The school and Commission staff will determine the inclusion of this measure prior to the start of the school year.

This measure compares the school's CCR rate to the resident district's CCR rate. The school's CCR rate must fall within 5% of the resident district's CCR rate. CCR rate is the number of graduates earning CCR status over the number of students in the graduating cohort. To be counted as earning the CCR status, students must be a graduate who meets one of the following criteria:

- Meets or exceeds a composite of 21 (ACT) or 1060 (SAT)
- Increases ACT score from junior to senior year by at least four points
- Earns a score of 31 or higher on the ASVAB AFQT
- Earns a Tier 3 Industry Credential (“IC”) or earns a Tier 2 IC and at least one other IC (any tier is acceptable for the second credential)
- Earns one or more “postsecondary credits”⁶

The CCR comparison aligns with the Tennessee Department of Education's CCR calculations. If the TDOE adjusts the calculation in future years, the Commission will adjust this indicator to continue to align with the TDOE's calculation.

⁵ Available on the [Commission's webpage for guidance documents and protocols](#)

⁶ The Tennessee Department of Education defines postsecondary credits in the State Letter Grade Protocol – found on the [District and School Accountability webpage](#).



The school's comparative performance to resident district on the CCR rate:

- ~~Exceeds: The school's CCR rate is greater than five percentage points above the resident district~~
- ~~Meets: The school's CCR rate is up to five percentage points above or below the resident district~~
- ~~Does Not Meet: The school's CCR rate is between five and ten percentage points lower than the resident district~~
- ~~Falls Far Below: The school's CCR rate is more than ten percentage points lower than the resident district~~

4: Overall Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (“TVAAS”) Composite Index (15%-25%)

| Measure | Description | Falls Far Below Standard | Does Not Meet Standard | Meets Standard | Exceeds Standard | Total Weight |
|---------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|
| 4(a) | The Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System ⁷ (“TVAAS”) measures student growth year over year, regardless of whether the student is proficient on the state assessment. In calculating a TVAAS score, a student’s performance is compared relative to the performance of his or her peers who have performed similarly on past assessments. | TVAAS Composite Score of 1 | TVAAS Composite Score of 2 | TVAAS Composite Score of 3 | TVAAS Composite Score of 4 or 5 | 15%-25%* |

Note – if a school does not have a TVAAS score, the weight will be reallocated evenly amongst the other indicators in the academic section.

*The student outcomes and TVAAS sections have a range of weights due to re-allocation of weight for schools scoring a TVAAS 4 or 5. If a school meets standard at a TVAAS 3 or scores a TVAAS 2 or 1, the allocation of weights will be 25% for student outcomes and 15% for TVAAS. If a school earns a TVAAS 4, the allocation of weights will be 20% for student outcomes and 20% for TVAAS. If a school earns a TVAAS 5, the allocation of weights will be 15% student outcomes and 25% TVAAS. This is to reward schools for having higher growth scores.

⁷ Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System: <https://www.tn.gov/education/data/tvaas.html>

5. Postsecondary Readiness (High School Only) (10%)

5(a). College and Career Readiness Measure (5%)

Each school authorized by the Commission with a graduating class in the evaluated school year will be accountable to the comparative CCR rate with the resident district in which the school is located. A school must have a graduating class for this portion of the framework.

This measure compares the school's CCR rate to the resident district's CCR rate. The school's CCR rate must fall within ten percent of the resident district's CCR rate. CCR rate is the number of graduates earning CCR status over the number of students in the graduating cohort. To be counted as earning the CCR status, students must be a graduate who meets one of the following criteria:

- Meets or exceeds a composite of 21 (ACT) or 1060 (SAT)
- Increases ACT score from junior to senior year by at least four points
- Earns a score of 31 or higher on the ASVAB AFQT
- Earns a Tier 3 Industry Credential ("IC") or earns a Tier 2 IC and at least one other IC (any tier is acceptable for the second credential)
- Earns one or more "postsecondary credits"⁸

The CCR comparison aligns with the Tennessee Department of Education's CCR calculations. If the TDOE adjusts the calculation in future years, the Commission will adjust this indicator to continue to align with the TDOE's calculation.

The school's comparative performance to resident district on the CCR rate:

- Exceeds: The school's CCR rate is greater than **tenfive** percentage points above the resident district
- Meets: The school's CCR rate is up to **tenfive** percentage points above or below the resident district
- Does Not Meet: The school's CCR rate is between **tenfive** and **fifteen** percentage points lower than the resident district
- Falls Far Below: The school's CCR rate is more than **tenfifteen** percentage points lower

⁸ The Tennessee Department of Education defines postsecondary credits in the State Letter Grade Protocol – found on the District and School Accountability webpage.

than the resident district

5(b). One-Year Graduation Rate (2.5%)

The One Year Graduation Rate indicator reviews the school's ability to adequately prepare students for graduation beyond the typical four-year timeline. A school must have a graduating class for this portion of the framework. This indicator looks at students who will be eligible for graduation within one year and answers the question, of the students eligible to graduate within one year, how many actually graduated?

- Exceeds: 85-100% of eligible students graduated
- Meets: 70-84% of eligible students graduated
- Does not meet: 55-69% of eligible students graduated
- Falls far below: 0-54% of eligible students graduated

5(bc). Credit Attainment Progress (2.5%)

The Credit Attainment Progress indicator measures the credit earning rate to monitor progress toward graduation, while also measuring persistence. This monitors whether students are adequately progressing through their coursework each year. This indicator measures earned credits against attempted credits. All high schools will be held to this indicator each year.

- Exceeds: On average, more than 90% of credits attempted are earned by students.
- Meets: On average, 75%-90% of credits attempted are earned by students.
- Does Not Meet: On average, 75%-60% of credits attempted are earned by students.
- Falls Far Below: On average, less than 60% of credits attempted are earned by students.

| Section | Indicator | Falls Far Below Standard | Does Not Meet Standard | Meets Standard | Exceeds Standard | Percentage of Section Score | Percentage of Overall Score |
|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Student Outcomes | School academic performance, as measured by the Tennessee Department of Education | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 100% | 15%-25%* |
| Mission-Specific Goal | Each school authorized by the Commission will define a mission-specific goal within their charter agreement to be evaluated within the School Performance Framework | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 100% | 20% |
| Comparative Performance | Time in Model Analysis and College and Career Readiness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 100% | 430% |
| Subsection | ELA: Comparative performance of students persisting in the model – Performance Level | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Schools without the CCR comparison :25% HS opting in to the CCR comparison :20% | n/a |
| Subsection | ELA: Comparative performance of students persisting in the model – Proficiency Rate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 25% Schools without the CCR comparison :25% HS opting in to the CCR comparison :20% | n/a |

| Section | Indicator | Falls Far Below Standard | Does Not Meet Standard | Meets Standard | Exceeds Standard | Percentage of Section Score | Percentage of Overall Score |
|------------|---|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Subsection | Math: Comparative performance of students persisting in the model – Performance Level | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 25% Schools without the CCR comparison :25% HS opting in to the CCR comparison :20% | n/a |
| Subsection | Math: Comparative performance of students persisting in the model – Proficiency Rate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 25% Schools without the CCR comparison :25% HS opting in to the CCR comparison :20% | n/a |

| Section | Indicator | Falls Far Below Standard | Does Not Meet Standard | Meets Standard | Exceeds Standard | Percentage of Section Score | Percentage of Overall Score |
|---|---|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Subsection | School comparative performance to resident district with the CCR rate | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | Schools without the CCR comparison : 0% HS opting in to the CCR comparison : 20% | n/a |
| TVAAS | Overall Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) Composite Index | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 100% | 15%-25%* |
| Postsecondary Readiness | High schools only | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>100%</u> | <u>10%</u> |
| Subsection | College and Career Readiness Measure | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>50%</u> | <u>n/a</u> |
| Subsection | One-Year Graduation Rate | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>25%</u> | <u>n/a</u> |
| Subsection | Credit Attainment Progress | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>25%</u> | <u>n/a</u> |

Average Total Rating (3 and above Meets Standard)**

* The student outcomes and TVAAS sections have a range of weights due to re-allocation of weight for schools scoring a TVAAS 4 or 5. If a school meets standard at a TVAAS 3 or scores a TVAAS 1 or 2, the allocation of weights will be 25% for student outcomes and 15% for TVAAS. If a school earns a TVAAS 4, the allocation of weights will be 20% for student outcomes and 20% for TVAAS. If a school earns a TVAAS 5, the allocation of weights will be 15% student outcomes and 25% TVAAS. This is to reward schools for having higher growth scores.

** To assign the final score determination, the "Average Total Rating" will be rounded to the nearest whole number. (For

Adopted: Pending

Revised:



example, a score of 2.5 would be rounded up to a 3 and assigned the determination of a “Meets Standard”. A score of 2.4 would be rounded down to a 2 and a determination of “Does Not Meet Standard”.)

Section II. Financial Performance

In addition to academic performance, another important indicator of short-term and long-term success of charter schools is financial performance. Annually, a charter school will be rated on the following near term and sustainability indicators. When a school does not meet the standard on a measure of the Financial Framework, it becomes necessary for the Commission to seek more information. A rating of “Does Not Meet Standard” on a single measure is not necessarily an indication of financial distress, instead, it is an invitation for the Commission to understand the reason for the financial underperformance, assess the severity of the situation, and if necessary, determine an appropriate course of action or intervention. Any intervention action based on the school’s ratings received in financial performance will be dictated by Commission Policy 3.400 Charter School Intervention.

Financial performance metrics are calculated primarily by using the audited financial statements for each of the Commission’s schools, which are prepared in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America as prescribed by the GASB. Consequently, the Statement of Net Position and Statement of Activities are presented in a consolidated manner with all schools operated under a single network. While the consolidated financial statements are utilized in the majority of the Financial Performance Framework for measuring the near term and sustainability measures of the charter school, the Commission will also consider each school’s financial position and hold it independently accountable.

Indicators and Measures:

1. Near Term Indicators:
 - a. Current Ratio
 - b. Unrestricted Days Cash
 - c. Enrollment Variance
 - d. Default
2. Sustainability Indicators:
 - a. Total Margin
 - b. Debt to Asset Ratio
 - c. Debt Service Coverage Ratio
 - d. Unrestricted Net Position
 - e. Total Margin by School (*if applicable*)

1. Near Term Indicators

1(a). Current Ratio:

Current Assets divided by Current Liabilities

Audit Source: "Statement of Net Position"

- Meets Standard
 - Current Ratio is greater than or equal to 1.1; OR
 - Current Ratio is between 1.0 and 1.1 and one-year trend is positive (current year ratio is higher than previous year ratio)
 - (For schools in their first or second year of operation) Current Ratio must be greater than or equal to 1.1
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - Current Ratio is between 0.9 and 1.0 or equal to 1.0; OR
 - Current Ratio is between 1.0 and 1.1 and one-year trend is negative
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - Current Ratio is less than or equal to 0.9
 - (For schools in their first or second year of operation) Current Ratio is less than 1.1

1(b). Unrestricted Days Cash:

Unrestricted Cash divided by ([Total Expense minus Depreciation Expense] divided by 365)

Audit Source: "Statement of Net Position" (Cash), "Statement of Activities" (Depreciation, Total Expenses)

Note: If Cash is not detailed in audit, then schools must provide this information directly to the Commission.

- Meets Standard
 - Days Cash is greater than or equal to 60 days; OR
 - Days Cash is between 30 and 60 days and one-year trend is positive
 - (For schools in their first or second year of operation) Days Cash is greater than or equal to 30 days
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - Days Cash is between 15-30 days or equal to 30 days; OR
 - Days Cash is between 30-60 days and one-year trend is negative
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - Days Cash is less than or equal to 15 days

- (For schools in their first or second year of operation) Days Cash is less than 30 days

1(c). Average Daily Membership (ADM) to Budget Variance:

Actual ADM (June 30 ADM) divided by Enrollment Projection used in June 1 Charter School Board-Approved Budget. Schools will be allowed one board-approved revised budget in a fiscal year.

Source of Data: Received Directly from School

- Meets Standard
 - ADM to Budget Variance greater than or equal to 95 percent in the most recent year
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - ADM to Budget Variance is between 85 percent and 95 percent in the most recent year
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - ADM to Budget Variance is less than or equal to 85 percent in the most recent year

1(d). Default:

Source of Data: Audit and/or Received Directly from School

- Meets Standard
 - School is not in default of loan covenant(s) and/or is not delinquent with debt service payments
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - School is in default of loan covenant(s), but has worked with lender(s) to restructure debt service payments
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - School is in default of loan covenant(s) and/or is delinquent with debt service payments.

2. Sustainability Measures

2(a). Total Margin:

Total Margin is Change in Net Position divided by Total Revenues; Aggregated Total Margin is Total Three-Year Change in Net Position divided by Total Three-Year Revenues

Audit Source: "Statement of Activities" (Total Revenues) and "Statement of Activities" (Change in Net Position)

- Meets Standard
 - Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is positive and the most recent year Total Margin is positive; OR
 - Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is greater than -1.5%, the trend is positive for the last two years, and the most recent year Total Margin is positive
 - *(For schools in their first or second year of operation)* Aggregated Two-Year Total Margin (if applicable) is positive, and the most recent year Total Margin is positive
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is greater than -1.5%, but trend does not "Meet Standard"
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is less than or equal to -1.5%; OR
 - The most recent year Total Margin is less than -10%.
 - *(For schools in their first or second year of operation)* Aggregated Two-Year Total Margin (if applicable) is negative (or zero), OR the most recent year Total Margin is negative (or zero)

2(b). Debt to Asset Ratio:

(Total Liabilities plus Deferred Inflows from Resources) divided by (Total Assets plus Deferred Outflows from Resources)

Audit Source: "Statement of Net Position"

- Meets Standard
 - Debt to Asset Ratio is less than or equal to 0.9
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - Debt to Asset Ratio is between 0.9 and 1.0
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - Debt to Asset Ratio is greater than or equal to 1.0

2(c). Debt Service Coverage Ratio:

(Change in Net Position + Depreciation Expense + Interest Expense + Rent/Lease Expense) divided by (Debt Due within One Year + Interest Expense + Rent/Lease Expense)

Audit Source: "Statement of Activities" (Change in Net Position, Depreciation Expense, Interest Expense); "Statement of Net Position" (Debt Due within One Year); "Notes to Financial Statements" (Rent/Lease Expense)

Note: If Rent/Lease Expense is not detailed in audit, then schools must provide this information directly

- Meets Standard
 - Debt Service Coverage Ratio is greater than or equal to 1.1
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - Debt Service Coverage Ratio is less than or equal to 1.1
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - Not Applicable

2(d). Unrestricted Net Position:

Unrestricted Net Position divided by total expenses

Audit Source: "Balance Sheet" (Unrestricted Net Position) and "Statement of Activities" (Total Expenses)

- Meets Standard
 - Unrestricted Net Position is greater than or equal to 5%
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - Unrestricted Net Position is greater than 0.0% but less than 5%
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - Unrestricted Net Position is negative

2(e). Total Margin by School (if applicable):

Total Margin by School is Change in Net Position for the authorized school divided by Total Revenues for the authorized school; Aggregated Total Margin is Total Three-Year Change in Net Position divided by Total Three-Year Revenues for the authorized school

Audit Source: "Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance by School"

Note: Charter schools may strategically plan to operate at a deficit in a given fiscal year. This often involves reducing unrestricted fund balance to support initiatives such as growth or expansion; investments in technology; adoption of new curricula; implementation of academic

Adopted: Pending

Page 29 of 43

Revised:

corrective action plans to improve school performance; or facilities and other capital improvements. While any deficit in the most recent fiscal year results in a school not meeting this standard, a documented, planned deficit will be considered when evaluating schools that do not meet this standard.

■ Meets Standard

- Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin by School is positive, and the most recent year Total Margin by School is positive; OR
- Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin by School is greater than -1.5%, the trend is positive for the last two years, and the most recent year Total Margin by School is positive
- (For schools in their first or second year of operation) Aggregated Two-Year Total Margin by School (if applicable) is positive, and the most recent year Total Margin by School is positive

■ Does Not Meet Standard

- Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin by School is greater than -1.5%, but trend does not "Meet Standard"

■ Falls Far Below Standard

- Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin by School is less than or equal to 1.5%; OR
- The most recent year Total Margin by School is less than -10%
- (For schools in their first or second year of operation) Aggregated Two-Year Total Margin by School (if applicable) is negative (or zero), OR the most recent year Total Margin by School is negative (or zero).

GASB Audit Data Sources for Financial Performance Framework:

| # | Metric | Data for Calculation | Data Source |
|----|-----------------------------|--|--|
| 1a | Current Ratio | Current Assets | Statement of Net Position |
| 1a | Current Ratio | Current Liabilities | Statement of Net Position |
| 1b | Unrestricted Days Cash | Cash & Cash Equivalents | Statement of Net Position or Directly from School |
| 1b | Unrestricted Days Cash | Total Expenses | Statement of Activities |
| 1b | Unrestricted Days Cash | Depreciation | Statement of Activities |
| 1c | Enrollment Variance | Actual Enrollment | Directly from School |
| 1c | Enrollment Variance | Budgeted Enrollment | Directly from School |
| 1d | Default | Default/Delinquency | Directly from School |
| 2a | Total Margin | Total Revenues | Statement of Activities |
| 2a | Total Margin | Change in Net Position | Statement of Activities |
| 2b | Debt to Asset Ratio | Total Liabilities | Statement of Net Position |
| 2b | Debt to Asset Ratio | Deferred Inflows | Statement of Net Position |
| 2b | Debt to Asset Ratio | Total Assets | Statement of Net Position |
| 2b | Debt to Asset Ratio | Deferred Outflows | Statement of Net Position |
| 2c | Debt Service Coverage Ratio | Change in Net Position | Statement of Activities |
| 2c | Debt Service Coverage Ratio | Depreciation | Statement of Activities |
| 2c | Debt Service Coverage Ratio | Interest Expense | Statement of Activities |
| 2c | Debt Service Coverage Ratio | Rent and Lease Expenses | Notes to Financial Statements or Directly from School |
| 2c | Debt Service Coverage Ratio | Short-term Debt | Statement of Net Position |
| 2c | Debt Service Coverage Ratio | Current Portion of Long-term Debt | Statement of Net Position |
| 2d | Unrestricted Net Position | Unrestricted Net Position | Statement of Net Position |
| 2d | Unrestricted Net Position | Total Expenses | Statement of Activities |
| 2e | Total Margin by School | Total Revenues for Authorized School | Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance by School |
| 2e | Total Margin by School | Change in Net Position for Authorized School | Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance by School |

Section III: Organizational Performance

A charter school's performance on the organizational measures is a large piece of the overall evaluation of a charter school. Deficiencies or weaknesses in organizational performance may be an indicator of the overall health of the charter school.

When a school does not meet the standard on a measure of the Organizational Performance portion of the framework, it becomes necessary for the Commission to seek more information. A rating of "Does Not Meet Standard" on a single measure may indicate non-compliance but is not necessarily an indication of overall organizational distress. Instead, it is an invitation for the Commission to understand the reason for the organizational underperformance, assess the severity of the situation, and if necessary, determine an appropriate course of action or intervention in alignment with the Commission's Charter School Intervention Policy – 3.400.⁹ Conversely, if shortcomings are identified and the school promptly comes into compliance within a reasonable timeframe, the Commission staff reserves the right to use professional discretion to determine if the school is eligible to receive a "Meets Standard" rating.

⁹ Tennessee Public Charter School Commission Charter School Intervention Policy – 3.400

Indicators and Measures:

1. Education Program:
 - a. Charter Terms
 - b. Compliance with Education Requirements
 - c. Enrollment Over Time
 - d. Student Retention Rates
 - e. Student Retention Rates by Subgroup
 - f. Students with Disabilities Rights
 - g. English Learner Rights
 - h. Enrollment Requirements
2. Financial Management and Oversight
 - a. Financial Reporting and Compliance Reporting
 - b. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles
3. Governance and Reporting
 - a. Governance Requirements
 - b. Accountability of Management
 - c. Reporting Requirements
4. Students and Employees
 - a. Rights of Students
 - b. Suspension Reporting Requirements
 - c. Attendance
 - d. Credentialing
 - e. Employment Rights
 - f. Background Checks
5. School Environment
 - a. Facilities and Transportation
 - b. Health and Safety
 - c. Information Handling
6. Additional Obligation

1. Education Program

1(a). Is the school implementing the material terms of the education program as defined in the current charter agreement?

- Meets Standard
 - The school implemented the material terms of the education program in all material respects and the education program in operation reflects the material terms as defined in the charter agreement, or the school has gained approval for a charter modification to the material terms pursuant to T.C.A. § 49-13-110. If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to implement the material terms of the education program in the manner described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school failed to implement its program in the manner described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

1(b). Is the school complying with applicable education requirements?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to education requirements, including but not limited to:
 - Instructional days or minutes requirements
 - Graduation, promotion, and retention requirements
 - Content standards, including implementation of Tennessee Academic Standards
 - State Assessments
 - Implementation of Response to Instruction and Intervention (RTI2)
 - Implementation of mandated programming as a result of state or federal funding
 - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard

- The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

1(c). Does the school have consistent enrollment over time?

*A school that is scaling opening by grade level year over year will be held to the comparable enrollment of the previous year’s enrollment count as outlined in the school’s growth plan included in the charter agreement and/or charter application. The School Performance Framework Supplemental Guidance Manual includes additional guidance on this calculation.

** A school within its first year of operation will be held harmless on this indicator.

- Meets Standard
 - The school’s enrollment is greater than or no more than 10% below its previous year’s enrollment.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school’s enrollment is between 10% and 20% below its previous year’s enrollment.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school’s enrollment is 20% below or greater than its previous year’s enrollment.

1(d). Is the school retaining students (students are staying enrolled throughout the year and year over year)?

- Meets Standard
 - Maintained at least a 70% student retention rate, or maintains an overall student retention rate in alignment with the goals outlined in the charter agreement, and
 - The school materially complies with applicable LEA policies and procedures; if shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school maintained a student retention rate between 60% and 70%, and/or;
 - The school failed to comply with LEA policies and procedures. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school maintained a student retention rate at or below 60%, and/or;
 - The school failed to comply with LEA policies and procedures. Once shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

1(e). Is the school retaining students that fall within special populations subgroups including students with disabilities, English Learners, economically disadvantaged students, and Black, Hispanic, and Native American subgroups at a similar rate to their overall student retention rate?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to retention rate goals by subgroup, including but not limited to:
 - Maintaining subgroup retention rates within five percentage points of the school's overall student retention rate; and/or
 - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school has subgroup retention rates between five and ten percentage points below the school's overall student retention rate, and/or;
 - The school failed to comply with applicable LEA policies and procedures. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school has subgroup retention rates greater than or equal to ten percentage points below the school's overall student retention rate.
 - The school failed to comply with applicable LEA policies and procedures. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

1(f). Is the school protecting the rights of students with disabilities?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement (including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act) relating to the treatment of students with identified disabilities and those suspected of having a disability, including but not limited to:
 - Equitable access and opportunity to enroll
 - Identification and referral
 - Appropriate development and implementation of Individualized Education Plans and Section 504 plans, in compliance with required timelines
 - Organizational compliance, including provision of services in the least restrictive

environment and appropriate inclusion in the school's academic program, assessments, and extracurricular activities

- Discipline, including due process protections, manifestation determinations, and behavioral intervention plans
 - Access to the school's facility and program in a lawful manner and consistent with students' IEPs or Section 504 Plans
 - Securing and properly accounting for all applicable federal and state funding
 - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school did not materially comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions relating to the treatment of students with identified disabilities and those suspected of having a disability in the manner described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
 - Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies, and procedures, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

1(g). Is the school protecting the rights of English learner (EL) students?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement (including Title I and III of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)) relating to the English learner requirements, including but not limited to:
 - Required policies and notifications related to the service of EL students
 - Proper steps for identification of students in need of EL services, in compliance with required timelines.
 - Appropriate and equitable delivery of services to identified students
 - Compliance with 1:35 EL teacher to student ratio
 - Annual assessment of EL students (screener and annual assessment)
 - Appropriate accommodations on assessments
 - Exiting of students from EL services
 - Ongoing monitoring of exited students
 - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.

- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school did not materially comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions relating to English learner requirements in the manner described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

1(h). Does the school meet enrollment requirements of an opportunity public charter school?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to enrollment requirements and
 - The school maintains at least the 75% at-risk student enrollment requirement as outlined in T.C.A. § 49-13-133.
 - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance, and
 - The school's at-risk enrollment percentage is between 75% and 65%.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school's at-risk enrollment percentage is below 65%.
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

2. Financial Management

2(a). Is the school meeting financial reporting and compliance requirements?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to financial reporting requirements, including but not limited to:
 - Complete and on-time submission of financial reports, including initial and revised board adopted budgets, periodic financial reports as required by the Commission via the Reporting Calendar, and any reporting requirements if the board contracts with an Education Service Provider (ESP)
 - On-time submission and completion of annual independent audit and corrective action plans, if applicable
 - Complete and on-time submission of all additional reporting requirements related to the use of public funds
 - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions relating to financial reporting requirements as described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

2(b). Is the school following Generally Accepted Accounting Principles as outlined by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to financial management and oversight expectations as evidenced by an annual independent audit, including but not limited to:
 - An unmodified audit opinion
 - An audit devoid of significant findings and conditions, material weaknesses, or significant internal control weaknesses

- An audit that does not include a going concern disclosure in the notes or an explanatory paragraph indicative of concern related to GAAP or material compliance with LEA rules and/or policies within the audit report
- If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions relating to financial management and oversight expectations described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

3. Governance and Reporting

3(a). Is the school complying with governance requirements?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to governance by its board, including but not limited to:
 - Board policies, including those related to oversight of an Education Service Provider (ESP) or Charter Management Organization (CMO), if applicable
 - Board bylaws
 - State open meetings law
 - Code of ethics
 - Conflicts of interest
 - Board composition and/or membership rules pursuant to T.C.A. § 49-13-109 (e.g. inclusion of a parent on board or proper membership on school advisory council.)
 - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions relating to governance by its board as described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

3(b). Is the school holding management accountable (Applicable to schools contracting with an Educational Service Provider (ESP) or Charter Management Organization (CMO))?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA Policies and Procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to oversight of school management through an ESP or CMO, including but not limited to:
 - Maintaining authority over management, holding it accountable for performance as agreed under a written performance agreement, and requiring annual financial reports of the ESP or CMO.

- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to comply with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions relating to oversight of school management. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school failed to comply with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

3(c). Is the school complying with reporting requirements?

| Reporting Calendar On-Time Completion Rate* | Meets Standard | Does Not Meet or Falls Far Below |
|---|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Submissions are on-time | ≥ 85% | < 85% |

*Note:

- Period= July –June
- On-Time= Within five (5) business days of the due date. If an item was not required of the school or an extension was granted and met, the item will be considered on time.
- Percentages will be rounded to the nearest whole number. (For example, an on-time percentage of 84.5 would be rounded up to an 85 and be eligible for a “Meets Standard” rating. An on-time percentage of 84.4 would be rounded down to an 84 and a rating of either “Does Not Meet Standard” or “Falls Far Below Standard.”)
- For schools in the first year of operation or transition to the Commission from the Achievement School District, completion rates will be reported, however, the school’s rating will not be tied to the on-time completion rate.
- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to relevant reporting requirements to the Commission, Tennessee Department of Education, and/or federal authorities. The school submits timely, complete, and accurate reports, including, but not limited to:
 - On-time completion rate for Reporting Calendar submissions of at least 85% (not applicable to schools in their first year of operation).
 - Timely and accurate attendance and enrollment reporting

- Timely and accurate reporting related to state and federal compliance and oversight
- Timely and accurate reporting of additional information requested by the Commission
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to timely comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions relating to relevant reporting requirements described above.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school exhibited a pattern of failure to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

4. Students and Employees

4(a). Is the school protecting the rights of all students?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to the rights of students, including but not limited to:
 - Policies and practices related to admissions, lottery, waiting lists, fair and open recruitment, and enrollment (including rights to enroll or maintain enrollment)
 - The collection and protection of student information (that could be used in discriminatory ways or otherwise contrary to law)
 - Due process protections, privacy, civil rights, and student liberties requirements, including First Amendment protections and the Establishment Clause restrictions prohibiting public schools from engaging in religious instruction
 - Conduct of discipline (discipline hearings and suspension and expulsion policies and practices)
 - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions relating to the rights of students as described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

4(b). Is the school meeting suspension reporting requirements?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to accurately reporting suspensions.
 - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and

procedures, and provisions relating to accurately reporting suspensions. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.

■ Falls Far Below Standard

- The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions relating to accurately reporting suspensions. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

4(c). Is the school meeting attendance goals?

■ Meets Standard

- The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to attendance goals, including but not limited to:
- Meeting attendance goals, including chronic absenteeism, outlined in the state and/or federal accountability measures.
- If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.

■ Does Not Meet Standard

- The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions relating to attendance goals described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.

■ Falls Far Below Standard

- The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

4(d). Is the school meeting teacher and other staff credentialing requirements?

■ Meets Standard

- The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement (including the federal Highly Qualified Teacher and Paraprofessional requirements within Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA] as amended by ESSA) relating to state certification requirements.
- If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.

■ Does Not Meet Standard

- The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions

relating to state certification requirements. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.

■ Falls Far Below Standard

- The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

4(e). Is the school complying with laws regarding employee rights?

■ Meets Standard

- The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to employment considerations, including those relating to the Family Medical Leave Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and employment contracts (if applicable). The school does not interfere with employees' rights to organize collectively or otherwise violate staff collective bargaining rights.
- If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.

■ Does Not Meet Standard

- The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions relating to employment considerations. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.

■ Falls Far Below Standard

- The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

4(f). Is the school completing required background checks?

■ Meets Standard

- The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to background checks of all applicable individuals (including staff, contractors and volunteers, where applicable).
- If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.

■ Does Not Meet Standard

- The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions

relating to background checks. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.

■ Falls Far Below Standard

- The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

5. School Environment

5(a). Is the school complying with facilities and transportation requirements?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to the school facilities, grounds, and transportation, including but not limited to:
 - Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
 - Fire inspections and related records
 - Viable certificate of occupancy or other required building use authorization
 - Asbestos inspections
 - Documentation of requisite insurance coverage
 - Student transportation (including transportation for students with disabilities)
 - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions relating to the school facilities, grounds, and transportation as described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

5(b). Is the school complying with health and safety requirements?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to safety and the provision of health-related services, including but not limited to:
 - Appropriate nursing services, school health reporting requirements, and dispensing of medication
 - Food service requirements
 - Emergency Operations, including emergency operations plans and required drills/trainings
 - Other state/district requirements

- If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions relating to safety and the provision of health-related services as described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

5(c). Is the school handling information appropriately?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions regarding the handling of information, including but not limited to:
 - Maintaining the security of and providing access to student records under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and other applicable laws
 - Access to documents maintained by the school under the state's open records law and other applicable authorities
 - Transferring of student records
 - Proper and secure maintenance of testing materials
 - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions related to the handling of information as described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance.

6. Additional Obligations

6(a). Is the school complying with all other obligations?

- Meets Standard
 - The school materially complies with all other material legal, statutory, regulatory, or contractual requirements contained in its charter agreement that are not otherwise explicitly stated herein, including but not limited to requirements from the following sources:
 - Revisions to state law
 - LEA policies and procedures
 - Consent decrees
 - Intervention requirements by the authorizer
 - Requirements by other entities to which the school is accountable (e.g. Tennessee Department of Education)
- Does Not Meet Standard
 - The school failed to materially comply with other material, legal, statutory, regulatory, or contractual requirements as described above. Once the shortcoming(s) were identified, the school did not promptly come into compliance.
- Falls Far Below Standard
 - The school failed to comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions described above. Once shortcomings were identified, the school did not come into compliance, or the failure was so severe that it outweighed any efforts to come into compliance

Appendix A – Mission-Specific Goal

[Insert School Name]

- 1) **School’s Mission:** What is the mission of the school?

- 2) **Student Profile Summary:** Who are the students at your school? Describe your student population in 2-3 sentences.

- 3) **Goal – Outcomes Driven:** What is your mission-specific goal? What metrics will you use to measure this goal?

- 4) **Goal’s Connection to Mission:** In 3-4 sentences, explain how the goal reflects your school’s mission.

- 5) **Targets and Rationale:** Input what would warrant an exceeds, meets, does not meet, or falls far below standard for your mission-specific goal and aligned metrics along with your rationale for these targets.

| Target | Rationale for Target |
|--|----------------------|
| Exceeds <i>(insert criteria)</i> | |
| Meets <i>(insert criteria)</i> | |
| Does Not Meet <i>(insert criteria)</i> | |
| Falls Far Below <i>(insert criteria)</i> | |

- 6) **Assessment Details:** Please describe the assessment being used. How will data be collected and how frequently is data collected?

- 7) **Results Summary:** What will the results and targets tell you?