



# Tennessee Public Charter School Commission

## Policy 3.700 - Charter School Performance Framework

---

### Policy Sections

I. Academic Performance.....	3
II. Financial Performance.....	19
III. Organizational Performance.....	26
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 Tennessee Department of Education, Commission-authorized schools, and other quality authorizers to develop this revised framework.

## **About the Performance Framework**

This document outlines the comprehensive benchmarks by which charter schools 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. A 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.”<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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

1. Student Outcomes (25%-35%)
2. Mission-Specific Goal (10%)
3. Comparative Performance (40%)
4. Overall TVAAS Composite Index (15%-25%)

---

<sup>1</sup> T.C.A. § 49-13-143(a)

<sup>2</sup> 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.

### 1(a). Student Outcomes (25%-35%)

The Student Outcomes section of the Commission’s School Performance Framework aligns with the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE)’s accountability framework. 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.

Measure	Description	Falls Far Below Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Total Weight
1a	School academic performance, as measured by the Tennessee Department of Education	D or F	C	B	A	25%-35%*

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 35% for student outcomes and 15% for TVAAS. If a school earns a TVAAS 4, the allocation of weights will be 30% for student outcomes and 20% for TVAAS. If a school earns a TVAAS 5, the allocation of weights will be 25% 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 and high school graduation rates are also reviewed and considered.

In the event there is a pause of the state’s accountability system by the TDOE, the Commission shall reallocate the 25% weight of student outcomes equally to all other sections within the academic section of the framework. The supplemental guidance document will provide further information on other measures such as chronic absenteeism 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 State’s Accountability System**

<b>Area of Academic Framework</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
Student Outcomes	10%
Mission-Specific Goal	15%
Comparative Performance	Total Weight – 50% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall Resident District Comparison – 25%</li> <li>• Subgroup Comparison – 25%</li> </ul>
TVAAS Composite Score	25%

**1(b). Student Outcomes for New Schools (25%-35%)**

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 they have 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”.

## 2: Mission-Specific Goal (10%)

Each school authorized by the Commission will define a mission-specific goal within their 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.
2. For elementary schools who may be missing state student outcomes data due to the majority of their students being in non-tested grade levels, this goal can track growth and achievement for students who do not take state testing through nationally normed assessments.
3. To include supplemental data for schools who are staggering their opening by grade level.
4. 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.

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 are available in the School Performance Framework Supplemental Guidance Manual.<sup>3</sup> 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.

The mission-specific goal will be discussed with the school during site visits and during interim reviews. The mission-specific goal will be included within the annual reporting for the school

---

<sup>3</sup> Available on the [Commission's webpage for guidance documents and protocols](#).



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 (40%)

#### 3a. School to Resident District – Overall (20%)<sup>4</sup>

Measure	Description	Grade Level	Falls Far Below Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Total Weight
3a	School comparative performance to resident district in ELA	All Grades	More than 15 percentage points lower than the resident district	5.1-15 percentage points lower than the resident district	Up to 5 percentage points below or above the resident district	Greater than 5 percentage points higher than the resident district	25%
3b	School comparative performance to resident district in math	All Grades	More than 15 percentage points lower than the resident district	5.1-15 percentage points lower than the resident district	Up to 5 percentage points below or above the resident district	Greater than 5 percentage points higher than the resident district	25%

<sup>4</sup> The Commission may use more contextualized comparisons for high stakes decisions such as intervention, renewal, or interim reviews. These comparisons could include other schools nearby, other schools within the cluster of the resident district the school is located, and/or other schools with similar demographics.

Measure	Description	Grade Level	Falls Far Below Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Total Weight
3c	School comparative performance to resident district in science	All Grades	More than 15 percentage points lower than the resident district	5.1-15 percentage points lower than the resident district	Up to 5 percentage points below or above the resident district	Greater than 5 percentage points higher than the resident district	25%
3d	School comparative performance to resident district in social studies	All Grades	More than 15 percentage points lower than the resident district	5.1-15 percentage points lower than the resident district	Up to 5 percentage points below or above the resident district	Greater than 5 percentage points higher than the resident district	25%

**3b. School to Resident District – Subgroups (20%; 5% per subgroup)**
**Subgroup – Students with Disabilities (5%)**

Measure	Description	Grade Level	Falls Far Below Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Total Weight
3a	School comparative performance to resident district in ELA	All Grades	More than 13 percentage points lower than the resident district	3.1-13 percentage points lower than the resident district	Up to 3 percentage points below or above the resident district	Greater than 3 percentage points higher than the resident district	50%
3b	School comparative performance to resident district in math	All Grades	More than 13 percentage points lower than the resident district	3.1-13 percentage points lower than the resident district	Up to 3 percentage points below or above the resident district	Greater than 3 percentage points higher than the resident district	50%

**Subgroup – English Learners (5%)**

Measure	Description	Grade Level	Falls Far Below Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Total Weight
3a	School comparative performance to resident district in ELA	All Grades	More than 13 percentage points lower than the resident district	3.1-13 percentage points lower than the resident district	Up to 3 percentage points below or above the resident district	Greater than 3 percentage points higher than the resident district	50%
3b	School comparative performance to resident district in math	All Grades	More than 13 percentage points lower than the resident district	3.1-13 percentage points lower than the resident district	Up to 3 percentage points below or above the resident district	Greater than 3 percentage points higher than the resident district	50%

**Subgroup – Economically Disadvantaged (5%)**

Measure	Description	Grade Level	Falls Far Below Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Total Weight
3a	School comparative performance to resident district in ELA	All Grades	More than 13 percentage points lower than the resident district	3.1-13 percentage points lower than the resident district	Up to 3 percentage points below or above the resident district	Greater than 3 percentage points higher than the resident district	50%
3b	School comparative performance to resident district in math	All Grades	More than 13 percentage points lower than the resident district	3.1-13 percentage points lower than the resident district	Up to 3 percentage points below or above the resident district	Greater than 3 percentage points higher than the resident district	50%

**Subgroup – Black, Hispanic, Native American (5%)**

Measure	Description	Grade Level	Falls Far Below Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Total Weight
3a	School comparative performance to resident district in ELA	All Grades	More than 13 percentage points lower than the resident district	3.1-13 percentage points lower than the resident district	Up to 3 percentage points below or above the resident district	Greater than 3 percentage points higher than the resident district	50%
3b	School comparative performance to resident district in math	All Grades	More than 13 percentage points lower than the resident district	3.1-13 percentage points lower than the resident district	Up to 3 percentage points below or above the resident district	Greater than 3 percentage points higher than the resident district	50%

1. Comparison of charter performance to the resident district average allows for the evaluation of whether the charter school is providing a better option for students. Comparative achievement will be measured by evaluating the percentage of students who scored “met or exceeded expectations” on the state assessments at the charter school, as compared to the resident district average.
  - a. In grades 3-8, an average percent “met expectations” or “exceeded expectations” of all grades will be calculated for each tested subject.
    - i. This average will be calculated by taking the total number of students scoring “met or exceeded expectations” and dividing it by the total number of students who have a valid test in grades 3-8.
  - b. In high school, an average percent “met or exceeded expectations” will be calculated for End-of-Course (EOC) assessments in English I, and II, Algebra or Integrated Math I, Geometry or Integrated Math II, Algebra II or Integrated Math III, Biology, and U.S. History as aligns to what is outlined within the current TDOE accountability protocol to determine overall subject proficiency for a high school.
    - i. This average will be calculated by taking the total number of students scoring “met or exceeded expectations” and dividing it by the total number of students who have a valid test, which will be grouped by subject.
      1. \*If a school is not being tested in certain subject areas, the total weight will be reallocated equally among the total tested subject areas.
2. Enrollment percentages for each subgroup defined above will be included in the Commission’s annual reporting for each school. If the school’s student count for any individual subgroup is less than 8 students per grade level, or 30 for a fully built out school of four tested grade levels, schools will not be held accountable due to statistical validity. In this instance, the individual subgroup indicator(s) will be suppressed and marked on the framework as “\*\*”, and the school will be held harmless for the specific subgroup(s). The corresponding weight(s) will be reallocated to the overall school to district comparison (up to 20%).
  - a. Additionally, if resident district proficiency data for a particular subgroup falls below 1%, requiring suppression, the school will be compared to a district score of 0.9% for that subgroup for comparison purposes. If a school’s data is suppressed publicly below 5%, the school will still be held accountable to the comparison, however the actual score will be suppressed in public reporting.



- b. If a school has a proficiency score of zero for a particular subgroup, they cannot meet the standard, even if it falls within three percent of the resident district. A school must have a proficiency score above zero percent to qualify for this indicator.

#### 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
4a	The Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System <sup>5</sup> (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 35% for student outcomes and 15% for TVAAS. If a school earns a TVAAS 4, the allocation of weights will be 30% for student outcomes and 20% for TVAAS. If a school earns a TVAAS 5, the allocation of weights will be 25% student outcomes and 25% TVAAS. This is to reward schools for having higher growth scores.

<sup>5</sup> Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System: <https://www.tn.gov/education/data/tvaas.html>

Section	Indicator	Falls Far Below Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Percentage of Section Score	Percentage of Overall Score
<b>Student Outcomes</b>	<b>School academic performance, as measured by the Tennessee Department of Education</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25%-35%*</b>
<b>Mission-Specific Goal</b>	<b>Each school authorized by the Commission will define a mission-specific goal within their charter agreement to be evaluated within the School Performance Framework</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>Comparative Performance</b>	<b>Comparative Performance to Resident District</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>40%</b>
Subsection	School comparative performance to resident district in ELA	1	2	3	4	25%	n/a
Subsection	School comparative performance to resident district in math	1	2	3	4	25%	n/a
Subsection	School comparative performance to resident district in science	1	2	3	4	25%	n/a
Subsection	School comparative performance to resident district in social studies	1	2	3	4	25%	n/a
<b>Comparative Performance</b>	<b>Comparative Subgroups Performance to Resident District</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>40%</b>
Subsection	Students with disabilities comparative performance to resident district in ELA and math	1	2	3	4	25%	n/a
Subsection	English learners comparative performance to resident district in ELA and math	1	2	3	4	25%	n/a
Subsection	Economically disadvantaged students comparative performance to resident district in ELA and math	1	2	3	4	25%	n/a
Subsection	Black, Hispanic, Native American students comparative performance to resident district in ELA and math	1	2	3	4	25%	n/a
<b>TVAAS</b>	<b>Overall Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) Composite Index</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>15%-25%*</b>

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

Adopted: October 28, 2020

Revised: July 25, 2025



\* 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 35% for student outcomes and 15% for TVAAS. If a school earns a TVAAS 4, the allocation of weights will be 30% for student outcomes and 20% for TVAAS. If a school earns a TVAAS 5, the allocation of weights will be 25% 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 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

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.<sup>6</sup> 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.

---

<sup>6</sup> 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
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, 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.

## 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
<b>Exceeds</b> <i>(insert criteria)</i>	
<b>Meets</b> <i>(insert criteria)</i>	
<b>Does Not Meet</b> <i>(insert criteria)</i>	
<b>Falls Far Below</b> <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?

## Appendix A – Mission-Specific Goal Cornerstone Prep Denver Campus

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

“Equip all students with the Wisdom and Knowledge necessary to succeed in college and to become leaders in the community.”

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

Cornerstone Prep Denver serves elementary students in the Frayser and Binghampton neighborhoods of Memphis.

Demographics:

- 98% of Economically Disadvantaged Students
- 17% of Students with Disabilities
- 1% of English Learners
- 51% male
- 49% female
- 98% African American
- 2% other

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

Cornerstone Prep Denver Campus seeks to close student academic gaps while moving them closer to grade level. Because most students enter our school more than one grade level behind, we seek to grow students at a rate higher than annual typical growth, effectively reducing their academic gaps and moving closer to grade level. CPD will also maintain an 85% participation rate to fulfill this goal.

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

The mission of Cornerstone Prep Denver Campus is to equip all students with the wisdom and knowledge necessary to succeed in college and become leaders in their community. As an elementary school, performing at grade level is the most accurate measure of the student's

status of being on track for college. Therefore, reducing academic gaps by growing a student more than 1 GLE each year while moving a student towards grade level reflects our school 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
<b>Exceeds</b>	1.25+ GLE Growth
<b>Meets</b>	1.0-1.25 GLE Growth
<b>Does Not Meet</b>	0.75-1.0 GLE Growth
<b>Falls Far Below</b>	Less than 0.75 GLE Growth

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

NWEA MAP School average for each subject will be used to calculate the mission specific goal. Scores will be averaged for all grades Fall to Spring for GLE growth.

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

The results from the mission specific goal will demonstrate Cornerstone Preps Denver Campus' efficacy in fulfilling its mission by moving students closer to college readiness by growing students at a higher rate than typical annual growth.