

2024-25 Performance Framework Overview

Core Question 1: Is the educational program a success?
<i>Elementary/Middle School</i>
1.1. Are students making adequate growth, as measured by Indiana’s accountability system?
1.2. Does the school demonstrate that students are improving, the longer they are enrolled at the school?
1.3. Is the school providing an equitable education to all students in their school building?
1.4. Is the school providing an equitable education to all students compared to the state?
1.5. Is the school’s attendance rate strong?
1.6. Is the school outperforming schools that the students would have been assigned to attend?
1.7. Are students demonstrating mastery of foundational reading standards as determined by IREAD-3?
<i>High School</i>
1.1. Are students making adequate growth as measured by the SAT Suite of Assessments?
1.2. Is the school preparing students to graduate on time as measured by Indiana’s cohort graduation rate or course completion?
1.3. Is the school providing an equitable education to all students in their school building?
1.4. Is the school providing an equitable education to all students compared to the state?
1.5. Is the school’s attendance rate strong?
1.6. Is the school preparing students for postsecondary success through FAFSA completion?
1.7. Is the school preparing students to graduate on time as measured by Ninth Grade On-Track?
Core Question 2: Is the organization in sound fiscal health?
2.1 A. Does the school demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?
2.1 B. Does the network demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?
2.2. Does the organization demonstrate long-term financial health?
2.3. Does the organization demonstrate it has adequate financial management and systems?
Core Question 3: Is the organization effective and well-run?
3.1. Does the board demonstrate strong governance oversight?
3.2. Is the board active, knowledgeable, diverse, and does it work toward a strategic vision?
3.3. Does the school satisfactorily comply with all its governance obligations?
3.4. Is the school leader strong in their academic and organizational leadership?
Core Question 4: Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success?
4.1. Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?
4.2. Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school’s mission?
4.3. Does the school provide sufficient guidance on and support and preparation for post-secondary options? <i>(9-12 only)</i>
4.4. Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?
4.5. Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?
4.6. Is the school’s mission clearly understood by all stakeholders?
4.7. Is the school climate responsive to the needs of students, staff, and families?
4.8. Is ongoing communication with students and families clear and helpful?
4.9. Do the school’s special education files demonstrate that it is in legal compliance and is implementing best practice?
4.10. Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to students with limited English proficiency?

Core Question 1: Is the educational program a success? Elementary and Middle School Indicators

1.1. Are students making adequate growth, as measured by Indiana’s accountability system?	
<i>Only applicable to schools serving students in any one or combination of grades 4-8.</i>	
Does not meet standard	Results indicate that less than 60.0% of students are making adequate growth.
Approaching standard	Results indicate that 60.0-69.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Meets standard	Results indicate that 70.0-79.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Exceeds standard	Results indicate that at least 80.0% of students are making adequate growth.
1.2. Does the school demonstrate that students are improving, the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does not meet standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show a decrease in combined proficiency rate of 5 or more percentage points OR no students are proficient.
Approaching standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show a change in combined proficiency rate of less than 5 percentage points but greater than -5 percentage points.
Meets standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show an increase in combined proficiency rate of 5 or more percentage points. OR the charter school has a combined proficiency of 70% or more.
Exceeds standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show an increase in combined proficiency rate of 15 or more percentage points. OR the charter school has a combined proficiency of 80% or more.
1.3. Is the school providing an equitable education to all students in their school building?	
<i>Schools are evaluated for subgroup proficiency in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	School has more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Approaching standard	School has no more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Meets standard	School has no more than 10 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Exceeds standard	School has no more than 5 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
1.4. Is the school providing an equitable education to all students compared to the state?	
<i>Schools are evaluated separately for subgroup proficiency and growth in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance less than 25 (bottom quartile)
Approaching standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 25 and 49
Meets standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 50 and 74
Exceeds standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance is 75 or higher (top quartile)
1.5. Is the school’s attendance rate strong?	
Does not meet standard	School’s attendance rate is less than 90.0%
Approaching standard	School’s attendance rate is between 90.0-94.9%
Meets standard	School’s attendance rate is greater than or equal to 95.0%
1.6. Is the school outperforming schools that the students would have been assigned to attend?	
Does not meet standard	School’s performance in terms of proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpaces that of schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 0-1 out of 4 categories.

	<p>Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpaces that of schools serving similar student populations in 0-1 out of 4 categories.</p>
Approaching standard	<p>School's performance in terms of both proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpaces that of the schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 2 out of 4 categories.</p> <p>Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpaces that of schools serving similar student populations in 2 out of 4 categories.</p>
Meets standard	<p>School's performance in terms of both proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpaces that of the schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 3 out of 4 categories.</p> <p>Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpaces that of schools serving similar student populations in 3 out of 4 categories.</p>
Exceeds standard	<p>School's performance in terms of both proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpaces that of the schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 4 out of 4 categories.</p> <p>Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpaces that of schools serving similar student populations in 4 out of 4 categories.</p>
1.7. Are students demonstrating mastery of foundational reading standards as determined by IREAD-3?	
Does not meet standard	IREAD-3 results indicate fewer than 69.9% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Approaching standard	IREAD-3 results indicate 70.0-79.9% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Meets standard	IREAD-3 results indicate 80.0-89.9% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Exceeds standard	IREAD-3 results indicate more than 90.0% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.

High School Indicators

1.1. Are students making adequate growth as measured by the SAT Suite of Assessments?	
Does not meet standard	Fewer than 60.0% of students are making adequate growth.
Approaching standard	60.0%-69.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Meets standard	70.0%-79.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Exceeds standard	More than 80.0% of students are making adequate growth.
1.2. Is the school preparing students to graduate on time as measured by Indiana's cohort graduation rate?	
Does not meet standard	School's 4-year graduation rate is below 70.0%
Approaching standard	School's 4-year graduation rate is 70.0 - 79.9%
Meets standard	School's 4-year graduation rate is at 80.0 – 89.9%
Exceeds standard	School's 4-year graduation rate is at least 90.0%
1.3. Is the school providing an equitable education to all students in their school building?	
<i>Schools are evaluated for subgroup proficiency in Math and ELA.</i>	

Does not meet standard	School has more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Approaching standard	School has no more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Meets standard	School has no more than 10 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Exceeds standard	School has no more than 5 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.

1.4. Is the school providing an equitable education to all students compared to the state?

Schools are evaluated separately for subgroup proficiency and growth in Math and ELA.

Does not meet standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance less than 25 (bottom quartile)
Approaching standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 25 and 49
Meets standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 50 and 74
Exceeds standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance is 75 or higher (to quartile)

1.5. Is the school's attendance rate strong?

Does not meet standard	School's attendance rate is less than 90.0%
Approaching standard	School's attendance rate is between 90.0-94.9%
Meets standard	School's attendance rate is greater than or equal to 95.0%

1.6. Is the school preparing students for postsecondary success through FAFSA completion?

Does not meet standard	Fewer than 75% of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA
Approaching standard	75-84.9% of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA
Meets standard	85-89.9% of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA
Exceeds standard	90% or more of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA

1.7. Is the school preparing students to graduate on-time as measured by ninth grade on-track?

Does not meet standard	School earns 2-3 out of 8 points for percent of students earning at least 10 credits and percent of students receiving 1 or more Fs in core classes.
Approaching standard	School earns 4 out of 8 points for percent of students earning at least 10 credits and percent of students receiving 1 or more Fs in core classes.
Meets standard	School earns 5-6 out of 8 points for percent of students earning at least 10 credits and percent of students receiving 1 or more Fs in core classes.
Exceeds standard	School earns 7-8 out of 8 points for percent of students earning at least 10 credits and percent of students receiving 1 or more Fs in core classes.

Core Question 2: Is the organization in sound fiscal health?

2.1 A. Short term Health: Does the school demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?	
<i>Applicable for all Mayor-sponsored charter schools</i>	
Does not meet standard	The school does not meet standard for two or more sub-indicators: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio, Days Cash on Hand, and Debt Default
Approaching standard	The school approaches standard for all sub-indicators: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio, Days Cash on Hand, and Debt Default OR The school meets standard for three of the sub-indicators and does not meet standard on the remaining sub-indicator OR the school approaches standard for two of the sub-indicators and meets standard for the remaining two sub-indicators.
Meets standard	The school meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio, Days Cash on Hand, and Debt Default
Exceeds Standard	The school meets standard for all sub-indicators: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio, Days Cash on Hand and Debt Default
2.1 B. Short term Health: Does the network demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?	
<i>Not Applicable for standalone Mayor-sponsored charter schools</i>	
Does not meet standard	The network does not meet standard for two or more sub-indicators: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio and Days Cash on Hand
Approaching standard	The network approaches standard for all sub-indicators: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio and Days Cash on Hand OR The school meets standard for two of the sub-indicators and does not meet standard on the remaining sub-indicator OR the school approaches standard for two of the sub-indicators and meets standard for the remaining sub-indicator.
Meets standard	The network meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio and Days Cash on Hand
Exceeds Standard	The network meets standard for all network-level sub-indicators: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio and Days Cash on Hand
2.2. Long term Health: Does the organization demonstrate long term financial health?	
<i>For schools within networks, OEI will use network consolidated financials to determine long-term financial sustainability. OEI will provide narrative in accountability reports related to school-specific metrics in this area.</i>	
Does not meet standard	The school meets standard for one sub-indicator, but does not meet standard for the remaining two sub-indicators: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio OR The school does not meet standard for any of the sub-indicators
Approaching standard	The school meets standard for two sub-indicators: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio OR The school approaches standard for all three sub-indicators
Meets standard	The school meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio, and c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio
Exceeds standard	The school meets standard for all sub-indicators: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio, and c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio
2.3. Does the organization demonstrate it has adequate financial management and systems?	
Does not meet standard	The school does not meet standard for one sub-indicator: a) Financial audit b) Financial Reporting Requirements
Approaching standard	The school meets standard for one sub-indicator but approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: a) Financial audit b) Financial Reporting Requirements
Meets standard	The school meets standard for both sub-indicators: a) Financial Audit and Financial Reporting Requirements

Core Question 3: Is the organization effective and well-run?

3.1. Does the board demonstrate strong governance oversight?	
<i>Sub-indicators: a) Board has relentless focus on academic outcomes; b) Active committees with clear goals; and c) Evaluation systems in place to monitor itself and school leadership</i>	
Does Not Meet Standard	The board does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The board either 1) approaches standard for all three sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 3) approaches standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds or meets standard for one sub-indicator, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The board either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 2) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, and approaches or does not meet for one, 3) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, or 5) meets standard for all sub-indicators.
Exceeds Standard	The board exceeds standard for at least two sub-indicators and meets standard for one.
3.2. Is the board active, knowledgeable, diverse, and does it work toward a strategic vision?	
<i>Sub-indicators: a) Board has diverse, active members with essential skillsets; b) Board uses clear and accurate data as part of a formal tracking system to monitor school health</i>	
Does Not Meet Standard	The board does not meet standard on one or both sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The board either 1) approaches standard for one or both sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for one sub-indicator and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The board either 1) meets standard for both sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for one sub-indicator and exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, or 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator and approaches standard for one sub-indicator.
Exceeds Standard	The board exceeds standard for both sub-indicators.
3.3. Does the school satisfactorily comply with all its governance obligations?	
<i>Sub-indicators: a) Compliance document submission; b) Charter Compliance; c) Compliance with Incident Communication Policy; d) Compliance with IODL</i>	
Does Not Meet Standard	The organization does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The organization either 1) approaches standard for all four sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 3) approaches standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The organization either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators, or 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators 5) meets standard for all sub-indicators.
Exceeds Standard	The organization exceeds standard for at one sub-indicator and meets standard for the rest.
3.4. Is the school leader strong in their academic and organizational leadership?	
<i>Sub-indicators: a) School leaders show clear track record of success; b) Are fully present and give data-driven updates; c) Collaborate with board to handle concerns; d) Maintains leadership stability with clear succession plan</i>	
Does Not Meet Standard	The organization does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The organization either 1) approaches standard for all four sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 3) approaches

	standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The organization either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators, or 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators 5) meets standard for all sub-indicators.
Exceeds Standard	The organization exceeds standard for at least two sub-indicators and meets standard for the rest.

Core Question 4: Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success?

Core Question 4 is measured using a rubric for each sub-indicator. Each level of the rubric has an assigned point value such that each indicator has a maximum number of points possible. This maximum number is used to determine an overall rating on each indicator. Point values of sub-indicators and an indicator ratings summary can be found below.

Indicator Ratings Summary	
Does Not Meet Standard	The average rating across all sub-indicators is 65% or less of the total points possible.
Approaching Standard	The average rating across all sub-indicators is between 65-79% of the total points possible.
Meets Standard	The average rating across all sub-indicators is between 79-89% of the total points possible.
Exceeds Standard	The average rating across all sub-indicators is more than 89% of the total points possible.
Sub-Indicator Point Values	
Planning	1 point
Emerging	2 points
Implementing	3 points
Sustaining	4 points

4.1. Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) The curriculum used across all academic areas is rigorous, evidenced-based and aligned with state standards.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is in place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
b) Systematic reviews of curricula are conducted by administrators and school staff to identify gaps based on student performance across and within subgroups.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
c) The school regularly reviews instructional curriculum maps to ensure presentation of content is aligned with learning objectives.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
d) The school has a well-defined horizontal and vertical alignment within and across grade levels and content areas that is prioritized and focuses on core learning objectives.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
e) Instructional staff have access to provided materials to deliver the curriculum effectively.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of instructional staff.
f) Instructional staff understand and uniformly use curriculum documents and related program materials to effectively deliver instruction.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of instructional staff.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: List of school-wide curricula, Curriculum Maps, Pacing Guides, Professional Development materials, Classroom Observations, Instructional Calendars, Staff handbook, Master Calendar, Staff Interviews, Survey Data, Focus Group Data

4.2. Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school's mission?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) The curriculum is implemented in all classrooms with fidelity.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of instructional staff.
b) A clearly documented lesson internalization process is used to explicitly target core learning objectives across all academic areas.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
c) A clearly documented lesson internalization process is used to explicitly identify a wide range of instructional strategies that target core learning objectives across all academic areas.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
d) Instruction is differentiated based on ongoing formative assessment of student learning needs, identified student interests, and preferred learning styles.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
e) Instructional strategies used are designed to promote authentic learning to impact levels of student engagement.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
f) Instructional practices are intentionally designed to validate and affirm the cultures of students.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.

g) Staff receive explicit feedback on instructional practices on an ongoing basis.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
--	---	---	---	---

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: List of school-wide curricula, Curriculum Maps, Pacing Guides, Professional Development materials, Classroom Observations, Instructional Calendars, Staff handbook, Master Calendar, Staff Interviews, Survey Data, Focus Group Data

4.3. For secondary students, does the school provide sufficient guidance on and support preparation for postsecondary options?				
<i>Only applies to schools serving students in grades 9-12</i>				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) The school provides access to rigorous coursework and career planning experiences (e.g., Advanced Placement courses, internships, independent study) to prepare students for post-secondary opportunities aligned to their interests.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is in place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
b) A system is in place to ensure school staff provide students with the supports they need to be effectively prepared for post-secondary opportunities.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
c) The school provides opportunities for extracurricular engagement and activities, connected to student interests, (e.g., athletics, academic clubs, vocational) to increase post-secondary options.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
d) The school offers a range of pathways that allow all students to meet or exceed Indiana Core 40 graduation requirements.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is in place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: School Handbook, List of School Curricula, Course of Study (including Pathway, AP, IB, and dual credit options), Disaggregated Reports on Course Enrollment, Counseling Department Policies and Procedures, Advising Procedures and Protocols, Student Handbook, Survey Data, Focus Group Data, Staff, Student, Family interviews

4.4. Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) Assessments utilized are well aligned to learning standards.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
b) Assessments utilized are varied in order to support a wide range of student learning styles and abilities.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
c) Assessments utilized provide student level data focused on growth and proficiency.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
d) Assessments are administrated with sufficient frequency and results are provided in a timely manner.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
e) A system is in place to ensure that assessment data is analyzed across and within subgroups and used to guide decision-making related to instruction and curriculum.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: Data Reports, Assessment Calendar, Assessment Materials, Professional Development Agendas, Master Calendar, Data Meeting Agendas/Notes, Instructional Calendars, Survey Data, Focus Group Data, Staff Interviews, Staff Policy and Procedure Handbook

4.5. Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) A standard recruitment/ hiring policy and procedure process is in place and is designed to ensure human resources are leveraged to reflect the needs of the school population.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
b) Hiring processes are well organized and used to support the success of new staff members.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
c) Staffing levels adequately allow staff to maximize instructional time and capacity.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of staff.
d) Faculty and staff are appropriately certified/sufficiently trained in areas to which they are assigned and possess the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of staff.
e) Professional learning opportunities are offered regularly in order to support the staff in delivering culturally relevant and differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
f) Professional learning opportunities are determined through analyses of student outcome data and clearly linked to strategic objectives and school improvement goals.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
g) The teacher evaluation process is explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: Hiring Policy and Procedure manual, Staff Deployment Plan, Organizational Chart, List of school staff and credentials, PD calendar, School Improvement Plan, Teacher evaluation summary data, Survey Data, Focus Group Data, Staff Interviews

4.6. Is the school's mission clearly understood by all stakeholders?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) Procedures are in place for assessing all stakeholder's perceptions, knowledge, and commitment to the intentions of the school's mission.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place for some stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented for most but not all stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all key stakeholders.
b) Procedures are in place for establishing meaningful partnerships with all families and community stakeholders to support the school's mission.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place for some families and stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented for most but not all families and stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all key families and stakeholders.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: School Improvement Plan, Student handbook, Staff Handbook, Family Engagement Plan, Survey Data, Focus Group Data

4.7. Is the school climate responsive to the needs of students, staff, and families?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) A multi-tiered framework designed to support the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of students is implemented with fidelity.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
b) Culturally responsive and evidenced based interventions are explicitly identified and implemented throughout the school to support the needs of students.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of staff.
c) Explicit procedures for facilitating the development of strong, positive relationships between adults and students are clearly communicated to and implemented by all staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of staff.
d) Procedures are in place for assessing staff, student, and family perspectives to ensure a sense of connectedness and engagement with the school.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place for some stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented for most but not all stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all key stakeholders.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: MTSS Handbook, Discipline Handbook, List of available interventions, Discipline Data, Classroom Management Plans, Classroom Observations, Family Engagement Plan, Survey Data, Focus Group Data, Staff, Student, Family Interviews.

4.8. Is ongoing communication with students and families clear and helpful?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) An active and ongoing system of communication between the school and family members in place.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of staff.
b) Procedures for responding to concerns of families are clearly defined and implemented by all school staff and validated by families.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place for some stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented for most but not all stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all stakeholders.
c) Families are regularly informed in their native or home language of their students' academic and behavioral strengths and areas of need.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place for some stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented for most but not all families.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all families.
d) The school's communication methods are designed to promote family- school partnerships in ways that meet the needs of a diverse set of families.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place for some stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented for most but not all families.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all families.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: School Improvement Plan, Student and Staff Handbooks, Family Engagement Plan, Family Interviews, Welcome Packet, School Newsletters, Meeting notices, Parent Correspondence, Student progress reports, Survey and Focus Group Data

4.9. Do the school's special education files demonstrate that it is in legal compliance and is implementing best practice?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) Services outlined in Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) adequately match the exceptional needs in present level of performance of the student and are being delivered as outlined.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 0-25% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 26-49% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 50-89% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 90-100% of students with IEPs.
b) IEP plans include student specific goals and plan for progress monitoring of student goals. Evidence of ongoing assessment is present.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 0-25% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 26-49% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 50-89% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 90-100% of students with IEPs.
c) IEP goals are rigorous, based on state and national learning standards, and related to present levels of performance.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 0-25% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 26-49% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 50-89% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 90-100% of students with IEPs.
d) IEP goals are reviewed and revised annually as determined by present levels of student level of performance.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 0-25% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 26-49% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 50-89% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 90-100% of students with IEPs.
e) IEP plans explicitly identify requirements for specifically designed curriculum and instruction, as well as accommodations that	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 0-25% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 26-49% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 50-89% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 90-100% of students with IEPs.

align with student needs. Evidence of specifically designed curriculum, instruction, and accommodations is present.				
---	--	--	--	--

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: Reviews of IEPs, Case Conference Meeting notes, and Confidential Student Files; Parent Correspondence, Conference Notifications, Survey and Focus Group Data, RDA Accountability Workbook

4.10. Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to students with limited English proficiency?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) Staff have a clear understanding of legal obligations, current legislation, research, and effective practices relating to the provision of services for ELL students.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of instructional staff.
b) Staff have a knowledge of the process of language acquisition and the skillsets needed to differentiate instructional strategies per the modifications and accommodations listed in the ILP to meet the needs of ELL students. Lesson plans and/or lesson internalizations and observations include evidence that these differentiated strategies are implemented in classroom instruction.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of instructional staff.
c) Procedures are in place to ensure relationships with ELL students, parents, and external providers are well-managed and in compliance with Indiana law and regulations.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice for some ELL students.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most ELL students.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all ELL students.
d) ILP plans include “strategies, instructional and assessment accommodations, modifications, goals for the student, the student’s English language proficiency levels, state and local assessment data, and details on their EL services (i.e. program model, frequency)” (IDOE EL Guidebook, 2023-2024). Evidence of academic progress is evident through student subgroup analysis.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 0-25% of students with ILPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 26-49% of students with ILPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 50-89% of students with ILPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 90-100% of students with ILPs.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: Reviews of ILPs, Confidential Student File reviews, Survey Data, Focus Group Data, RDA Accountability Workbook, Reviews of ILPs, Review of ILP Conference Meeting notes, Confidential Student File reviews, Parent Correspondence, Survey Data, Focus Group Data, RDA Accountability Workbook

Core Question 1: Is the educational program a success? Expanded Criteria

Overview

The Academic Performance Framework gauges the academic success of schools in serving their target populations and closing the achievement gap in Indianapolis.

The framework consists of indicators designed to measure schools on how well their students perform and grow on standardized testing measures, attendance, and measures that capture academic progress.

Collecting Evidence

To use the framework throughout the school year, OEI will need the following:

- ILEARN assessment data
- PSAT and SAT assessment data
- FAFSA Completion Information
- Student credit/course completion data
- ILEARN Results
- IREAD-3 Results
- DOE-ME Reports
- DOE-STN Reports
- Quarterly Attendance Reports
- Benchmark & Formative Assessment Data
- Student Level Demographic Data
- Student Residence Data

Evaluation

OEI will continue to evaluate and rate schools' performance on an annual basis against the academic performance framework. We will have meetings three times a year where we focus on the benchmark data in order to predict performance and make mid-course corrections as necessary. Schools determined to be in academic distress will be subject to additional monitoring and/or corrective action at the discretion of OEI staff.

Elementary and Middle School Expanded Criteria

1.1. Are students making adequate growth, as measured by Indiana's accountability system?	
<i>Only applicable to schools serving students in any one or combination of grades 4-8.</i>	
Does not meet standard	Results indicate that fewer than 60.0% of students are making adequate growth.
Approaching standard	Results indicate that 60.0-69.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Meets standard	Results indicate that 70.0-79.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Exceeds standard	Results indicate that at least 80.0% of students are making adequate growth.

Formative Indicator Calculations

Does not meet standard	Fewer than 60% of students are on track to make adequate growth.
Approaching standard	Between 60.0%-69.9% of students are on track to make adequate growth.

Meets standard	Between 70.0%-79.9% of students are on track to make adequate growth.
Exceeds standard	At least 80% of students are on track to make adequate growth.

Students must make adequate growth under requirements of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act. This metric was used beginning in 2021 to determine growth based on state ILEARN results. This rate uses student growth percentiles (SGP) as the basis of the growth measure. SGP metrics are formulated based on how a student’s assessment performance compares with Indiana students who had similar achievement the prior year. Growth is calculated for all students based on their relative position compared to academic peers. The resulting student growth percentile is then compared to a growth target set by the state that translates into the amount of growth necessary for the student to reach proficiency by 2026.

The school receives credit for each student demonstrating adequate growth by meeting or exceeding the annual growth target or attaining proficiency in both ELA and math. The adequate growth rate is calculated based on those students enrolled at the school for at least 162 days, or 90 percent of the school year, with two consecutive years of valid test results.

Data Sources

Summative: State test data published by IDOE

Formative: Benchmark data shared by school (e.g., NWEA, Airways, DIBELS)

1.2. Does the school demonstrate that students are improving, the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does not meet standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show a decrease in combined proficiency rate of 5 or more percentage points OR no students are proficient.
Approaching standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show a change in combined proficiency rate of less than 5 percentage points but greater than -5 percentage points.
Meets standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show an increase in combined proficiency rate of 5 or more percentage points OR the charter school has a combined proficiency of 70% or more.
Exceeds standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show an increase in combined proficiency rate of 15 or more percentage points OR the charter school has a combined proficiency of 80% or more.

Calculation: Schools are evaluated based on students who are enrolled at the school for at least 162 days for two or more consecutive years.

Data Sources

Summative: ILEARN data provided by IDOE (for current year and previous year)

1.3. Is the school providing an equitable education to all students in their school building?	
<i>Schools are evaluated for subgroup proficiency in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	School has more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Approaching standard	School has no more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Meets standard	School has no more than 10 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.

Exceeds standard	School has no more than 5 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
-------------------------	---

Calculation: Schools are evaluated on each subgroup with 10 or more tested students who have been enrolled for at least 162 days. Each subgroup is evaluated based on a combined ELA and Math proficiency. The rating for this indicator is based on the subgroup with the largest gap.

Data Sources

Summative: ILEARN data provided by IDOE

1.4. Is the school providing an equitable education to all students compared to the state?	
<i>Schools are evaluated separately for subgroup proficiency and growth in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance less than 25 (bottom quartile)
Approaching standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 25 and 49
Meets standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 50 and 74
Exceeds standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance is 75 or higher (to quartile)

Calculation: Schools are evaluated separately for each subgroup with 10 or more tested students who have been enrolled for at least 162 days. Each subgroup is evaluated for ELA proficiency, Math proficiency, ELA growth, and Math growth and ranked based on statewide performance in the same grades served by the charter school. Schools receive an overall rating for the indicator that represents the average rank across all reported subgroups. Subgroups include all race and ethnicity categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Data Sources

Summative: ILEARN data provided by IDOE

1.5. Is the school’s attendance rate strong?	
Does not meet standard	School’s attendance rate is less than 90.0%
Approaching standard	School’s attendance rate is between 90.0 – 94.9%
Meets standard	School’s attendance rate is greater than or equal to 95.0%

Data Sources

Summative: DOE-AT report

Formative: SIS attendance average (Average Daily Attendance/Average Daily Membership)

1.6. Is the school outperforming schools that the students would have been assigned to attend?	
Does not meet standard	School’s performance in terms of proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpaces that of schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 0-1 out of 4 categories. Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpaces that of schools serving similar student populations in 0-1 out of 4 categories.
Approaching standard	School’s performance in terms of both proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpaces that of the schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 2 out of 4 categories. Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpaces that of schools serving similar student populations in 2 out of 4 categories.

Meets standard	School's performance in terms of both proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpaces that of the schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 3 out of 4 categories. Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpaces that of schools serving similar student populations in 3 out of 4 categories.
Exceeds standard	School's performance in terms of both proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpaces that of the schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 4 out of 4 categories. Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpaces that of schools serving similar student populations in 4 out of 4 categories.

Calculation: Schools are evaluated based on ILEARN test results that compare performance to that of those schools that students would be assigned to attend based on their residence. Evaluations for Innovation Network Schools also include results from student performance at similar schools. Comparison schools serving similar student populations will be selected based on demographic enrollment, location, and grades served.

Data Sources

Summative: GIS Maps, school-level SGPs, IDOE test data, Student Residence Report for OEI compliance

1.7. Are students demonstrating mastery of foundational reading standards as determined by IREAD-3?	
Does not meet standard	IREAD-3 results indicate fewer than 69.9% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Approaching standard	IREAD-3 results indicate 70.0-79.9% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Meets standard	IREAD-3 results indicate 80.0-89.9% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Exceeds standard	IREAD-3 results indicate more than 90.0% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.

Calculation: Schools will be assessed on IREAD-3 pass rates for all third-grade students enrolled 162+ days, including those who retested and those who passed as second graders.

Data Sources

Summative: IREAD-3 pass rates provided by IDOE

High School Expanded Criteria

1.1. Are students making adequate growth as measured by the SAT Suite of Assessments?	
Does not meet standard	Fewer than 60.0% of students are making adequate growth.
Approaching standard	60.0%-69.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Meets standard	70.0%-79.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Exceeds standard	More than 80.0% of students are making adequate growth.

Calculation: Adequate growth, per College Board benchmarks, are a score increase of at least 60 points between exams, but OEI is still working to determine a final benchmark for this indicator. The analysis would be based on *combined* Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) and Math proficiency scores for 162-day students. OEI will continue to monitor and align this indicator with new metrics at the state level. We will communicate new information with schools as we receive it.

Data Sources

Summative: College Board assessment data including PSAT and SAT

1.2. Is the school preparing students to graduate on time as measured by Indiana’s cohort graduation rate	
<i>Only applicable to schools with a graduating class</i>	
Does not meet standard	School’s 4-year graduation rate is below 70.0%
Approaching standard	School’s 4-year graduation rate is 70.0 - 79.9%
Meets standard	School’s 4-year graduation rate is at 80.0 – 89.9%
Exceeds standard	School’s 4-year graduation rate is at least 90.0%

Calculation: Ratings are based on the state graduation rate calculated in the IDOE Graduation Rate Report.

Data Sources

Summative: IDOE Graduation Rate

Formative: Quarterly count of students in the cohort on track to graduate with a waiver/certificate/diploma

1.3. Is the school providing an equitable education to all students in their school building?	
<i>Schools are evaluated for subgroup proficiency in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	School has more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Approaching standard	School has no more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Meets standard	School has no more than 10 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Exceeds standard	School has no more than 5 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.

Calculation: Schools are evaluated on each subgroup with 10 or more tested students who have been enrolled for at least 162 days. Each subgroup is evaluated based on a combined ELA and Math proficiency. The rating for this indicator is based on the subgroup with the largest gap.

Data Sources

Summative: State assessment data provided by IDOE from SAT.

1.4. Is the school providing an equitable education to all students compared to the state?	
<i>Schools are evaluated separately for subgroup proficiency and subgroup growth in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance less than 25 (bottom quartile)
Approaching standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 25 and 49
Meets standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 50 and 74
Exceeds standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance is 75 or higher (to quartile)

Calculation: Schools are evaluated separately for each subgroup with 10 or more tested students who have been enrolled for at least 162 days. Each subgroup is evaluated for ELA proficiency, Math proficiency, ELA growth, and Math growth and ranked based on statewide performance in the same grades served by the charter school. Schools receive an overall rating for the indicator that represents the average rank across all reported subgroups. Subgroups include all race and ethnicity categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Data Sources

Summative: Data provided by IDOE from SAT.

1.5. Is the school's attendance rate strong?	
Does not meet standard	School's attendance rate is less than 90.0%
Approaching standard	School's attendance rate is between 90.0 – 94.9%
Meets standard	School's attendance rate is greater than or equal to 95.0%

Data Sources

Summative: DOE-AT report

Formative: SIS attendance average (Average Daily Attendance/Average Daily Membership)

1.6. Is the school preparing students for postsecondary success through FAFSA completion?	
Does not meet standard	Fewer than 75% of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA
Approaching standard	75-84.9% of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA
Meets standard	85-89.9% of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA
Exceeds standard	90% or more of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA

Calculation: number of students who completed FAFSA / number of students within the cohort eligible for FAFSA

The only students who would be removed from the cohort would be those who are undocumented and do not have DACA status.

Data Sources

Summative: School-reported FAFSA completion information, Scholar Track reports, Indiana Commission for Higher Education FAFSA completion report

Formative: Check-ins with academic analyst

1.7. Is the school preparing students to graduate on-time as measured by 9th Grade On-Track sub-indicators?			
Ninth grade students with at least 10 credits		Percent of students receiving 1 or more F in core classes	
Fewer than 70% (1 pt)		30.1% or more (1 pt)	
70-79.9% (2 pts)		20.1-30% (2 pts)	
80-89.9% (3 pts)		10.1-20% (3 pts)	
90%+ (4 pts)		10% or fewer (4 pts)	
2-3 out of 8 pts DNMS	4 out of 8 pts AS	5-6 out of 8 pts MS	7-8 out of 8 pts ES

Calculation: The final rating is calculated by adding up the points from the sub-indicators. Credits earned will include all credits earned by the student from eighth grade through the summer after ninth grade.

The second sub-indicator will be calculated by totaling the number of Fs students receive in a core class during the academic year. A core class is defined as an English/Language Arts, Math, Science, or Social Studies class that fulfills a core requirement (English/Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies) for an Indiana diploma. A full list of these class descriptions can be found [here](#). Students who make up a failed course during summer school will not count toward this metric. An F is defined as a final rating for a class in which no credit is earned by the student, relative to the school’s individual grading system.

Data Sources

Summative: School-reported summer school credits and state course completion reports

Formative: Check-ins with academic analyst.

Core Question 2: Is the organization in sound fiscal health? Expanded Criteria

Overview

The Financial Performance Framework gauges the financial health of schools in the short and long term through quarterly check-ins and the results of annual audits with independent auditors. The framework consists of indicators designed to measure schools on enrollment consistency, liquidity, long-term financial planning, and the school’s ability to meet short- and long-term debt obligations.

Data Collection

In order to use the framework throughout the school year, OEI will need the following:

- Unaudited quarterly financial statements, including balance sheets, statements of activity and/or profit and loss statements for schools and networks as needed.
- Annual budgets, including budget vs. actual analyses.
- Annual Audit of Financial Statements submitted to the Indiana State Board of Accounts
- Enrollment reported through semi-annual Count Days in October and February

Evaluation

OEI will continue to evaluate and rate schools’ and networks’ performance on an annual basis against the financial performance framework using the audited financial statements required of all charter schools and submitted each year to the Indiana State Board of Accounts.

We will also have quarterly meetings and/or correspondence where we focus on the prior quarter’s unaudited financial statements and a budget vs. actuals comparison to understand financial trajectory and make mid-course corrections as necessary. Schools determined to be in financial distress will be subject to additional monitoring and/or corrective action at the discretion of OEI staff.

2.1 A. Short term Health: Does the school demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?	
<i>Applicable for all Mayor-sponsored charter schools</i>	
Does not meet standard	The school does not meet standard for two or more sub-indicators: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio, Days Cash on Hand, and Debt Default
Approaching standard	The school approaches standard for all sub-indicators: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio, Days Cash on Hand, and Debt Default OR The school meets standard for three of the sub-indicators and does not meet standard on the remaining sub-indicator OR the school approaches standard for two of the sub-indicators and meets standard for the remaining two sub-indicators.
Meets standard	The school meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio, Days Cash on Hand, and Debt Default
Exceeds Standard	The school meets standard for all sub-indicators: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio, Days Cash on Hand and Debt Default

Indicator 2.1A is calculated for all mayor-sponsored charter schools. For schools within networks, the 2.1A sub-indicators will be calculated using school-specific data on enrollment, cash-flow, expenses, debt obligations, etc.

School-level Enrollment Variance Ratio

The enrollment variance ratio tells authorizers whether the school is meeting its enrollment targets as specified on the board-approved budget, thereby generating enough revenue to fund operations for the current school year. It also examines attrition between fall and spring counts.

Enrollment is typically the largest source of revenue for a school. If a school is consistently hitting the enrollment targets used to build the annual budget, then it is bringing in the amount of necessary to ensure the school is in a healthy financial position. If the school consistently does not meet its enrollment targets, then the school will need to adjust its spending to reflect the reduced amount of revenue.

Data Source: Estimated enrollment from the board-approved budget submitted to OEI on July 1 and actual enrollment from the Department of Education’s October and February Count Days (Average Daily Membership, ADM).

Calculation: Average of the fall and spring enrollment variances.
$$[(\text{Fall ADM}/\text{July 1 board-approved budgeted enrollment}) * 100] + [(\text{Spring ADM}/\text{Fall ADM}) * 100] / 2$$

Does not meet standard	Enrollment Variance is less than or equal to 89%
Approaching standard	Enrollment Variance is between 90% - 94%
Meets standard	Enrollment Variance equals or exceeds 95%

School-level Current Ratio

The current ratio depicts the relationship between a school’s current assets (what they own) and current liabilities (what they owe).

Current is defined as within the next twelve months. If the current ratio is 1.1 or greater, then a school owns more than it owes in the short term. If the school owns more than it owes, then it has a good chance of meeting its obligations. If a school owes more than it owns, then it may not be able to meet its financial obligations over the next twelve months.

Data Source: Audited Statement of Financial Position/Balance Sheet

Calculation: Current Assets/Current Liabilities

Does not meet standard	Current Ratio is less than 1.0
Approaching standard	Current Ratio is between 1.0 - 1.09
Meets standard	Current Ratio equals or exceeds 1.1

School-level Days Cash on Hand

Days cash on hand indicates how many days a school can pay its expenses without another inflow of cash.

Best practice indicates a school should have between 30-60 days cash on hand to cover unexpected expenses. This is particularly important given the cyclical nature of cash inflows and the restricted nature of many of the funds school use throughout the year. For this indicator, Unrestricted Cash includes cash and cash equivalents and excludes escrow accounts and board-restricted funds. Short-term investments that can be converted into cash quickly, such as treasury bills with a maturity of up to 90 days, will also be considered cash equivalents.

Data Source: Audited Statement of Financial Position/Balance Sheet (checking or savings account balance, other unrestricted cash) and audited Statement of Activities/Income Statement (Total Expenses, Depreciation and Amortization), Statement of Functional Expenses (Depreciation)

Calculation: Unrestricted Cash / ((Total Expenses – Depreciation)/365)

Does not meet standard	Days Cash on Hand is less than 30 days
Approaching standard	Days Cash on Hand is between 30-44 days
Meets standard	Days Cash on Hand equals or exceeds 45 days

School-level Debt Default

Debt default indicates if a school is not meeting debt obligations or covenants. Schools must meet all requirements when servicing debt and complying with other covenants in their agreements.

Data Source: Notes to the audited financial statements

Calculation: Review of notes to the financial statements in the accrual-based audit

Does not meet standard	Default or delinquent payments identified and/or is in violation of covenants
Approaching standard	The school is in violation of covenants, but audit indicates that a waiver was granted.
Meets standard	Not in default or delinquent

2.1 B. Short term Health: Does the network demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?	
<i>Not Applicable for standalone Mayor-sponsored charter schools</i>	
Does not meet standard	The network does not meet standard for two or more sub-indicators: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio and Days Cash on Hand
Approaching standard	The network approaches standard for all sub-indicators: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio and Days Cash on Hand, OR The school meets standard for 2 of the sub-indicators and does not meet standard on the remaining sub-indicator OR the school approaches standard for two of the sub-indicators and meets standard for the remaining sub-indicator.
Meets standard	The network meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio and Days Cash on Hand
Exceeds Standard	The network meets standard for all network-level sub-indicators: Enrollment Variance, Current Ratio and Days Cash on Hand

Indicator 2.1B is calculated only for mayor-sponsored charter school networks using the organization’s consolidated financial statements. “Network” in OEI’s framework refers to the entire organization (campuses + administration). The analysis includes data on enrollment, cash-flow, expenses, debt obligations, etc., from the consolidated financial statements.

Network-level Enrollment Variance Ratio

The enrollment variance ratio tells authorizers whether the network is meeting its enrollment targets in the board-approved budget, thereby generating enough revenue to fund operations for the current school year. It also examines attrition between fall and spring counts.

Enrollment is typically the largest source of revenue for a network. If a network is consistently hitting the enrollment targets at each school that are used to build the annual budget, then it is bringing in the amount of

necessary to ensure it is in a healthy financial position. If the network consistently does not meet its enrollment targets, then it will need to adjust its spending to reflect the reduced amount of revenue.

Data Source: Estimated enrollment from the board-approved budget submitted to OEI on July 1 and actual enrollment from the Department of Education’s October and February Count Day.

Calculation: Average of the fall and spring enrollment variances.

$$\frac{[(\text{Fall ADM}/\text{July 1 board-approved budgeted enrollment}) * 100] + [(\text{Spring ADM}/\text{Fall ADM}) * 100]}{2}$$

Does not meet standard	Enrollment Variance is less than 90%
Approaching standard	Enrollment Variance is between 90% - 94%
Meets standard	Enrollment Variance equals or exceeds 95%

Network-level Current Ratio

The current ratio depicts the relationship between a network’s current assets (what they own) and current liabilities (what they owe).

Current is defined as within the next twelve months. If the current ratio is 1.1 or greater, then a network owns more than it owes in the short term. If the network owns more than it owes, then it has a good chance of meeting its obligations. If a network owes more than it owns, then it may not be able to meet its obligations.

Data Source: Audited Statement of Financial Position

Calculation: Current Assets/Current Liabilities

Does not meet standard	Current Ratio is less than 1.0
Approaching standard	Current Ratio is between 1.0 - 1.09
Meets standard	Current Ratio equals or exceeds 1.1

Network-level Days Cash on Hand

Days cash on hand shows how long a network can pay its expenses without another inflow of cash.

Best practice indicates a network should have between 30-60 days cash on hand to cover unexpected expenses. This is particularly important given the cyclical nature of cash inflows and the restricted nature of many of the fund’s networks use throughout the year. For this indicator, Unrestricted Cash includes cash and cash equivalents and excludes escrow accounts and board-restricted funds. Short-term investments that can be converted into cash quickly, such as treasury bills with a maturity of up to 90 days, will also be considered cash equivalents.

Data Source: Audited Statement of Financial Position/Balance Sheet (checking/savings account balance, other unrestricted cash) and audited Statement of Activities/Income Statement (Total Expenses, Depreciation and Amortization), Statement of Functional Expenses (Depreciation)

Calculation: Unrestricted Cash / ((Total Expenses – Depreciation)/365)

Does not meet standard	Days Cash on Hand is less than 30 days
Approaching standard	Days Cash on Hand is between 30-44 days
Meets standard	Days Cash on Hand equals or exceeds 45 days

2.2. Long term Health: Does the organization demonstrate long term financial health?

For schools within networks, OEI will use the organization's consolidated financials to determine long-term financial sustainability. OEI will provide narrative in accountability reports related to school-specific metrics in this area as needed.

Does not meet standard	The organization meets standard for one sub-indicator but does not meet standard for the remaining two sub-indicators: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio OR The school does not meet standard for any of the sub-indicators
Approaching standard	The organization meets standard for two sub-indicators: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio OR The school approaches standard for all 3 sub-indicators
Meets standard	The organization meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio, and c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio
Exceeds standard	The organization meets standard for all sub-indicators: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio, and c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio

Indicator 2.2 is calculated for all mayor-sponsored charter schools. Sub-indicators for standalone schools will be calculated using audited financial statements, and those for networks will be calculated using the organization's consolidated financial statements. "Network" refers to all campuses plus administration.

Three-Year Aggregate Net Income

Net income measures the difference between a school or network's revenues and expenses (including non-cash expenditures such as depreciation and amortization)

Net income indicates whether a school or network operates with a surplus or a deficit in a given time period. Net income is important because schools cannot operate at a deficit for sustained periods of time without risk of closure. The three-year aggregate net income is simply the sum of the net incomes for the most recent three years to understand if the school or network is generating a surplus in the long run.

Data Source: Three Years of Audited Statements of Activity

Calculation: Sum of Net Incomes for the past three years

Note: For schools in year one and year two of operation, we are looking for positive net incomes each year. Aggregate metrics will not be calculated until year three.

Does not meet standard	Aggregate three-year Net Income is negative OR Aggregate three-year net income is not available and most recent year net income is negative.
Approaching standard	Aggregate three-year Net Income is positive and most recent year is negative OR Aggregate Three-year Net Income is negative and most recent year Net Income is positive.
Meets standard	Aggregate three-year Net Income is positive and most recent year Net Income is positive.

Debt-to-Asset Ratio

The debt-to-asset ratio measures the amount of liabilities a school/network owes versus the assets they own; it measures the extent to which the school/network relies on borrowed funds to finance its operations. The debt-to-asset ratio is the long-term version of the current ratio. It compares school's/networks total assets to their total liabilities. This is a snapshot of how much a school/network owns vs. how much they owe in total. A lower debt-to-asset ratio generally indicates stronger health.

Data Source: Audited Statement of Financial Position

Calculation: Total Liabilities/Total Assets

Does not meet standard	Debt-to-Asset Ratio exceeds 0.95
Approaching standard	Debt-to-Asset Ratio is between 0.91 – 0.95
Meets standard	Debt-to-Asset Ratio is less than or equal to 0.90

Debt Service Coverage Ratio

This ratio indicates a school/network’s ability to cover its debt obligations in the next year based on its current net income. This measure depicts a school/network’s ability to pay obligations once you add back the non-cash expenditure (depreciation) and the interest expense. This is then divided by the total principal and interest payments due in the coming year to understand if the income generated is enough to meet those obligations.

Data Sources: Audited Statement of Activity or Income Statement (change in net assets or net income, interest expense, depreciation expense) and the notes to the audited Financial Statements (annual principal, principal maturities of the note payable)

Calculation: (Net Income + Depreciation+ Amortization + Interest Expense) / (Principal + Interest Payments for the next year)

Does not meet standard	Debt Service Coverage ratio is less than 1.05
Approaching standard	Debt Service Coverage ratio is between 1.05 – 1.1
Meets standard	Debt Service Coverage ratio equals or exceeds 1.2

2.3. Does the organization demonstrate it has adequate financial management and systems?	
Does not meet standard	The organization does not meet standard for one sub-indicator: a) Financial audit b) Financial Reporting Requirements
Approaching standard	The organization meets standard for the Financial Reporting sub-indicator but approaches standard for the Financial Audit sub-indicator
Meets standard	The organization meets standard for both sub-indicators: a) Financial Audit b) Financial Reporting Requirements

Indicator 2.3 is calculated for all mayor-sponsored charter schools. Sub-indicators for standalone schools will be calculated using audited financial statements, and those for networks will be calculated using the organization’s consolidated financial statements. “Network” refers to all campuses plus administration.

Financial Audit

The annual accrual-based audit provides an opinion on the validity of the information being shared in the financial statements and provides insight into school’s financial health.

Data Sources: Annual accrual-based audit document

Does not meet standard	Receives an audit with multiple significant deficiencies or any material weaknesses
Approaching standard	Receives a clean audit opinion with a few significant deficiencies noted but no material weaknesses
Meets standard	Receives a clean audit opinion

Financial Reporting Requirements

Schools need to turn in all financial documents in a timely manner. Reporting requirements are critical in ensuring the ongoing monitoring of financial health.

Data Sources: OEI Finance Analyst, audit firm, accounting firm, and others

Calculation: OEI reserves the right to consider the following when determining that a school does not meet standard for this sub-indicator: Compliance with charter requirements; Late submission or failure to submit quarterly financial documents; Late submission or failure to submit the annual accrual-based audit per OEI, SBOA, or Federal OMB deadlines; Cancellation of compliance meetings with OEI for non-emergency reasons and/or failure to reschedule meetings.

Does not meet standard	Fails to satisfy financial reporting requirements by submitting less than 80% of documents on-time or is out of compliance with charter requirements
Meets standard	Satisfies all financial reporting requirements by submitting at least 80% of documents on-time and is in compliance with charter requirements

Core Question 3: Is the organization effective and well-run? Expanded Criteria

Overview

The Governance Performance Framework gauges the strength, capacity, and effectiveness of school and board leadership, as well as ability to remain in compliance with the terms of the charter and all other applicable laws and policies. The framework consists of indicators designed to measure schools and networks on governance oversight, board capacity and focus, compliance, and organizational leadership and collaboration.

Data Collection

In order to use the framework throughout the school year, OEI will need the following:

- Board-approved minutes from every meeting and/or in-person observations of those meetings
- Assurance (through compliance submissions) that boards are meeting requirements of Indiana Open Door Law
- On-time compliance submissions through the Charter Achievement Portal
- Results from evaluations of the board, school leadership, and EMO/CMO (if applicable)
- Notes and information from semi-annual board chair check-ins between board leaders and Governance analysts
- Any relevant complaints from students, parents, or staff

Evaluation

OEI will continue to evaluate and rate schools' and networks' performance on an annual basis against the governance performance framework using the minutes, reports, and observations of board meetings and results of regular check-ins with board and school leadership throughout the year. Schools determined to be out of compliance will be subject to additional monitoring and/or corrective action at the discretion of OEI staff.

3.1. Does the board practice strong governance oversight?	
Does not meet standard	The board does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching standard	The board either 1) approaches standard for all three sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 3) approaches standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds or meets standard for one sub-indicator, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets standard	The board either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 2) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, and approaches or does not meet for one, 3) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, or 5) meets standard for all sub-indicators.
Exceeds Standard	The board exceeds standard for at least two sub-indicators and meets standard for one.

Indicator 3.1 centers the board's prioritization of academic outcomes, financial viability of the school, and school leader accountability. A board that is focused on data is just as important as a data-driven school leader.

3.1a: The board exercises relentless focus on student academic outcomes

Boards are expected to regularly discuss student data, in aggregate and disaggregated by subgroup. This should occur at least three times per year to correspond with beginning-, middle-, and end-of-year assessments and checkpoints. Governance analysts will consult with academic analysts on this indicator.

Data Sources:

- Board discussions of academic data
- Board meeting minutes
- Academic and or/or progress report-outs on board goals
- Evidence of an academic committee and/or individual(s) on the board who collaborate with the school leader to closely monitor progress.

Does not meet standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board is unable to gauge whether students are on track; or • The board does not have an active academic committee.
Approaching standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board was engaged during academic performance discussions. • The board did not regularly discuss disaggregated data.
Meets standard	<p>The board did three of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centered student academic outcomes in discussions. • Discussed disaggregated academic data regularly. • Worked with school leadership to adjust course when needed. • Has an academic committee that regularly meets with school leadership to review academic data and reports to the full board.
Exceeds Standard	<p>The board did all the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centered student academic outcomes in discussions. • Discussed disaggregated academic data regularly. • Worked with school leadership to adjust course when necessary. • Has an academic committee that regularly meets with school leadership review academic data and reports to the full board.

3.1b: The board has active committees with clear goals

Boards bylaws should include provisions for committees that regularly meet for their intended purpose. OEI suggests, at the least, that a board has an academic, finance, and governance committee. Committees should set goals and consistently report to the full board. Board members and non-members who are part of the school community may serve on committees.

Data Sources:

- Evidence of committees that operate against a clear charge
- Evidence that committees are able to articulate their progress on goals
- Board bylaws
- Board meeting minutes
- Committee report-outs

Does not meet standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence of active committees; or • Committee goals do not align to school-specific goals; or • The board has committees, but there is minimal to no evidence progress to goals was shared.
Approaching standard	<p>The board has two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active committees rooted in student/school-level success. • Each committee has goals aligned to student/school-level success. • Committees share progress to goals with recommendations to full board when necessary.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At a minimum, committees in academics and finance.
Meets standard	<p>The board has three of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active committees rooted in student/school-level success. Each committee has goals aligned to student/school-level success. Committees share progress to goals with recommendations to full board when necessary. At a minimum, committees in academics and finance.
Exceeds Standard	<p>The board has all the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active committees rooted in student/school-level success. Each committee has goals aligned to student/school-level success. Committees share progress to goals with recommendations to full board when necessary. At a minimum, committees in academics and finance.

3.1c: The board has evaluation systems in place to monitor itself and school leadership

It is important that boards have strong systems that allow them to hold school leadership accountable to the promises in the charter contract and set high expectations for student performance. Similarly, the board should also take time to reflect on its own performance and progress toward helping the school achieve its mission and vision. Evaluations should drive plans for improvement and avoid punitive measures. If evaluations are not satisfactory and require leadership changes, the board should also have a strong succession plan on file to allow for seamless transition and limited, if any, disruption for students, staff, and families.

Data Sources:

- Board self-evaluations
- Board evaluation of school leader or executive director
- Board of evaluation of the CMO/EMO
- School leader self-evaluation
- School leader succession plan

Does not meet standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization is missing all evaluations; or The board did not submit a school leader succession plan.
Approaching standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization is missing two or more required evaluations; or The board has an outdated school leader succession plan on file.
Meets standard	<p>The organization did all the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization completed all but one of the required evaluations. The board has an updated school leader succession plan on file.
Exceeds Standard	<p>The organization did all the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board evaluated the school leader. The school leader conducted a self-assessment. The board conducted a self-assessment. The board evaluated its education service provider, if applicable. The board has an updated school leader succession plan on file.

3.2. Is the board active, knowledgeable, diverse, and does it work toward a strategic vision?

Does not meet standard	The board does not meet standard on one or both sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching standard	The board either 1) approaches standard for one or both sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for one sub-indicator and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.

Meets standard	The board either 1) meets standard for both sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for one sub-indicator and exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, or 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator and approaches standard for one sub-indicator.
Exceeds standard	The board exceeds standard for both sub-indicators.

Indicator 3.2 centers on the board’s ability to craft a diverse team to lead the school as well as the ability to accurately monitor and keep a pulse on the overall health of the school.

3.2a: The board has diverse members with essential skillsets where all members are contributing

Historically, OEI has looked to evaluate board diversity by the presence of academic, legal, finance, HR, and operations skills on the Board, as well as the expectation that board members backgrounds are also diverse in terms of race, ethnicity, and other markers of identity, particularly those relevant to the school's student population.

Data Sources:

- Board roster and board member resumes
- Board member attendance (individual and committee)
- Board meeting schedule, agendas, packets, reports, minutes, meeting discussions, and notes
- Gender and racial/ethnic diversity of the board relative to the students served at the school
- State-audited school-level demographics
- Board-submitted goals for recruiting diverse members (if not captured in board-submitted formal tracking system, policies, and/or bylaws)

Does not meet standard	The board did most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board experiences lack diverse and strategic skills. • The board met quorum at less than 80% of meetings. • Board committees were rarely represented in meetings.
Approaching standard	The board did most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board experiences include one of the following skillsets: law, finance, or academics. • The board met quorum at 80% of meetings. • Committees were represented at 80% of meetings.
Meets standard	The board did most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board members mostly reflect the student population or measurable goals were set for recruitment. • Board experiences include two of the following skillsets: law, finance, or academics. • The board met quorum at 90% of meetings. • Committees were represented at 90% of meetings.
Exceeds Standard	The board did all the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board members reflect the student population or measurable goals were set for recruitment. • Board experiences include law, finance, and academics. • The board met quorum at 100% of meetings. • Committees and members were represented and contributing at every meeting.

3.2b: The board uses clear and accurate data as part of a formal tracking system to monitor school health

One of the primary roles of a charter school board is working with the school leader to set, monitor, and evaluate performance against annual goals that are aligned with the school’s long-term strategic vision. A school’s annual goals reflect the unique approach and strategies it uses to ensure delivery on the promises articulated in its charter. Goals vary from year to year and depend upon student performance, school leadership, operations, and overall functioning of the board.

Data Sources:

- Progress monitoring and ongoing mechanisms to formally track performance on school-level goals
- Board meeting minutes
- Committee/board reports
- Formal tracking system with board’s annual goals

Does not meet standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board does not have goals and/or a way to monitor their progress.
Approaching standard	<p>The board did most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence of a formal tracking system in place. • Targets include a combination of academic, finance, and operational indicators. • The board has general goals, but only assesses progress once per year.
Meets standard	<p>The board did most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board exercises oversight of the financial and operational health of the school using clear and accurate data and a consistent set of metrics. • At minimum, targets include academic, finance, and operational indicators. • The board sets annual goals and discusses progress towards goals at least quarterly.
Exceeds Standard	<p>The board did all the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exercised tight oversight of the health of the school using clear and accurate data and a consistent set of metrics. • At minimum, targets included academic, finance, and operational indicators. • Set annual goals and discusses progress towards goals at all board meetings.

3.3. Does the school satisfactorily comply with all its governance obligations?	
Does Not Meet Standard	The organization does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The organization either 1) approaches standard for all four sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 3) approaches standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The organization either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators, or 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators 5) meets standard for all sub-indicators.
Exceeds Standard	The organization exceeds standard for at one sub-indicator and meets standard for the rest.

Indicator 3.3 centers and reviews compliance items boards are required to submit to OEI, as well as school-level compliance with applicable laws. Most of these items are outlined in the board’s charter agreement. The spirit of this indicator encourages boards to be timely and proactive in their compliance items while remaining in good standing with laws specific to the state of Indiana.

3.3a: Compliance Document Submission

OEI maintains a document submission platform, where schools are given access to upload required items each month. These requirements are details in the Calendar of Reporting Requirements found later in this handbook.

Data Sources:

- Compliance items submitted in the Charter Achievement Portal (CAP)

Calculation: Documents submitted on-time / Documents required

Does not meet standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organization submitted fewer than 75% of compliance documents on-time.
Approaching standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organization submitted 75-85% of compliance documents on-time.
Meets standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organization submitted 86-94% of compliance documents on-time.
Exceeds Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organization submitted at least 95% of compliance documents on-time.

3.3b: Charter Compliance

The organizer is expected to remain in compliance, at all times, with the terms of the charter contract and its associated amendments. Failure to do so may result in a formal Notice of Noncompliance or Notice of Deficiency and engagement in OEI's performance improvement process.

Data Sources:

- Complaints or charges from individuals or institutions pertaining to compliance
- Notifications of deficiencies (from OEI or other sources)

Does not meet standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organization was out of compliance with multiple sections of its charter and/or applicable law or was unable to resolve several violations during the school year.
Approaching standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organization was out of compliance with one or more sections of its charter and/or applicable law but worked to resolve the issue(s) during the school year.
Meets standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organization remained in compliance with all sections of its charter and applicable laws.

3.3c: Compliance with OEI's Incident Communication Policy

Boards are required to craft plans to notify OEI when issues arise at the school level. To meet OEI's standards of communication, the board must notify the authorizer of any school-level incident within 24 hours of occurrence. Additionally, school leadership should engage in regular, responsive communication with OEI. This includes in regard to scheduling meetings, providing feedback, and addressing other concerns as needed. This policy is detailed further in a later section of this handbook.

Data Sources:

- Charter agreement
- Communications with school and/or board leadership
- Board-submitted plan to notify OEI of incidents
- Cancellation of compliance meetings with OEI for non-emergency reasons and/or failure to schedule or reschedule meetings

Does not meet standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event of a material incident, the organization did not comply with OEI's Incident Communication Policy.
Meets standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event of a material incident, the organization complied with OEI's Incident Communication Policy.

3.3d: Compliance with Indiana Open Door Law

As public schools, charter school boards must ensure board meetings are held in accordance with Indiana Open Door Law. A reference guide is included later in this handbook, as well as a link to the full requirements.

Data Sources:

- Signed IODL Assurance Form
- Board meeting announcements, agendas, and minutes
- Evidence of board meeting transparency via communication outlets (calendar, meeting notices, minutes, social media, etc.)

Does not meet standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board failed to comply with IODL on multiple occasions and/or did not resolve issues at subsequent meetings.
Approaching standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board failed to comply with IODL at one meeting but resolved issues at subsequent meetings.
Meets standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board complied with IODL at all meetings.

3.4. Is the school leader strong in their academic and organizational leadership?	
Does Not Meet Standard	The organization does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The organization either 1) approaches standard for all four sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 3) approaches standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The organization either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators, or 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators 5) meets standard for all sub-indicators.
Exceeds Standard	The organization exceeds standard for at least two sub-indicators and meets standard for the rest.

Indicator 3.4 centers on the performance of the school leader as well as the relationship between the school leader and the board. The spirit of this indicator aims to encourage collaboration between the school leader and the board. This indicator also reinforces that the board is expected to hold the school leader accountable for strong school outcomes.

3.4a: School and/or network leaders show a clear track record of success

This sub-indicator is based on results for the prior year's academic accountability (Core Question 1) report. Results are reviewed and used to determine a rating. For networks with multiple schools, school-level ratings are averaged to determine an overall rating.

Data Sources:

- State-audited summative data
- Academic team performance analysis
- Formative assessment data
- Additional academic data, including, but not limited to graduation, rate, IREAD-3 data, PSAT, attendance

Does not meet standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organization has an average of Does Not Meet Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
-------------------------------	---

Approaching standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization has an average of Approaches Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Meets standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization has an average of Meets Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Exceeds Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization has an average of Exceeds Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.

3.4b: School and/or network leaders are fully present and give data-driven updates to the board

OEI expects school leadership to consistently attend board meetings in order to both provide the board with updates and transparently represent to the community the health of the school. This sub-indicator relies on observations from governance analysts and interpretation of meeting minutes.

Data Sources:

- Board meeting minutes
- School leadership reports to the board
- School leadership attendance and reporting structure
- School leadership ability to report on progress indicators across multiple campuses (if network)

Does not meet standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended fewer than 60% of board meetings. Did not present on academic or financial outcomes or presentations were not accurate. Did not present on school trends and/or there were no plans to address concerns.
Approaching standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended 60% of board meetings. Did not present on academic or financial outcomes or presentations were not accurate. Informed the board when trends declined but did not adjust course accordingly.
Meets standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended 80% of board meetings. Presented transparent and accurate academic and financial information. Made mid-course adjustments to improve results when trends declined.
Exceeds Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended 100% of board meetings. Presented transparent and accurate academic and financial information. Made mid-course adjustments to improve results when trends declined.

3.4c: School and/or network leadership collaborates with the board to handle school-level complaints and concerns

This sub-indicator relies on observations during meetings as well as any complaints or issues that occur over the course of the year. This could be in the form of specific complaints to OEI, or issues that OEI is made aware of. We expect that the school and board leaders can effectively work together to ensure students, families, and staff have their concerns or problems addressed, and that the problem-solving process includes collaboration and effective communication.

Data Sources:

- Board meeting minutes
- School leadership reports
- Parent/stakeholder complaints

Does not meet standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board was unaware of several issues or concerns at the school level. There is little to no evidence of collaboration to resolve issues.
Approaching standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board was not always aware of or brought on in a timely manner regarding school concerns or issues.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of some collaboration between board and school leadership to resolve issues.
Meets standard	<p>Leadership did at least two the following when concerns arose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented thorough data to the board. • Collaborated with the board to develop solutions that centered the best interests of students. • Resolved most school-level issues or complaints.
Exceeds Standard	<p>Leadership did all of the following when concerns arose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented thorough data to the board. • Collaborated with the board to develop solutions that centered the best interests of students. • Resolved all school-level issues or complaints.

3.4d: The school and/or network maintains leadership stability in key administrative positions with a clear plan for succession

A successful school requires stable, consistent leadership. Schools are expected to ensure leadership stability at the administrative level (deans, directors, principal, executive director, CEO, etc.) to allow the school to meet its mission and vision and effectively carry out instruction and implement building culture. This sub-indicator will also consider the extent to which any transitions resulted in disruption for the school community.

Data Sources:

- Academic meetings
- Quarterly finance meetings
- Board chair check-ins
- Other communications as indicated

Does not meet standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School leadership was unstable with significant administrative turnover. • School leadership changes disrupted school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
Approaching standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School leadership was unstable with minimal administrative turnover. • School leadership changes disrupted school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
Meets standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School leadership was stable with minimal administrative turnover. • School leadership changes had minimal disruption on school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
Exceeds Standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School leadership was stable with minimal administrative turnover. • School leadership changes did not disrupt school operations, student success, or charter compliance.