



Accountability Plan Performance Framework

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Overview	3
Indicator 1: Academic Performance	4
1.1: State and Federal Academic Performance	4
Federal Accountability Rating	4
State Accountability Rating	5
Progress Towards Proficiency on State Summative Assessment: 3-8	5
College Readiness on State Summative Assessment: 9-12	5
Growth on State Summative Assessment: Grades 3-8	7
Comparison to Local Schools	7
3rd Grade Literacy	8
6th Grade Math	8
Graduation Pathways Completion	8
Diploma Strength	8
Average Student Attendance	9
Addressing Chronic Absenteeism	9
English Learners	9
Special Education	10
1.2: Local Academic Performance	12
Instruction	12
High School Graduation on Track	13
Progress Towards Proficiency on Benchmark Assessment	13
Historical Proficiency	14
Indicator 2: Financial Performance	15
Financial Management	15
Enrollment Variance	15
Current Ratio	16
Days Cash	16
Debt/Default Delinquency	16
Debt to Asset Ratio	16
Debt Service Coverage Ratio	16
Indicator 3: Organizational Performance	17
3.1: Organizational Performance of the Governing Board	17
Focus on High Academic Achievement	17
Commitment to Exemplary Governance	18
Fiduciary Responsibilities	19
Strategic Planning and Oversight	19
Legal and Regulatory Compliance	20
3.2: Organizational Performance of the School Leader(s)	21
Culture of High Expectations	21
Staff Development	22
Instructional Leadership	23
3.3: Organizational Performance of Compliance	24
Charter Implementation	24
Charter Compliance	24
Indicator 4: School Climate	25
Stakeholder Satisfaction	25

Overview

In addition to meeting state and federal accountability requirements in Indiana, charter schools must also meet the conditions outlined in their charter agreement. The Accountability Plan Performance Framework (APPF) is a core component of that agreement. It defines the specific performance indicators that represent school success and are used to inform charter renewal decisions. The APPF is organized into four key areas:

- Academic Performance;
- Financial Performance;
- Organizational Performance; and
- School Climate

Education One evaluates these areas using both qualitative and quantitative data sources, including:

- Reviewing submitted reports and documentation;
- Conducting regular site visits and support checks;
- Attending board meetings; and
- Analyzing stakeholder satisfaction surveys.

Evidence is collected throughout the year and presented to the school's Board of Directors and leadership team during scheduled meetings. This continuous monitoring allows Education One to identify trends in performance over time, proactively address areas of concern, and highlight and celebrate successes more frequently. While this process requires a significant investment of time, Education One believes that high accountability, paired with strong collaboration and support, leads to better outcomes for students and families and provides a clear foundation for renewal or revocation decisions.

Schools authorized by Education One are encouraged to use the APPF regularly to guide planning and monitor progress. It is a valuable self-assessment tool that should drive both short-term action steps and long-term strategic goals. Each performance measure includes a rationale explaining its relevance, details on what data is collected and how, and a timeline for when results are reported. A rubric is also included to evaluate school performance, using the following rating levels:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school is going above and beyond the standard expectations.	The school is evidencing outcomes consistent with quality education.	The school is mostly evidencing outcomes consistent with quality education and has a plan to address deficiencies.	The school is not evidencing outcomes consistent with quality education or does not have a plan to address deficiencies.

For schools in their first charter term with Education One, a performance progression table outlines expected benchmarks by the end of each year, particularly in academic and climate indicators. This allows Education One and school leadership to monitor progress toward meeting the APPF standards by the end of Year 3. Organizational and policy-related measures are expected to Meet Standard every year and therefore do not follow a progression model.

Progress Towards Meets Standard by End of 3rd Year in Charter Term with Education One		
Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Not applicable. Baseline data is collected. Progress percentages are changed based on Year 1 data for Years 2-3.		

Indicator 1: Academic Performance

Fundamental Question: Is the school academically successful?

The Academic Performance indicator captures the impact the school has on its primary stakeholders, students. It includes metrics used to gauge the academic success of the school in serving its target populations and closing achievement gaps. The Academic Performance indicator is broken down into two areas:

- [Indicator 1.1: State and Federal Academic Performance](#)
- [Indicator 1.2: Local Academic Performance](#)

1.1: State and Federal Academic Performance

The State and Federal Academic Performance sub-indicator measures the results of state summative assessments and how they meet state and federal goals and/or requirements. Data utilized for the ratings of the following measures is from the previous academic school year and collected at the time when it was publicly released by the Indiana Department of Education. The measures for the State and Federal Academic Performance sub-indicator are as follows:

- [Federal Accountability Rating](#)
- [State Accountability Rating](#)
- [Progress Towards Proficiency on State Summative Assessment: 3-8](#)
- [College Readiness on State Summative Assessment: Grades 9-12](#)
- [Growth on State Summative Assessment: Grades 3-8](#)
- [Comparison to Local Schools](#)
- [3rd Grade Literacy](#)
- [6th Grade Math](#)
- [Graduation Pathways Completion](#)
- [Diploma Strength](#)
- [Average Student Attendance](#)
- [Addressing Chronic Absenteeism](#)
- [Special Populations Compliance](#)
- [Special Populations Outcomes](#)

Federal Accountability Rating

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law in December 2015. ESSA required states to submit consolidated plans regarding state academic standards, assessments, state accountability systems, and school support and improvement activities. Indiana’s Consolidated State Plan was approved in January 2019. Under this plan, each school receives a federal accountability rating that looks at various data points that measure Indiana-specific goals. More information on the plan can be found [here](#). The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school receives a rating of Exceeds Expectations for the most recent school year.	The school receives a rating of Meets Expectations for the most recent school year.	The school receives a rating of Approaches Expectations for the most recent school year.	The school receives a rating of Does Not Meet Expectations for the most recent school year. OR The school receives a rating of Approaches Expectations for two or more consecutive years.

State Accountability Rating

Indiana’s accountability model ensures every student is equipped with the knowledge, skills, and experiences they need to thrive not just on state assessments, but across life’s diverse pathways. Developed through a collaborative process involving educators, students, families, community leaders, and industry partners, this model is rooted in the state’s “Graduates Prepared to Succeed” framework and elevates traditional academic outcomes alongside broader indicators such as communication and collaboration, work ethic, civic/financial/digital literacy, and career & post-secondary readiness.

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school receives 90-100 points, resulting in a grade of an ‘A.’	The school receives 70-89 points, resulting in a grade of a ‘B’ or a ‘C.’	The school receives 60-69 points, resulting in a grade of a ‘D.’	The school receives less than 60 points, resulting in a grade of an ‘F.’ OR The school receives a grade of a ‘D’ for two or more consecutive years..

Progress Towards Proficiency on State Summative Assessment: 3-8

Traditional accountability systems often compare a school’s overall proficiency rates to statewide averages. However, this approach does not take into account that charter schools often serve significantly different student populations than the state as a whole. To ensure an accurate evaluation of the implementation of the educational model, a Weighted Comparative Index (WCI) is used. This method allows Education One to understand how a school is performing in comparison to the state, while accounting for the unique makeup of the students served. Rather than holding schools to the same unadjusted target, this index adjusts expectations based on the types of students the school serves. It helps identify when a school is out performing or underperforming relative to what would be expected given its population.

The WCI compares the proficiency rates of the following student subgroup at the school, with 10 or more students, to the statewide proficiency rate for that same subgroup:

- English Learner;
- Race;
- Socioeconomic Status; and
- Special Education.

Students included in the percentage used for comparison are legacy students. A legacy student is defined as having attended the school for a minimum of three years. Data is collected from the previous school year. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school has an average WCI of 1.15 or above. OR The average annual growth in WCI over time is greater than or equal to 0.11.	The school has an average WCI between 0.95-1.149. OR The average annual growth in WCI over time is between 0.05 and 0.109.	The school has an average WCI between 0.80-0.949. OR The average annual growth in WCI over time is between 0.01 and 0.049.	The school has an average WCI less than 0.80. OR The average annual growth in WCI over time is less than 0.01.

College Readiness on State Summative Assessment: 9-12

Nationally normed assessments aligned to college and career readiness standards serve as a key indicator of academic preparation at the high school level. As a part of this framework, Education One holds high schools accountable for

overall performance on the state’s chosen assessment (Proficiency on State Summative Assessment), as well as for the outcomes of students who are pursuing a college pathway.

Measuring results across the full student body provides a consistent benchmark for evaluating schoolwide instructional effectiveness and academic rigor. Disaggregating results for students identified as college-bound ensures that those pursuing postsecondary education are graduating with the skills necessary to succeed in college-level coursework without the need for remediation. Data is collected from the previous school year. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The percentage of college-bound students meeting or exceeding assessment benchmarks is 75.0% or greater.	The percentage of college-bound students meeting or exceeding assessment benchmarks is between 60.0–74.9%.	The percentage of college-bound students meeting or exceeding assessment benchmarks is between 45.0–59.9%.	The percentage of college-bound students meeting or exceeding assessment benchmarks is less than 45.0%.

Growth on State Summative Assessment: Grades 4-8

Median Growth: Education One measures the success of the school’s implementation of its educational model by analyzing the amount of academic progress students make in a given year compared to other students with similar histories of academic proficiency. The school receives annual ratings for growth in English/Language Arts and Math utilizing data from the state summative assessment. Data is collected from the previous school year. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school’s Median Growth Percentile is greater than 65.	The school’s Median Growth Percentile is between 45 and 65.	The schools’ Median Growth Percentile is between 30 and 45.	The school’s Median Growth Percentile is less than 30.

Passing Status Growth: Education One measures the success of the school’s implementation of its educational model by analyzing the percentage of students whose growth supports the maintenance or obtaining of proficiency. The school receives separate annual ratings for students based on previous proficiency status of ‘Pass/Pass +’ or ‘Did Not Pass’ for English/Language Arts and Math. Data is collected from the previous school year. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
More than 50.0% of students with a previous status of Pass or Pass+ have an SGP of at least 45.	40.0–50.0% of students with a previous status of Pass or Pass+ have an SGP of at least 45.	25.0–39.9% of students with a previous status of Pass or Pass+ have an SGP of at least 45.	Less than 25.0% of students with a previous status of Pass or Pass+ have an SGP of at least 45.

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
More than 50.0% of students with a previous status of Did Not Pass have an SGP of at least 55.	40.0–50.0% of students with a previous status of Did Not Pass have an SGP of at least 55.	25.0–39.9% of students with a previous status of Did Not Pass have an SGP of at least 55.	Less than 25.0% of students with a previous status of Did Not Pass have an SGP of at least 55.

Comparison to Local Schools

Education One compares its public charter schools to surrounding traditional and/or charter public schools that serve students with similar demographics and are within 10 miles of the school’s location to ensure a quality choice is being provided to the community. The Weighted Comparative Index (WCI) approach is useful when comparing a school to

nearby schools as it reflects how well a school is doing compared to others serving a similar community. It helps surface meaningful differences in student outcomes across schools that look alike demographically but may use different approaches. Data is collected from the previous school year. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school is outperforming comparison schools with a WCI of 1.15 or above.	The school is performing on par with comparison schools with a WCI of 0.95-1.149.	The school is performing slightly below comparison schools with a WCI of 0.80-0.949..	The school is performing noticeably below comparison schools with a WCI of less than 0.80.

3rd Grade Literacy

The 3rd Grade Literacy measure calculates the percentage of grade 3 students demonstrating proficiency after the summer administration of the Indiana Reading Evaluation and Determination (IREAD-3) assessment. This summative assessment evaluates foundational reading standards through grade 3 to ensure all students are reading proficiently moving into grade 4. Data is collected from the previous school year. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The percentage of grade 3 students receiving a passing score is greater than or equal to 90.0%.	The percentage of grade 3 students receiving a passing score is between 80.0-89.9%.	The percentage of grade 3 students receiving a passing score is between 70.0-79.9%.	The percentage of grade 3 students receiving a passing score is less than 70.0%.

6th Grade Math

Sixth-grade math often introduces students to more advanced mathematical concepts and skills, such as algebraic expressions, equations, ratios, and proportions. Proficiency in 6th-grade math serves as a foundation for success in subsequent math courses, including pre-algebra, algebra, geometry, and beyond. The 6th Grade Math Growth measure calculates the percentage of grade six students meeting their growth targets on the state's summative math assessment. These targets are determined based on individual student performance and academic needs. Data is collected from the previous school year. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
More than 50.0% of grade 6 students have an SGP of at least 45.	40.0-50.0% of grade 6 students have an SGP of at least 45.	25.0-39.9% of grade 6 students have an SGP of at least 45.	Less than 25.0% of grade 6 students have an SGP of at least 45.

Graduation Pathways Completion

Education One assesses a school's ability to support students in completing Indiana's graduation requirements. This measure illustrates the percentage of students in the most current grade 12 cohort that completed state requirements for graduating in four years. This is also commonly referred to as a graduation rate. Data is collected from the previous school year. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
More than 95.0% of grade 12 students complete graduation requirements.	85.0%-95.0% of grade 12 students complete graduation requirements.	75.0-84.9% of grade 12 students complete graduation requirements.	Less than 75.0% of grade 12 students complete graduation requirements.

Diploma Strength

Education One measures its high schools' effectiveness in providing rigorous and relevant experiences for students to be prepared for college and/or careers. The Diploma Strength measure calculates the percentage of students in the most recent grade 12 cohort who earned at least a Core 40 diploma. Data is collected from the previous school year. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The percentage of grade 12 students who earned at least a Core 40 diploma is greater than the state.	The percentage of grade 12 students who earned at least a Core 40 diploma is within 0-10.0% of the state.	The percentage of grade 12 students who earned at least a Core 40 diploma is within 10.1-20.0% of the state.	The percentage of grade 12 students who earned at least a Core 40 diploma is greater than 20.0% from the state.

Average Student Attendance

The school receives an overall rating for this measure at the end of the year based on data submitted to the IDOE. Starting at the age of seven, students in Indiana are required to attend school regularly. IC 20-20-8-8 defines habitual truancy as ten or more days absent from school, meaning students are required to attend school for 95% of the 180 days in a school year. Attendance data is submitted to and collected from the IDOE on a monthly basis. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school's calculated attendance is between 98.0-100%	The school's calculated attendance is between 95.0-97.9%	The school's calculated attendance is between 90.0-94.9%.	The school's calculated attendance is less than 90.0%

Addressing Chronic Absenteeism

Student attendance, on a federal level, measures whether students are considered "model attendees" by either demonstrating persistent attendance or improved attendance during the school year. Persistent attendance is defined as having at least a 96% attendance rate. Improved attendance is defined as improving the student's attendance rate by at least three percentage points from the prior school year to the current. The school receives an overall rating for this measure at the end of the year based on data submitted to the IDOE and ESSA goals created by the state of Indiana. The rubric for this indicator is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
More than 80.0% of students were model attendees.	70.0-80.0% of students were model attendees.	60.0-69.9% of students were model attendees.	Less than 60.0% of students were model attendees.

Special Populations Compliance

English Learner Compliance: To ensure that laws and requirements are being upheld and students who are English Learners (EL) are being serviced appropriately, Education One conducts an EL compliance check quarterly, looking for the following components:

- Evidence that ILP goals are established, current, and up to date in Indiana's online system;
- Case conference meetings occur in compliance with all state and federal laws;
- Evidence of interventions and ILPs are appropriately communicated with the classroom teacher;
- Evidence of high-quality interventions and ILPs are implemented in push-in and/or pull-out settings;
- Staff-to-student ratios are adequate for providing services, per state and federal guidelines; and

- Staff receive ongoing professional development to understand legal obligations, current legislation, research, and effective practices relating to services being provided.

The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
65.0% or more of compliance characteristics are rated as Meets Standard, with no measures rated as Does Not Meet Standard.	50.0-64.9% of compliance characteristics are rated as Meets Standard, with no measures rated as Does Not Meet Standard.	Less than 50.0% of characteristics are rated as Meets Standard OR Two or more measures are rated as Does Not Meet Standard.

Special Education Compliance: To ensure students with disabilities are receiving services that are both legally compliant and educationally appropriate, Education One evaluates Special Education practices using a performance-based, tiered support model. Under this approach, school outputs drive the level of oversight and intervention, while inputs are tailored to support growth and improvement.

Education One conducts compliance checks based on school-specific needs, examining the following key indicators of sound special education practice:

- Evidence that IEP goals are established, current, and up to date in Indiana’s online system;
- Case conference meetings occur in compliance with all state and federal laws;
- Evidence of high-quality interventions and IEPs are appropriately communicated with the classroom teacher;
- Evidence of high-quality interventions and IEPs are implemented in push-in and/or pull-out settings;
- Staff-to-student ratios are adequate for providing services, per state and federal guidelines
- Staff receive ongoing professional development to understand legal obligations, current legislation, research, and effective practices relating to services being provided;
- Evidence that disciplinary actions are appropriate, legal, equitable, and fair; and
- The percentage of disciplinary actions of SPED students does not exceed the percentage of students identified as SPED.

The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
75.0% or more of compliance characteristics are rated as Meets Standard.	50.0-74.9% of compliance characteristics are rated as Meets Standard.	Less than 50.0% of compliance characteristics are rated as Meets Standard OR Two or more compliance characteristics are rated as Does Not Meet Standard.

Special Populations Outcomes

English Language Performance: Education One measures the effectiveness of a school’s English Learner (EL) program by analyzing the percentage of English Language Learners who are approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the English Language Arts portion of the state summative assessment. This measure leverages readily available state assessment data to evaluate whether EL students are demonstrating sufficient academic language proficiency to access grade-level content. The goal is to ensure that EL services are not only compliant, but also effective in supporting students’ academic achievement in English language arts.

The rubrics are as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
45.0% or more of English Language Learners in grades 3-8 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the ELA portion of the state summative assessment.	30.0-44.9% or more of English Language Learners in grades 3-8 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the ELA portion of the state summative assessment.	20.0-29.9% or more of English Language Learners in grades 3-8 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the ELA portion of the state summative assessment.	Less than 20.0% of English Language Learners in grades 3-8 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the ELA portion of the state summative assessment.
Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
30.0% or more of English Language Learners in grades 9-12 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the EBRW portion of the state summative assessment.	20.0-29.9% or more of English Language Learners in grades 9-12 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the EBRW portion of the state summative assessment.	10.0-19.9% or more of English Language Learners in grades 9-12 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the EBRW portion of the state summative assessment.	Less than 10.0% of English Language Learners in grades 9-12 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the EBRW portion of the state summative assessment.

Special Education Performance: In addition to monitoring compliance with legal and instructional requirements, Education One also evaluates Special Education outcomes by examining how well students are progressing toward academic proficiency. This measure focuses on the percentage of students with IEPs who are approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the state summative assessment. The goal is to ensure that services are not only compliant but also effective in improving student outcomes. The rubrics are as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
40.0% or more of Special Education students in grades 3-8 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the state summative assessment.	25.0-39.9% of Special Education students in grades 3-8 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the state summative assessment.	10.0-24.9% of Special Education students in grades 3-8 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the state summative assessment.	Less than 10.0% of Special Education students in grades 3-8 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the state summative assessment.
Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
25.0% or more of Special Education students in grade 11 were approaching or meeting/exceeding on the state summative assessment.	15.0-24.9% of Special Education students in grade 11 were approaching or meeting/exceeding on the state summative assessment.	7.0-14.9% of Special Education students in grade 11 were approaching or meeting/exceeding on the state summative assessment.	Less than 7.0% of Special Education students in grade 11 were approaching or meeting/exceeding on the state summative assessment.

Bottom 25% Performance: Education One recognizes that overall school performance does not always reflect how effectively a school serves its most academically at-risk students. As a result, Education One evaluates the performance of students in the Bottom 25% subgroup to assess whether schools are successfully supporting students who enter furthest from proficiency and accelerating their academic achievement.

This measure examines the percentage of students identified within the Bottom 25% subgroup who are approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the state summative assessment. By monitoring outcomes for these students, Education One can evaluate the effectiveness of a school's instructional practices, intervention systems, and targeted supports designed to improve achievement for students with the greatest academic needs. The rubrics are as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
40.0% or more of the Bottom 25% students in grades 3-8 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the state summative assessment.	25.0-39.9% of the Bottom 25% students in grades 3-8 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the state summative assessment.	10.0-24.9% of the Bottom 25% students in grades 3-8 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the state summative assessment.	Less than 10.0% of the Bottom 25% students in grades 3-8 were approaching, meeting, or exceeding proficiency on the state summative assessment.

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
25.0% or more of the Bottom 25% students in grade 11 were approaching or meeting/exceeding on the state summative assessment.	15.0-24.9% of the Bottom 25% students in grade 11 were approaching or meeting/exceeding on the state summative assessment.	7.0-14.9% of the Bottom 25% students in grade 11 were approaching or meeting/exceeding on the state summative assessment.	Less than 7.0% of the Bottom 25% students in grade 11 were approaching or meeting/exceeding on the state summative assessment.

DRAFT

1.2: Local Academic Performance

The Local Academic Performance sub-indicator measures the results of school-level initiatives, practices, and assessment results. Data utilized for the ratings of each measure is from the current academic school year and collected via regularly scheduled site visits throughout the school year, attendance and guidance reports, and benchmark data submission. The measures for the Local Academic Performance sub-indicator are as follows:

- [Instruction](#)
- [High School Graduation on Track](#)
- [Progress Towards Proficiency on Benchmark Assessment](#)
- [Historical Proficiency](#)

Instruction

Education One evaluates this measure on a monthly, quarterly, or bi-annual basis during scheduled site visits, where classroom observations are conducted to monitor the implementation of the following instructional best practices.

- **Rigor and Relevance:** Instructional delivery possesses the appropriate level of rigor and relevance, whereas rigor is defined as complexity and relevance is defined as culturally affirming.
- **Differentiated Instruction:** Differentiation in a classroom refers to the practice of tailoring instruction to meet the diverse needs of students.
- **Checks for Understanding:** Checks for understanding are strategies used by teachers to assess whether students have grasped the material being taught. These checks help teachers gauge student comprehension and inform instructional decisions.
- **Growth Feedback:** Growth feedback in a classroom focuses on providing constructive input that encourages and supports students in their academic and personal development.
- **Classroom Management:** Effective classroom management is crucial for creating a positive and productive learning environment.
- **Active Engagement:** Active engagement in a classroom refers to students being fully involved, participating, and invested in their learning.
- **Learning Objectives:** Learning objectives are specific, measurable, and observable statements that describe what students should know or be able to do by the end of a lesson, unit, or course.
- **Curriculum Implementation:** Curriculum implementation refers to the process of putting educational plans and materials into practice in the classroom.

Classroom observation data is compiled to identify overarching trends across the school. The school receives points (1-4) for each area observed based on the percentage of classrooms showing a concern. The school's overall instruction rating coincides with the sum of those weighted points, based on the effect size on student proficiency and growth. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school receives an instructional rating within the range of 3.5-4.0.	The school receives an instructional rating within the range of 3.0-3.4.	The school receives an instructional rating within the range of 2.0-2.9.	The school receives an instructional rating within the range of 1.0-1.9.

High School Graduation on Track

This measure evaluates the percentage of students in grades 9-12 who are on track to graduate within four years, based on credit accumulation, successful completion of core courses, and other school-defined pathway criteria. Being "on track" means a student has earned enough credits and passed appropriate coursework by the end of each academic year to remain on pace for on-time graduation. Data is collected after the completion of a semester or trimester to monitor this measure, however, the school receives an overall rating based on end-of-year data collection.

The rubric is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The percentage of students on track to graduate is greater than or equal to 90%.	The percentage of students on track to graduate is between 80.0-89.9%.	The percentage of students on track to graduate is between 65.0 and 79.9%.	The percentage of students on track to graduate is less than 65.0%.

Progress Towards Proficiency on Benchmark Assessment

Whole School: The success of the school's educational model is measured by analyzing the percentage of students who demonstrate grade-level proficiency or who are growing appropriately towards proficiency. Ratings for both reading and math are provided on an annual basis based on the results of the school's chosen benchmark assessment and standards. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
80.0% or more of students demonstrate grade-level proficiency standards or meet growth targets.	70.0-79.9% of students demonstrate grade-level proficiency standards or meet growth targets.	60.0-69.9% of students demonstrate grade-level proficiency standards or meet growth targets.	Less than 60.0% of students demonstrate grade-level proficiency standards or meet growth targets.

Subgroups: Similarly, Education One monitors the school's individual subgroup proficiency and growth results to ensure equitable opportunities are provided for all students enrolled. The school receives separate annual ratings in reading and math for each of the following subgroups with 10 or more students, based on benchmark assessment results and standards.

- Bottom 25%;
- Enrollment Pathway (9-12 only);
- English Learner;
- Race;
- Socioeconomic Status; and
- Special Education.

The rubric for this measure is as follows, for each subgroup:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
80.0% or more of students demonstrate grade-level proficiency standards or meet growth targets.	70.0-79.9% of students demonstrate grade-level proficiency standards or meet growth targets.	60.0-69.9% of students demonstrate grade-level proficiency standards or meet growth targets.	Less than 60.0% of students demonstrate grade-level proficiency standards or meet growth targets.

Historical Proficiency

This measure evaluates the effectiveness of the school's educational model by examining the academic performance of legacy students, those who have been enrolled for three or more years. The intent is to assess whether sustained enrollment in the school's program leads to stronger student outcomes, particularly in reading and math.

A Legacy Performance Index (LPI) is used to quantify this relationship by comparing the proficiency rates of legacy students to non-legacy peers. This approach allows for consistent year-over-year comparisons and accounts for differences in group size. In addition, absolute proficiency thresholds are included to highlight when legacy students demonstrate high achievement regardless of comparison.

The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
<p>LPI >1.075 OR The percentage of 2nd-8th grade legacy students meeting grade level proficiency standards is at least 80.0%.</p>	<p>LPI is between 1.050-1.075 OR The percentage of 2nd-8th grade legacy students meeting grade level proficiency standards is between 70.0-79.9%.</p>	<p>LPI is between 1.025-1.049 OR The percentage of 2nd-8th grade legacy students meeting grade level proficiency standards is between 60.0-69.9%.</p>	<p>LPI <1.025 OR The percentage of 2nd-8th grade legacy students meeting grade level proficiency standards is less than 60.0%</p>
Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
<p>LPI >1.075 OR The percentage of 9th-12th grade legacy students meeting or exceeding assessment benchmarks is above the state average.</p>	<p>LPI is between 1.050-1.075 OR The percentage of 9th-12th grade legacy students meeting or exceeding assessment benchmarks is within 10.9% of the state average.</p>	<p>LPI is between 1.025-1.049 OR The percentage of 9th-12th grade legacy students meeting or exceeding assessment benchmarks is within 11-20.9% of the state average.</p>	<p>LPI <1.025 OR The percentage of 9th-12th grade legacy students meeting or exceeding assessment benchmarks is less than 21% of the state average.</p>

Indicator 2: Financial Performance

Fundamental Question: Is the school financially healthy?

The Financial Performance indicator assesses both short-term financial health as well as long-term financial stability. Quarterly financial statements provided by the school as well as annual audits completed by an accounting firm are used to rate the following measures for Financial Performance:

- [Financial Management](#)
- [Enrollment Variance](#)
- [Current Ratio](#)
- [Days Cash](#)
- [Debt/Default Delinquency](#)
- [Debt to Asset Ratio](#)
- [Debt Service Coverage Ratio](#)

Financial Management

Education One measures the capacity of the school's financial management by the following characteristics:

- Submission of an annual audit that is timely, complete, and has identified no significant deficiencies or weaknesses that are within the school's financial controls; and
- Submission of quarterly financial statements that are timely, complete, and able to be utilized to assess financial measures.

These characteristics are observed quarterly as well as annually when new financial information is provided by the school and the State Board of Accounts (SBOA). The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school meets standard for both the financial audit and quarterly financial reporting requirements.	The school meets standard for either the financial audit or quarterly financial reporting requirements.	The school does not meet standard for either the financial audit or quarterly financial reporting requirements.

Enrollment Variance

The state of Indiana calculates its state tuition based on the number of students enrolled at various times per academic school year. A school's ability to identify an appropriate enrollment target to support its budget creates stability with staffing and operations. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
Actual enrollment is greater than budgeted enrollment.	Actual enrollment is between 98.0 and 100% of the budgeted enrollment.	Actual enrollment is between 93.0 and 97.9% of the budgeted enrollment.	Actual enrollment is less than 93.0% of the budgeted enrollment.

Current Ratio

Education One assesses if the school's current assets (cash or other assets that can be accessed in the next twelve months) exceed its current liabilities (debt obligations due in the next twelve months). The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The current ratio is 1.1 or greater.	The current ratio is less than 1.1.

Days Cash

Education One calculates days cash on hand as an important measure of the school's fiscal health. The metric indicates how many more days after the end of the current fiscal year (June 30) the school would be able to operate. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
Days cash on hand is at least 60 days. OR between 30 and 60 days cash and the one-year trend is positive.	Days cash on hand is at least between 15-30 days. OR between 30 and 60 days cash and the one-year trend is negative.	Days cash is less than 15 days.

Debt/Default Delinquency

This measure is determined by both the auditors' comments in the audited financial statements and contact with the school's creditors. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school is not delinquent or in default on any outstanding loan.	The school is delinquent and/or in default on any outstanding loan.

Debt to Asset Ratio

Education One monitors the school's debt-to-asset ratio, which indicates the percentage of assets that are being financed with debt. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The debt-to-asset ratio is less than 0.90.	The debt-to-asset ratio is 0.90 or greater.

Debt Service Coverage Ratio

Education One monitors the school's debt service coverage ratio, which is a measurement of the cash flow available to pay current debt obligations. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The debt service coverage ratio is at least 1.15.	The debt service coverage ratio is less than 1.15.

Indicator 3: Organizational Performance

Fundamental Question: Is the school organizationally sound?

The Organizational Performance indicator gauges the academic and operational leadership of the school and consists of various measures designed to identify how well the school's administration and Governing Board comply with the terms of the charter agreement, applicable compliance requirements and laws, and authorizer expectations. Organizational Performance is broken down into three sub-indicators:

- [Indicator 3.1: Organizational Performance of the Governing Board](#)
- [Indicator 3.2: Organizational Performance of the School Leader](#)
- [Indicator 3.3: Organizational Performance of Compliance](#)

3.1: Organizational Performance of the Governing Board

The Organizational Performance of the Governing Board sub-indicator assesses the effectiveness of the school's Board of Directors in developing the school's vision and mission, adherence to the charter agreement, and relentless focus on student outcomes through strategic planning and goal setting. Data utilized to rate these measures are from the current academic school year and are collected throughout the year via attendance at regularly scheduled board meetings and through consistent interactions with key members of the school board. The measures for Organizational Performance of the Governing Board are as follows:

- [Focus on High Academic Achievement](#)
- [Commitment to Exemplary Governance](#)
- [Fiduciary Responsibilities](#)
- [Strategic Planning and Oversight](#)
- [Legal and Regulatory Compliance](#)

Focus on High Academic Achievement

Education One expects governing boards to actively support the school's mission and charter, ensuring students are on track for high-level academic achievement. This includes having a shared belief in the mission, a clear definition of academic excellence, understanding how achievement is measured, and using student data to inform decisions and progress toward goals. The rubrics for this measure are as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The board <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reviews student achievement data at least quarterly • engages in strategic discussions tied to school goals • consistently uses data to inform key decisions. The leadership team leaves meetings with a clear understanding of next steps.	The board <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reviews student achievement data at least once per semester • uses data to guide some decisions • discusses progress toward school goals. The leadership team has a clear understanding of next steps.	The board <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inconsistently reviews student achievement data (less than once per semester) OR • only sometimes uses it to guide decisions. The leadership team's understanding of next steps is unclear or inconsistent.	The board <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rarely or never reviews student achievement data OR • does not use it to guide decisions • discussions about school goals are limited or absent. The leadership team lacks clarity on next steps for improvement.

Commitment to Exemplary Governance

Education One measures governing boards based on their commitment to strong governance practices and the ability to maintain a high-functioning, engaged board. Exemplary boards demonstrate this by recruiting and retaining skilled members, completing board self-evaluations to support board development and training, and engaging meaningfully through active contributions both during and outside of meetings. The rubrics for this measure are as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The board completes a self-evaluation annually, with at least 90% participation. Results inform training needs.	The board completes a self-evaluation annually, with at least 80.0-89.9% participation. Results inform training needs.	<p>The board completes a self-evaluation annually, with 60.0-79.9% participation. Results inform training needs.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>The board completes a self-evaluation annually, with at least 80.0% participation but results do not inform training needs.</p>	<p>The board completes a self-evaluation annually, with less than 60.0% participation. Results may or may not inform training needs.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>The board completes a self-evaluation annually, with 60.0-79.9% participation but results do not inform training needs.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>The board does not complete a self-evaluation.</p>

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The average meeting attendance is at least 90.0%	The average meeting attendance is 75.0-89.9%.	The average meeting attendance is 60.0%-74.9%.	The average meeting attendance is less than 60.0%.

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The average board member makes 3 or more relevant contributions during each meeting that demonstrate preparation, insight, and help advance discussion or decision making.	The average board member makes 1-2 relevant contributions during each meeting that demonstrate preparation, insight, and help advance discussion or decision making.	The average board member contributes, however participation is inconsistent or lacks depth.	The average board member rarely contributes or contributions are off-topic, superficial, or not aligned with agenda discussions.

Fiduciary Responsibilities

Education One evaluates the quality of a governing board based on its commitment to overseeing the school's financial health, securing external funding, leveraging networks for partnerships, and assisting school leadership teams with strategic financial planning. Exemplary boards demonstrate this by approving a budget that aligns with student achievement goals, ensuring all members are financially literate, regularly reviewing financial data, and advocating for policies that support charter schools. The rubrics for this measure are as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The board demonstrates proactive and strategic financial oversight by regularly analyzing financial trends, monitoring long-term sustainability, and making data-informed decisions aligned to organizational goals and student outcomes. Financial discussions consistently connect resource allocation to school performance, sustainability, and strategic priorities.	The board demonstrates sound financial oversight by approving and monitoring a budget aligned to school needs and priorities. The board regularly reviews financial reports, monitors financial goals, and engages in discussions regarding sustainability, operational decision-making, and resource allocation.	The board demonstrates inconsistent financial oversight. Financial reports and budgets are reviewed periodically, but discussions regarding sustainability, strategic alignment, and financial decision-making lack consistency, depth, or follow-through.	The board demonstrates limited financial oversight. Financial reports and budgets are infrequently reviewed or lack meaningful discussion and alignment to school priorities, sustainability needs, or organizational goals.

Strategic Planning and Oversight

Education One believes that an effective governing board determines the strategic direction of a school, understands and respects the balance between oversight and management, and evaluates and holds school leaders and management partners accountable. The rubrics for this measure are as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The board develops a comprehensive, clear, and measurable strategic plan that is aligned with the school's vision and long-term goals. The plan is reviewed and adjusted regularly based on progress toward goals, and clear milestones are established and met.	The board oversees the development of a clear strategic plan aligned with the school's vision. The plan is reviewed periodically, and some adjustments are made to keep it aligned with changing priorities or needs, though milestones may be more general.	The board develops a strategic plan but may lack clear goals, timelines, or regular reviews. The plan is not always fully aligned with the vision, and progress toward goals is monitored inconsistently.	The board does not oversee the development of a clear or measurable strategic plan. The plan may be vague or outdated, and there is no regular review of progress or alignment with the school's vision.

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The board consistently provides autonomy to the school leader to manage the day-to-day operations of the school, while maintaining oversight of outcomes.	The board mostly provides autonomy to the school leader to manage the day-to-day operations of the school, while maintaining oversight of outcomes.	The board provides autonomy to the school leader but maintains a level of micromanagement that may limit the leader's effectiveness. Oversight of outcomes may or may not be inconsistent.	The board micromanages the school leader's role and undermines the leader's authority in managing the school. There is little to no oversight of outcomes.

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The board evaluates the school leader's performance with an appropriately rigorous multi-faceted system that includes self-assessment, stakeholder input, and objective performance data that leads to strategic and measurable goals.	The board evaluates the school leader's performance with an appropriately rigorous evaluation system, with evidence of clear next steps and/or goals.	The board evaluates the school leader's performance, but the process lacks consistency, depth, or alignment with student and school performance. Next steps are vague and/or generic.	The board does not evaluate the school leader in a formal or meaningful way. There is no evidence that the evaluation informs leadership growth or school improvement.

Legal and Regulatory Compliance

Education One monitors whether or not a governing board adheres to the legal and ethical duties of care, as well as meets all expectations outlined in the charter agreements and bylaws. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The board consistently complies with all applicable state and federal laws, with no material compliance issues noted. The board consistently complies with its policies and bylaws, which are reviewed and updated as needed.	The board has minor, non-systemic compliance issues that are addressed promptly when identified through oversight or audit. The board mostly complies with policies/bylaws, though some may be outdated or inconsistently applied.	The board has recurring or serious legal and/or compliance issues, with corrective actions delayed, inappropriate, or absent. The board fails to comply with and/or regularly update its policies and bylaws.

3.2: Organizational Performance of the School Leader(s)

The Organizational Performance of the school leader(s) sub-indicator assesses the effectiveness of the school's leadership team in developing and executing an action plan to achieve the goals set by the board and outlined in the charter agreement. Data utilized for the ratings of these measures are from the current academic school year and are collected throughout the year via qualitative site visits, attendance at regularly scheduled board meetings, collection of ongoing performance evaluations, student assessment outcomes, and quantitative classroom observations.

- [Culture of High Expectations](#)
- [Staff Development](#)
- [Instructional Leadership](#)

Culture of High Expectations

Education One measures the effectiveness of the school's leadership team in cultivating a culture of high expectations that drives student success and organizational excellence. There are specific, observable conditions that define what strong performance looks like:

- Maintain stability in key administrative positions, with clear roles and responsibilities;
- Establish system for addressing areas of deficiency on time; and
- Execute goals established by the school's board of directors while providing consistent information and engaging in regular consultation to support decision making.

The rubrics for this measure are as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
There has been no turnover in key administrative positions in the last three years.	There has been minimal turnover, 0.0-10.0%, in key administrative positions in the last three years.	There has been moderate turnover, 10.1-25.0%, in key administrative positions in the last three years. OR There is minimal turnover, but roles and responsibilities are inconsistently defined or implemented.	There has been high turnover, more than 25.0% in key administrative positions in the last three years.

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
90.0% or more of identified academic performance deficiencies are addressed within established timelines.	75.0-89.9% of identified academic performance deficiencies are addressed within established timelines.	60.0-74.9% of identified academic performance deficiencies are addressed within established timelines.	Less than 60.0% of identified academic performance deficiencies are addressed within established timelines.

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
Provides comprehensive, data-driven updates aligned to school-specific goals/initiatives at every board meeting. Engages the board proactively to address challenges, shares trend data, and includes actionable recommendations to support strategic decisions.	Provides regular updates to the board that include some data on school specific goals/initiatives, though not always fully integrated or forward looking. Consultation occurs consistently, but response to challenges may be more reactive than proactive.	Provides inconsistent updates to the board. Data is limited or not clearly tied to school-specific goals/initiatives. Consultation may be irregular, and responses to issues are often delayed or lacking depth.	Provides minimal or no updates, rarely uses data or goal-related progress in board discussions. The board is not meaningfully consulted on key issues; communication lacks transparency and strategic value.

Staff Development

Education One evaluates school leadership on the effectiveness of systems that promote continuous teacher development and instructional improvement, that credibly differentiates the performance of teachers based on rigorous and fair definitions of teacher effectiveness. There are specific, observable conditions that define what strong performance looks like:

- At least 90.0% of full-time teachers hold or are actively pursuing appropriate Indiana licensure, and all individuals providing services requiring licensure under Indiana law possess the necessary credentials;
- Conduct regular, rigorous evaluations using clearly defined criteria that inform coaching and personnel decisions; and
- Provide sustained, high-quality professional development and coaching that is directly tied to classroom practice and aligns with school priorities to improve instructional effectiveness.

The rubrics for this measure are as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
95.0% or more of teachers and staff are appropriately licensed or hold a permit to teach in the charter school under Indiana Law.	90.0-94.9% of teachers and staff are appropriately licensed or hold a permit to teach in the charter school under Indiana Law.	80-89.9% of teachers and staff are appropriately licensed or hold a permit to teach in the charter school under Indiana Law.	Less than 80.0% 80-89.9% of teachers and staff are appropriately licensed or hold a permit to teach in the charter school under Indiana Law.

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school receives an average instructional rating of 3.5 to 4.0.	The school receives an average instructional rating within the range of 3.0-3.4.	The school receives an average instructional rating within the range of 2.0-2.9.	The school receives an average instructional rating within the range of 1.0-1.9.

Instructional Leadership

Education One expects school leadership teams to actively shape the academic vision of the school by driving instructional quality and student achievement. There are specific, observable conditions that define what strong performance looks like:

- Define specific instructional and behavioral actions that are linked to the school’s mission and/or vision;
- Use classroom observations to provide prompt and actionable feedback to teachers to support the improvement of student outcomes; and
- Analyze assessment results frequently to adjust classroom instruction, grouping of students, and/or identifying students for special intervention.

The rubrics for this measure are as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
<p>The school consistently and effectively implemented instructional strategies that reflect and reinforce the school’s model and/or key initiatives across classrooms and grade levels.</p> <p>90.0% or more of observed classrooms consistently implemented instructional strategies aligned with the school’s model and/or initiatives.</p>	<p>The school generally implemented instructional strategies aligned with the school’s model and/or initiatives, with occasional minor inconsistencies in practice.</p> <p>80-89.9% of observed classrooms consistently implemented instructional strategies aligned with the school’s model and/or initiatives.</p>	<p>The school implemented instructional strategies aligned with the model and/or initiatives inconsistently. Alignment was evident in some areas but lacked coherence or depth across the school.</p> <p>70-79.9% of observed classrooms consistently implemented instructional strategies aligned with the school’s model and/or initiatives.</p>	<p>The school rarely or did not implement instructional strategies aligned with the school’s model and/or initiatives. Evidence of alignment was minimal or absent.</p> <p>Less than 70.0% of observed classrooms consistently implemented instructional strategies aligned with the school’s model and/or initiatives.</p>

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
<p>80.0% or more of classrooms show measurable growth on interim assessments.</p>	<p>65.0-79.9% of classrooms show measurable growth on interim assessments.</p>	<p>50.0-64.9% of classrooms show measurable growth on interim assessments.</p>	<p>Less than 50.0% of classrooms show measurable growth on interim assessments.</p>

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
<p>During data meetings, the leader articulates specific instructional shifts or student groupings tied directly to data trends and demonstrates proactive planning and reflection.</p>	<p>During data meetings, the leader identifies general strengths/needs and proposes instructional or grouping strategies with a logical connection to findings.</p>	<p>During data meetings, the leader provides minimal analysis and instructional or grouping decisions are vague or generic.</p>	<p>During the data meetings, the leader provides no meaningful analysis of the data and makes no instructional adjustments or grouping decisions.</p>

3.3: Organizational Performance of Compliance

The Organizational Performance of Compliance sub-indicator assesses the school's ability to fulfill the requirements of its charter. Data utilized for the ratings of these measures are from the current academic school year and are collected throughout the year via report submissions and scheduled meetings with Education One. The measure for Organizational Performance of Compliance is as follows:

- [Charter Implementation](#)
- [Charter Compliance](#)

Charter Implementation

Education One will hold the charter school accountable to the mission, model, and/or goals outlined in the approved application, ensuring alignment with the Charter Agreement and applicable requirements. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school consistently and clearly demonstrates alignment to its mission, model, and/or stated goals as outlined in the approved application and Charter Agreement. Multiple, observable examples of intentional implementation are evident across systems, practices, and outcomes.	The school generally demonstrates alignment to its mission, model, and/or goals, with minor inconsistencies in implementation. Most key components are present, though depth, intentionality, or consistency may vary slightly across areas.	The school shows partial alignment to its mission, model, and/or goals, but implementation is inconsistent or limited in scope. Some components are present, but connections to the approved application or Charter Agreement are weak or unclear.	The school does not demonstrate clear alignment to its mission, model, and/or goals. Key elements outlined in the approved application or Charter Agreement are missing, inconsistently applied, or contradicted by current practices.

Charter Compliance

Schools are held accountable to be in compliance with the terms of their charter and collaborate effectively with Education One. The following components are assessed monthly:

- Submission of all required compliance documentation on time as set forth by Education One, including but not limited to meeting minutes and schedules, board member information, compliance reports, and employee documentation; and
- Compliance with the terms of its charter, including amendments, school policies and regulations, and applicable federal and state laws.

The rubrics for this measure is as follows:

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
90.0% or more of required compliance documentation was submitted on time.	80.0-89.9% of required compliance documentation was submitted on time.	70.0-79.9% of required compliance documentation was submitted on time.	Less than 70.0% of required compliance documentation was submitted on time.

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The school fully adheres to the terms of its charter, all amendments, and applicable federal/state laws and regulations.	The school complies with most terms of its charter, amendments, and applicable laws.	The school has a few instances of non-compliance with its charter amendments, or applicable laws.	The school fails to comply with significant aspects of its charter, amendments, or applicable laws.

Indicator 4: School Climate

Fundamental Question: Is the climate effective in supporting the school in carrying out its mission and vision?

The School Climate indicator gauges how stakeholder satisfaction supports student re-enrollment and teacher retention. School Climate is broken down into the following measure:

- [Stakeholder Satisfaction](#)

Stakeholder Satisfaction

Education One requires its schools to conduct an annual third-party survey of staff, students, and families, to gauge the school's effectiveness in carrying out its mission and vision. Results should be used to drive programming, policies, and procedure changes, if necessary. Education One's standard for survey reliability is a participation rate of at least 70.0%. The rubric for this measure is as follows:

Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
The weighted percentage of parents, students, and staff reporting overall satisfaction is at or above 80.0%.	The weighted percentage of parents, students, and staff reporting overall satisfaction is between 70.0 and 79.9%.	The weighted percentage of parents, students, and staff reporting overall satisfaction is less than 70.0%.