



Renewal Application

The Nature School of Central Indiana

Education One, L.L.C.

Table of Contents

Renewal Application Overview	2
Part I: Academic Performance	3
Proficiency on State Summative Assessment: Math	4
Growth on State Summative Assessment: E/LA	5
Growth on State Summative Assessment: Math	5
Comparison to Local Schools	5
Chronic Absenteeism	5
Attendance	6
Progress Towards Proficiency: Math	6
Historical Proficiency: Math	6
Part II: Financial Performance	8
Days Cash	8
Part III: Organizational Performance	10
Part IV: School Wide Climate	12
Stakeholder Satisfaction	12

Renewal Application Overview

As part of the charter renewal process, Education One requires each school to provide comprehensive evidence of performance across all indicators outlined in the Accountability Plan Performance Framework. The renewal application is structured to promote transparency, encourage meaningful reflection, and support continuous improvement.

For each performance indicator, the application includes the following components:

- **Overall Rating of Performance Table:** A summary table showing the school's overall annual rating for the indicator across the charter term.
- **Rating Rubric:** A detailed rubric defining the criteria for each performance level: *Meets Standard*, *Approaching Standard*, and *Does Not Meet Standard*.
- **Justification Table:** A narrative explanation of the evidence and rationale that supports the school's overall rating for the indicator.
- **Measure-Specific Rating Table:** A table summarizing the school's annual performance on each individual measure within the indicator over the charter term.

For any measure within a performance indicator that has received a rating of "Approaching Standard" or "Does Not Meet Standard," the school is required to complete an Action Plan detailing how it will address the area of underperformance in the upcoming charter term. This requirement ensures that all renewal decisions are grounded in evidence and that schools are actively working toward improved outcomes for students.

Required Action Plan Template

Measure:	
Current Rating:	
Provide a root cause analysis, explaining the underlying cause(s) for not meeting standard.	
Identify any action the school has taken or will take to receive a rating of meets standard.	
Based on the actions identified, indicate when the school anticipates to meet standard?	
Who will be responsible for implementing the action plan for this measure?	

Completion of the Action Plan(s) is a critical component of the renewal process and provides Education One with clear insight into how the school is actively addressing areas of underperformance. Schools are encouraged to use this opportunity to reflect honestly, identify specific strategies for growth, and demonstrate a commitment to achieving measurable progress. The quality and feasibility of the Action Plan will be considered as part of the overall renewal evaluation.

If additional space or supporting documentation is needed to fully explain the school's improvement strategy, it may be included as an appendix to the renewal application.

Part I: Academic Performance

The Academic Performance review gauges the academic success of the school in serving its target populations and closing equity gaps.

Overall Rating for Academic Performance	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
	Approaching Standard	Approaching Standard	Approaching Standard	Approaching Standard	

Is the school's educational program successful?

Performance Rubric	Meets Standard	The school complies with and presents minimal to no concerns in the indicator measures.
	Approaching Standard	The school presents some concerns in the indicator measures. There is a credible plan to address the issues.
	Does Not Meet Standard	The school presents concerns in some of the indicator measures with no credible plan to address the issues OR the school presents concerns in a majority of indicator measures with or without a credible plan to address the issues.

What did the Overall Rating for Academic Performance mean?

Year 1	The school received an overall rating of Approaching Standard, indicating that the school presented some concerns in the indicator measures but had a credible plan to address those issues. As a new school, there were only four measures in which the school received a rating. Ratings of Does Not Meet Standard were given to growth measures for the school overall and by subgroups for both reading and math on the local benchmark assessment. The school needs to create and implement intentional instructional pacing and standards mapping, specifically in math, to support students in either maintaining grade level proficiency or growing towards proficiency. At the time of the report, the school has a plan in place to implement such structures and the personnel capacity to do so from the leadership team and teaching staff.
Year 2	The school received an overall rating of Approaching Standard, indicating that the school presented some concerns in the indicator measures but had a credible plan to address those issues. During its second year, the school received ratings for 12 measures. The majority of those measures were rated as either Exceeding, Meeting, or Approaching Standard. Ratings of Does Not Meet Standard were given to the achievement measures on the local math benchmark assessment. The school still needs to implement intentional instructional pacing and standards mapping in math, to support students in either maintaining grade level proficiency or growing towards proficiency. Similarly, due to the Montessori and Nature Based Model, it is important that the school work to identify alternative assessments to more appropriately student success and mission implementation. At the time of the report, the school has a plan in place to implement such structures and the personnel capacity to do so from the leadership team and teaching staff.
Year 3	The school received an overall rating of Approaching Standard, indicating that the school presented some concerns in the indicator measures but had a credible plan to address those issues. During its third year, the school received ratings for 20 measures. 15 of those measures were rated as either Exceeding, Meeting, or Approaching Standard. Four of the five measures with a Does Not Meet Standard rating involved math, specifically from the results of the 2022-23 ILEARN assessment. Chronic absenteeism also received a rating of Does Not Meet Standard. The school also exhibited a decrease in overall rating in Instruction. While the school evidenced implementation of next steps from the 2022-23 school year, plans were ineffective in showing progress towards meeting standard. With fidelity, the school is required to implement more frequent formative assessments to guide differentiation instruction throughout the school year. Specifically in math, intervention for students who are not performing on grade level needs to begin after beginning of year local assessments are completed. The school is evidencing that students are outperforming their peers in math when they have finished the last grade in their multi-age classroom. The school needs to complete its assessment of how the curriculum supports the newly revised Indiana Academic Standards and ensure students are being exposed to math content based on those expectations.
Year 4	The school received an overall rating of Approaching Standard, indicating that the school presented some concerns in the indicator measures but had a credible plan to address those issues. During its third year, the school received

	<p>ratings for 26 measures. 20 of those measures were rated as either Exceeding, Meeting, or Approaching Standard. Three of the six measures with a Does Not Meet Standard rating involved math, specifically from the results of the 2023-24 ILEARN assessment. Chronic Absenteeism continues to be a concern. This was the first year the school was compared to local schools and did not outperform in any area. Leadership did focus more efforts in math instruction, curriculum implementation, and differentiation, which was evidenced on increase in student performance on local math assessments. As the school enters its next phase of growth, the focus needs to shift toward strengthening instructional rigor and ensuring that curriculum implementation is both aligned with Montessori principles and grade-level academic expectations. With families drawn to the school's unique nature-based Montessori model, it is essential that all staff are adequately trained to deliver instruction that meets the dual goals of developmental appropriateness and academic challenge.</p>
--	--

	Accountability Plan Performance Framework Indicators	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
State and Federal Academic Performance	Proficiency on State Summative Assessment: E/LA	N/A	N/A	N/A	AS	ES
	Proficiency on State Summative Assessment: Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	DNMS	AS
	Growth on State Summative Assessment: E/LA	N/A	N/A	MS	AS	U/A
	Growth on State Summative Assessment: Math	N/A	N/A	DNMS	AS	U/A
	Pass or Pass+ Status Growth: E/LA	N/A	N/A	MS	AS	U/A
	Did Not Pass Status Growth: E/LA	N/A	N/A	MS	AS	U/A
	Pass or Pass+ Status Growth: Math	N/A	N/A	DNMS	DNMS	U/A
	Did Not Pass Status Growth: Math	N/A	N/A	MS	AS	U/A
	Comparison to Local Schools	N/A	N/A	N/A	DNMS	U/A
	3rd Grade Literacy	N/A	N/A	MS	ES	U/A
	6th Grade Math	N/A	N/A	AS	ES	U/A
	Chronic Absenteeism	N/A	AS	DNMS	DNMS	U/A
	Special Education Compliance	MS	MS	AS	AS	U/A

	Accountability Plan Performance Framework Indicators	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Local Academic Performance	Instruction	MS	MS	AS	MS	U/A
	Attendance	MS	AS	AS	AS	U/A
	Progress Towards Proficiency: E/LA	N/A	N/A	MS	MS	U/A
	Progress Towards Proficiency: Math	N/A	N/A	AS	AS	U/A
	Historical Proficiency: E/LA	N/A	N/A	MS	ES	U/A
	Historical Proficiency: Math	N/A	N/A	ES	DNMS	U/A

*N/A indicates results were not applicable to the school for that year.

**U/A indicates that data is unavailable for the current school year at the time of this application.

Measure:	Proficiency on State Summative Assessment: Math
Current Rating:	Approaching Standard
Provide a root cause analysis, explaining the underlying cause(s) for not meeting standard.	Through lesson observations and data analysis, we identified a gap between classroom instruction and state-level expectations as measured by NWEA and ILEARN. Specifically, our math instruction has not consistently emphasized the <i>representational phase</i> of learning. While learners engage in concrete and abstract work, the representational stage, where learners use models, drawings, or symbols to bridge concrete experiences and abstract reasoning, has not been intentionally or systematically embedded into lessons. This missing component has limited learners' ability to demonstrate and transfer their understanding on standardized assessments.
Identify any action the school has taken or will take to receive a rating of meets standard.	Professional Development: We designed and delivered PD focused on the three phases of math instruction—concrete, representational, and abstract—explicitly connecting each to Montessori practices and clear look-fors during classroom

	<p>observations.</p> <p>Curriculum Alignment: We purchased a Montessori-aligned follow up curriculum that requires learners to demonstrate understanding through written and representational work, ensuring fidelity to all phases of instruction. Additionally, we use the IDOE Item Specification document as pre-tests and/or exit tickets to determine the level of understanding of the standard. This document mirrors the ILEARN assessment so children are used to seeing the questions/skill in a variety of ways.</p> <p>Targeted Practice & Monitoring: We purchased and implemented IXL, which aligns to Indiana Academic Standards and ILEARN checkpoints. Teachers assign IXL lessons directly connected to both Montessori lessons and identified standards aligned to the checkpoints, reinforcing concepts and providing actionable data.</p>
Based on the actions identified, indicate when the school anticipates to meet standard?	We expect to see growth during interim assessments, including ILEARN checkpoints and IXL performance, which will allow us to make timely instructional adjustments. Our ultimate goal is to demonstrate measurable improvement on the ILEARN assessment in Spring, with evidence of progress observable throughout the school year.
Who will be responsible for implementing the action plan for this measure?	<p>Teachers will intentionally incorporate the representational phase into math instruction, assign aligned IXL lessons, and collect evidence of learner mastery.</p> <p>Administrators will co-plan with teachers, monitor implementation through observations, and analyze data monthly to ensure practices are effective. They will provide coaching and support to maintain consistency and improve learner outcomes.</p>

Measure:	Growth on State Summative Assessment: E/LA
Current Rating:	Approaching Standard
Provide a root cause analysis, explaining the underlying cause(s) for not meeting standard.	<p>Analysis of 2024 data revealed that our school's median growth percentile (MGP) decreased by 17 points, resulting in an MGP of 32. This decline impacted multiple subgroups, including White learners, Special Education learners, Pass or Pass+ learners, and Did Not Pass learners. Upon review, we identified two underlying causes: (1) instructional practices did not consistently address the varied needs of these subgroups, particularly in differentiation and targeted small-group work, and (2) our curriculum alignment and progress monitoring lacked the precision needed to ensure learners were making consistent growth toward state-level expectations.</p>
Identify any action the school has taken or will take to receive a rating of meets standard.	<p>Instructional Focus on Differentiation and Flexible Grouping: Teachers are implementing targeted small-group instruction in ELA to address specific learner needs, with additional scaffolds for Special Education learners and extension opportunities for learners already meeting grade-level standards. These groups are going to fluctuate based on the data from classroom observation, IXL, and ILEARN checkpoints. ELA intervention began the 3rd week of school targeting children that did not pass ILEARN ELA or that did not make growth.</p> <p>Curriculum Alignment & Intervention: We reviewed and adjusted our ELA curriculum to strengthen alignment to Indiana Academic Standards and ILEARN Checkpoints. We embedded more intentional practice with comprehension, vocabulary, and written responses to high quality text, ensuring learners are prepared for the rigor of ILEARN.</p> <p>Progress Monitoring: We increased the frequency and depth of data analysis through IXL, ILEARN checkpoints, and classroom-based assessments. Teachers and</p>

	<p>administrators collaboratively reviewed subgroup performance to adjust instruction in real time.</p> <p>Professional Development: Teachers received PD on evidence-based reading strategies, including the Science of Reading through IDOE. Our internal PD has had a focus on supporting diverse learners and differentiating work plans.</p>
Based on the actions identified, indicate when the school anticipates to meet standard?	We expect to see growth during interim assessments, including ILEARN checkpoints and IXL performance, which will allow us to make timely instructional adjustments. Our ultimate goal is to demonstrate measurable improvement on the ILEARN assessment in Spring, with evidence of progress observable throughout the school year.
Who will be responsible for implementing the action plan for this measure?	<p>Teachers will intentionally incorporate the representational phase into math instruction, assign aligned IXL lessons, and collect evidence of learner mastery.</p> <p>Administrators will co-plan with teachers, monitor implementation through observations, and analyze data monthly to ensure practices are effective. They will provide coaching and support to maintain consistency and improve learner outcomes.</p>

Measure:	Growth on State Summative Assessment: Math
Current Rating:	Approaching Standard
Provide a root cause analysis, explaining the underlying cause(s) for not meeting standard.	On NWEA our math median growth percentile (MGP) was 35, representing an increase of 10 points from the prior assessment. On 2025 ILEARN, we had 24% passing with 29% approaching standard. While this growth reflects improvement, it still resulted in a rating of <i>Approaching Standard</i> , with several subgroups: White learners, Special Education learners, Pass or Pass+ learners, and Did Not Pass learners, not meeting standard. Analysis suggests two root causes: (1) math instruction had not consistently included targeted differentiation to address the wide range of learner readiness across subgroups, and (2) while overall instructional practices were improving, there was insufficient emphasis on reinforcing conceptual understanding through ongoing practice and representation, which impacted subgroup performance on standardized measures.
Identify any action the school has taken or will take to receive a rating of meets standard.	<p>Strengthening Differentiation: Teachers are implementing small-group instruction in math that targets subgroup needs, with additional scaffolds and supports for Special Education learners and enrichment opportunities for learners already demonstrating proficiency.</p> <p>Curriculum Alignment: We enhanced our Montessori-based math curriculum to better integrate state standards and ensure learners regularly engage with the concrete, representational, and abstract phases of learning. Our scope and sequence is now aligned to the ILEARN checkpoints.</p> <p>Progress Monitoring: Teachers are using lesson observation, ILEARN Item Level Specification as exit tickets, ILEARN checkpoints, and IXL to monitor learner growth and provide additional practice aligned to state standards. Subgroup data was specifically tracked during monthly data meetings.</p>
Based on the actions identified, indicate when the school anticipates to meet standard?	We expect to see growth during interim assessments, including ILEARN checkpoints and IXL performance, which will allow us to make timely instructional adjustments. Our ultimate goal is to demonstrate measurable improvement on the ILEARN assessment in Spring, with evidence of progress observable throughout the

	school year.
Who will be responsible for implementing the action plan for this measure?	<p>Teachers will intentionally incorporate the representational phase into math instruction, assign aligned IXL lessons, and collect evidence of learner mastery.</p> <p>Administrators will co-plan with teachers, monitor implementation through observations, and analyze data monthly to ensure practices are effective. They will provide coaching and support to maintain consistency and improve learner outcomes.</p>

Measure:	Comparison to Local Schools
Current Rating:	Does Not Meet Standard
Provide a root cause analysis, explaining the underlying cause(s) for not meeting standard.	Our proficiency rates did not meet the standard compared to local schools. After careful analysis, we identified three primary causes: (1) our Montessori-based instruction was not consistently aligned to Indiana Academic Standards in both scope and rigor; (2) learners did not have sufficient practice with questions formatted similarly to ILEARN, limiting their ability to demonstrate mastery in the assessment setting; and (3) flexible grouping strategies were not consistently implemented, which reduced opportunities to target instruction for learners at varying readiness levels.
Identify any action the school has taken or will take to receive a rating of meets standard.	<p>Curriculum Alignment & Rigor: We purchased and implemented Montessori-aligned follow up curriculum materials that explicitly integrate Indiana Academic Standards and require learners to demonstrate mastery in concrete, representational, and abstract ways. Additionally, our scope and sequence is aligned to the ILEARN Checkpoints.</p> <p>Assessment Readiness: We adopted IXL and ILEARN checkpoints to give learners consistent practice with state-aligned questions and formats, ensuring they are prepared for the structure and rigor of ILEARN.</p> <p>Flexible Grouping: Teachers received professional development on using data to create fluid, flexible groups for targeted instruction. This allows learners to receive the support or extension they need, regardless of proficiency level.</p> <p>Professional Development: We are providing ongoing PD in aligning lessons to standards, designing rigorous learning opportunities, flexible grouping, and structuring lessons that build both conceptual understanding and assessment readiness.</p>
Based on the actions identified, indicate when the school anticipates to meet standard?	We expect to see growth during interim assessments, including ILEARN checkpoints and IXL performance, which will allow us to make timely instructional adjustments. Our ultimate goal is to demonstrate measurable improvement on the ILEARN assessment in Spring, with evidence of progress observable throughout the school year.
Who will be responsible for implementing the action plan for this measure?	<p>Teachers will intentionally incorporate the representational phase into math instruction, assign aligned IXL lessons, and collect evidence of learner mastery.</p> <p>Administrators will co-plan with teachers, monitor implementation through observations, and analyze data monthly to ensure practices are effective. They will provide coaching and support to maintain consistency and improve learner outcomes.</p>

Measure:	Chronic Absenteeism
Current Rating:	Does Not Meet Standard

Provide a root cause analysis, explaining the underlying cause(s) for not meeting standard.	Our chronic absenteeism rate was impacted by two primary factors: (1) several learners experienced prolonged illnesses that required week-long or extended absences, and (2) as a parent-transportation school, families occasionally faced barriers in consistently getting learners to school. These factors, while often outside of learners' control, directly affected attendance rates and contributed to our school not meeting standard.
Identify any action the school has taken or will take to receive a rating of meets standard.	<p>Family Communication & Support: We implemented proactive communication with families of learners who show early signs of absenteeism. Administrators and staff collaborate with parents to problem-solve barriers, including transportation challenges.</p> <p>Transportation Partnerships: We are actively exploring partnerships with community organizations and ride-share support systems to provide more reliable options for families with consistent transportation barriers via family Facebook page. We created a heat map of where our learners live to help with ridesharing.</p> <p>Health & Wellness Support: For learners with extended illnesses, we are creating systems to maintain connection to the classroom through take-home packets, digital resources, and ongoing communication with teachers, reducing the impact of time away.</p> <p>Attendance Monitoring: Attendance is tracked daily, with data reviewed weekly in administrative meetings. Early intervention protocols are in place for learners approaching chronic absenteeism thresholds.</p>
Based on the actions identified, indicate when the school anticipates to meet standard?	With systems for early intervention and increased family engagement now in place, we anticipate improvement throughout the 2025–26 school year. While health-related absences will continue to be monitored on a case-by-case basis, our proactive supports and transportation solutions are expected to reduce the overall chronic absenteeism rate and help us meet standard by the next accountability cycle.
Who will be responsible for implementing the action plan for this measure?	<p>Teachers will maintain punctual attendance so the main office can communicate with families when absences occur and support learners in reintegrating academically after missed days. Teachers will also post in their newsletters the importance of attendance and communicating absences in PikMyKid.</p> <p>Administrators will oversee attendance tracking, coordinate transportation supports, and meet with families of chronically absent learners to develop individualized plans..</p>

Measure:	Attendance
Current Rating:	Approaching Standard
Provide a root cause analysis, explaining the underlying cause(s) for not meeting standard.	Our current average daily attendance rate is 94%, which is slightly below the state goal of 95%. The underlying causes include occasional barriers to timely communication with families about attendance expectations and procedures, as well as situations where learners are engaging in academic activities at home but not documented under school attendance records. Additionally, parents face barriers to getting their children to school daily.
Identify any action the school has taken or will take to receive a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactive Parent Communication: In alignment with new state attendance laws, we increased the speed and frequency of communication with

rating of meets standard.	<p>families when absences or tardies occur, ensuring immediate awareness and follow-up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeliness Emphasis: Families receive reminders and support around the importance of punctual arrival to maximize instructional minutes. • Data Monitoring: Attendance data is reviewed weekly, with outreach to families of learners approaching at-risk thresholds.
Based on the actions identified, indicate when the school anticipates to meet standard?	With systems for early intervention and increased family engagement now in place, we anticipate improvement throughout the 2025–26 school year. While health-related absences will continue to be monitored on a case-by-case basis, our proactive supports and transportation solutions are expected to reduce the overall chronic absenteeism rate and help us meet standard by the next accountability cycle.
Who will be responsible for implementing the action plan for this measure?	<p>Teachers will maintain punctual attendance so the main office can communicate with families when absences occur and support learners in reintegrating academically after missed days. Teachers will also post in their newsletters the importance of attendance and communicating absences in PikMyKid.</p> <p>Administrators will oversee attendance tracking, coordinate transportation supports, and meet with families of chronically absent learners to develop individualized plans..</p>

Measure:	Progress Towards Proficiency: Math
Current Rating:	Approaching Standard
Provide a root cause analysis, explaining the underlying cause(s) for not meeting standard.	Our current progress toward proficiency in math is 0.53 , which falls below the state expectation of 1.15 . Analysis shows three underlying causes: (1) inconsistent alignment between Montessori lessons and Indiana Academic Standards limited learners' exposure to the full scope of grade-level content, (2) instruction did not always include the representational phase of learning, which bridges concrete to abstract thinking, and (3) progress monitoring was not frequent or targeted enough to ensure timely interventions for learners who were not on track toward proficiency.
Identify any action the school has taken or will take to receive a rating of meets standard.	<p>Curriculum Alignment: We purchased Montessori-aligned curriculum materials that explicitly integrate Indiana standards and require learners to demonstrate their understanding through concrete, representational, and abstract methods.</p> <p>Targeted Interventions: Teachers are implementing flexible grouping and small-group instruction to provide both remediation for learners not yet proficient and enrichment for those closer to mastery.</p> <p>Progress Monitoring: We strengthened our use of NWEA, ILEARN checkpoints, and IXL to provide frequent, aligned data points. Teachers use this data to adjust instruction and assign targeted lessons tied to state standards.</p> <p>Professional Development: Staff received PD on teaching through the full concrete–representational–abstract sequence and on designing lessons that build both conceptual understanding and assessment readiness.</p>
Based on the actions identified, indicate when the school	We anticipate measurable improvement throughout the 2025–26 school year, with interim growth reflected in ILEARN checkpoints and IXL usage data. Our goal is to

anticipates to meet standard?	close the gap and reach the state target of 1.15 during the Spring 2026 ILEARN assessment cycle.
Who will be responsible for implementing the action plan for this measure?	<p>Teachers will deliver lessons aligned to standards, incorporate the representational phase consistently, and assign targeted IXL lessons based on progress monitoring data.</p> <p>Accessible Education Staff will provide individualized supports to ensure learners with IEPs progress toward grade-level proficiency while addressing specific learning needs.</p> <p>Administrators will co-plan with teachers, lead monthly data reviews, and provide coaching to ensure consistent implementation and effective use of interventions.</p>

Measure:	Historical Proficiency: Math
Current Rating:	Does Not Meet Standard
Provide a root cause analysis, explaining the underlying cause(s) for not meeting standard.	Historical data for math proficiency shows rates of 0.61, 0.51, 0.41, and 0.53 . While the most recent increase reflects improvement, the overall trend demonstrates that learners have not consistently reached proficiency expectations. Root cause analysis indicates: (1) instruction has not always been fully aligned to Indiana Academic Standards in scope and rigor, (2) the representational phase of math instruction was inconsistently implemented, limiting learners' ability to transfer knowledge to standardized assessments, and (3) progress monitoring and targeted interventions were not systematically used across all grade levels to accelerate learners toward proficiency.
Identify any action the school has taken or will take to receive a rating of meets standard.	<p>Curriculum Alignment & Rigor: We adopted Montessori-aligned follow up curriculum materials that explicitly integrate Indiana standards and require demonstration of understanding in concrete, representational, and abstract forms.</p> <p>Targeted Practice: Learners receive aligned IXL lessons connected to Montessori lessons and ILEARN checkpoints to build both conceptual mastery and familiarity with state assessment formats.</p> <p>Flexible Grouping: Teachers now use formative data to create dynamic small groups, allowing for targeted remediation or enrichment as needed.</p> <p>Data-Driven Instruction: Teachers and administrators meet monthly to analyze NWEA, ILEARN checkpoint, and classroom data, ensuring timely interventions for learners not on track toward proficiency.</p> <p>Professional Development: Teachers received PD on lesson design that includes the full concrete–representational–abstract sequence and on strategies to increase learner readiness for rigorous, standards-based assessments.</p>
Based on the actions identified, indicate when the school anticipates to meet standard?	While historical proficiency rates have trended downward, the recent increase to 0.53 indicates that our corrective actions are beginning to yield results. We anticipate continued growth during the 2025–26 school year, with incremental gains visible in ILEARN checkpoints and NWEA assessments, and we project meeting standard on the Spring 2026 ILEARN assessment cycle.
Who will be responsible for implementing the action plan for this measure?	<p>Teachers will consistently embed the representational phase, assign targeted practice aligned to standards, and monitor learner progress in small groups.</p> <p>Accessible Education Staff will adapt instruction to ensure accessibility for</p>

	<p>learners with IEPs while maintaining alignment to grade-level expectations.</p> <p>Administrators will oversee curriculum alignment, lead monthly data reviews, and provide coaching to ensure instructional consistency and rigor across classrooms.</p>
--	---

Part II: Financial Performance

The Financial Performance review gauges both short-term financial health as well as long term financial stability, while accounting for key financial reporting requirements.

Overall Rating for Financial Performance	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
	Approaching Standard	Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Meets Standard	

Is the school in good financial standing?		
Performance Rubric	Meets Standard	The school complies with and presents minimal to no concerns in the indicator measures.
	Approaching Standard	The school presents some concerns in the indicator measures. There is a credible plan to address the issues.
	Does Not Meet Standard	The school presents concerns in some of the indicator measures with no credible plan to address the issues OR the school presents concerns in a majority of indicator measures with or without a credible plan to address the issues.

What did the Overall Rating for Financial Performance mean?	
Year 1	The school received a rating of Approaching Standard by presenting concerns in indicator measures with a credible plan to address the issues. Overall, the school needs to ensure it is budgeting based on an attainable enrollment projection and increase its days cash.
Year 2	The school received a rating of Meets Standard by presenting minimal concerns in the indicator measures. The school appropriately budgeted based on an attainable enrollment and increased its days cash to meet standard. There were deficiencies noted in the school's first audit, which reflected the school's overall financial management. However, the school quickly addressed the concern within the school year, leaving minimal concern at the time of the annual review.
Year 3	The school received a rating of Meets Standard, with no concerns in the indicator measures. The school continues to improve upon financial management practices during its third year in operation, meeting or exceeding enrollment targets, and increasing days cash over time.
Year 4	The school received a rating of Meets Standard, with minimal concerns in the indicator measures. The school continues to improve upon financial management by exceeding enrollment targets. Days Cash did decrease throughout the school year.

Accountability Plan Performance Framework Indicators		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Financial Performance	Financial Management	MS	AS	MS	MS	U/A
	Enrollment Variance	DNMS	MS	ES	ES	U/A
	Current Ratio	MS	MS	MS	MS	U/A
	Days Cash	AS	MS	MS	AS	U/A
	Debt/Default Delinquency	MS	MS	MS	MS	U/A
	Debt to Asset Ratio	MS	MS	MS	MS	U/A
	Debt Service Coverage	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	U/A

*N/A indicates results were not applicable to the school for that year.

**U/A indicates that data is unavailable for the current school year at the time of this application.

Measure:	Days Cash
Current Rating:	Approaching Standard

Provide a root cause analysis, explaining the underlying cause(s) for not meeting standard.	<p>Zoning Permissions for Wallingwood Purchase – The attempted acquisition of the Wallingwood property required additional zoning approvals. This delayed the project and created unanticipated holding and planning costs that impacted available cash.</p> <p>Unexpected Yurt Costs – The school invested in yurt structures to provide immediate classroom space while awaiting permanent facilities. The actual cost of installation and compliance exceeded original estimates, reducing reserves more than planned.</p>
Identify any action the school has taken or will take to receive a rating of meets standard.	Budget revisions and tighter cash controls were implemented to reduce discretionary spending and build reserves more quickly. Salary freezes, reduce unnecessary spending, and usage of grant dollars for salary budget.
Based on the actions identified, indicate when the school anticipates to meet standard?	As of June 30, 2025 , our school achieved 88 days cash on hand , meeting the required threshold. Based on current financial trajectory and implemented changes, the school anticipates maintaining a “Meets Standard” rating going forward , with reserves continuing to grow through FY2026 and beyond.
Who will be responsible for implementing the action plan for this measure?	<p>Head of School – Oversight of financial health, facilities planning, and board communication.</p> <p>Board Governance – Monitoring reserves, approving budgets, and ensuring compliance with financial policies.</p> <p>Finance Team (Accountant and AT Financing) – Day-to-day financial operations, cash flow monitoring, and reporting.</p>

Part III: Organizational Performance

The Organizational Performance review gauges the academic and operational leadership of the school.

Overall Rating for Organizational Performance	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
	Approaching Standard	Approaching Standard	Meets Standard	Meets Standard	

Is the school's organizational structure successful?

Performance Rubric	Meets Standard	The school complies with and presents minimal to no concerns in the indicator measures.
	Approaching Standard	The school presents some concerns in the indicator measures. There is a credible plan to address the issues.
	Does Not Meet Standard	The school presents concerns in some of the indicator measures with no credible plan to address the issues OR the school presents concerns in a majority of indicator measures with or without a credible plan to address the issues.

What does the Overall Rating for Organizational Performance mean?

Year 1	Overall, the school received a rating of Approaching Standard, indicating that there were some concerns with the indicator measures but the school presented credible plans to address those issues. The school was held accountable to seven measures and received ratings of approaching standard in five of them. Moving into the 2022-23 school year, there needs to be an increase in overall engagement at the board level during board meetings, more representation of various skill sets, and an increase in discussions about academic outcomes and programming. Clear roles and responsibilities of the board and leadership team need to be established within the shared leadership structure.
Year 2	Overall, the school received a rating of Approaching Standard, indicating that there were some concerns with the indicator measures but the school presented credible plans to address those issues or were showing improvement towards meeting standard. The school was held accountable to seven measures and received a rating of approaching standard in two of them. Moving forward, committee structures should be employed and organized in a way that allows the board to accomplish its work strategically and efficiently. Board meeting materials also need to be distributed in a timely manner to Education One prior to scheduled meetings.
Year 3	Overall, the school received a rating of Meets Standard, indicating that there were minimal concerns with the indicator measures. The school established a plan to address the issue involving Special Education Compliance. It has proven to be effective. The school needs more time to evidence that the issue has been fully remedied.
Year 4	Overall, the school received a rating of Meets Standard, indicating that there were minimal concerns with the indicator measures. As the school transitions out of its foundational years, focused on establishing policies and procedures, it is now entering a critical phase of implementation with fidelity. This shift requires both the governing board and school leadership team to align their efforts toward practices that directly impact student outcomes, enrollment stability, and teacher retention. Moving from system-building to system-execution will be key to initiating progress and drive measurable improvement across all areas of the school.

	Accountability Plan Performance Framework Indicators	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Governing Board	Focus on High Academic Achievement	AS	MS	MS	MS	U/A
	Commitment to Exemplary Governance	AS	AS	MS	MS	U/A
	Fiduciary Responsibilities	AS	MS	MS	MS	U/A
	Strategic Planning and Oversight	AS	AS	MS	MS	U/A
	Legal and Regulatory Compliance	MS	MS	MS	MS	U/A
School Leader	Culture of High Expectations				MS	U/A
	Staff Development	MS	MS	MS	MS	U/A

	Instructional Leadership				MS	U/A
Compliance	Charter Compliance	AS	MS	MS	MS	U/A

*N/A indicates results were not applicable to the school for that year.

**U/A indicates that data is unavailable for the current school year at the time of this application.

Part IV: School Wide Climate

The School Climate indicator gauges how stakeholder satisfaction supports student re-enrollment and teacher retention.

Overall Rating for School Climate	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
	Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Approaching Standard	Approaching Standard	

Is the school's organizational structure successful?		
Performance Rubric	Meets Standard	The school complies with and presents minimal to no concerns in the indicator measures.
	Approaching Standard	The school presents some concerns in the indicator measures. There is a credible plan to address the issues.
	Does Not Meet Standard	The school presents concerns in some of the indicator measures with no credible plan to address the issues OR the school presents concerns in a majority of indicator measures with or without a credible plan to address the issues.

Accountability Plan Performance Framework Indicators					Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Stakeholder Satisfaction					MS	MS	AS	AS	U/A

*N/A indicates results were not applicable to the school for that year.

**U/A indicates that data is unavailable for the current school year at the time of this application.

Measure:	Stakeholder Satisfaction
Current Rating:	Approaching Standard
Provide a root cause analysis, explaining the underlying cause(s) for not meeting standard.	<p>The school did not initially meet the stakeholder satisfaction standard due to low participation rates in feedback collection. Although a Google Form was included in the weekly newsletter, only a small number of stakeholders (families, staff, and community members) engaged with the survey. The underlying causes include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Survey Accessibility – The form was linked in a newsletter format that may not have been convenient for quick responses, especially on cell phones. Survey Fatigue – Families already receive multiple school communications, and stakeholders may not see an incentive to complete another form. Limited Awareness of Impact – Stakeholders may not understand how their feedback directly influences school decisions, lowering motivation to respond.
Identify any action the school has taken or will take to receive a rating of meets standard.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diversified Feedback Channels – In addition to the newsletter, the school has begun offering paper surveys at events, QR codes posted in classrooms, and short in-person exit polls at family meetings. Simplified Survey Design – The school shortened surveys to take under two minutes and provided bilingual options for accessibility. Communicating Impact – Results and actions taken based on past feedback are now shared in newsletters and at parent nights, helping

	families see that their input matters.
Based on the actions identified, indicate when the school anticipates to meet standard?	The school anticipates achieving "Meets Standard" by the end of FY2026 , with a significant increase in participation rates expected by the conclusion of the 2025–26 school year. Early indicators (e.g., pilot focus groups and paper survey returns) suggest rising engagement levels.
Who will be responsible for implementing the action plan for this measure?	<p>Administration – Ensuring that stakeholder voice remains central in planning and decision-making.</p> <p>Administrative Coordinator– Leading survey distribution, data collection, and communications.</p> <p>Board Governance – Reviewing results and ensuring stakeholder feedback informs policy and school improvement.</p>