

Evaluation Rubric

The University of St. Thomas (St. Thomas) Accountability System, including the Evaluation Framework and Evaluation Rubric will be used on an annual basis to evaluate schools, and whenever formal decisions are made about the effectiveness of a charter school in meeting its stated mission and objectives as well as the expectations set forth in its contract.

The Accountability System will be used by authorizing program staff and by the St. Thomas Charter School Authorizing Board to assess authorized schools' suitability for Contract Renewal, program expansion, and to evaluate any charter school seeking a change of authorizer.

Please note that the rubric below represents a template that will be modified to enable UST to appropriately evaluate each of its authorized schools.

SECTION I – IS THE LEARNING PROGRAM A SUCCESS?

1.1 3rd Grade MCA Reading Proficiency: Are students proficient in reading?

1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 40% of are proficient in reading.
2 = Approaching standard	40-55.0% of students are proficient in reading.
3 = Meets standard	55.1%-75.0% of students are proficient in reading.
4 = Exceeds standard	More than 75% of students are proficient in reading.

2025

Rating: Enter the number that most closely matches your assessment:

Comments/Evidence: 25% of third grade students at Cornerstone Montessori scored as proficient in reading. This is another significant decrease in proficiency and well below the state proficiency of 46.5%.

2024

Rating: Enter the number that most closely matches your assessment:

Comments/Evidence: 47.6% of third grade students scored as proficient in reading. This is slightly below the state average (48%) and a significant decrease from the 2022 average (63.6%).

Data Source: Minnesota Department of Education *School Report Card*, Test Data spreadsheets

1.2 MCA Proficiency: Are students performing as well as or better than the state, the resident district, and demographically comparable schools on MCA math and reading exams?

1.2a Reading

1.2b Mathematics

1 = Does not meet standard	More than 10 percentage points below comparison groups
2 = Approaching standard	6-10 percentage points below comparison groups
3 = Meets standard	Within 5 percentage points of comparison groups
4 = Exceeds standard	Exceeds comparison group by more than 5 percentage points

	Reading Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	52.7%			
Average of demographic match schools	40.8%	4	37.5%	1.5
Resident district	33.9%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	51.6%	3	25%	.75
			100%	Reading Total: 3.75
	Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	26%			
Average of demographic match schools	33.7%	2	37.5%	.75
Resident district	29.8%	3	37.5%	1.125
State	49.9%	1	25%	.25
			100%	Math Total: 2.125

2025

1.2a Reading: 3.75

1.2b Mathematics: 2.125

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 2.9

Comments/Evidence: Cornerstone continued to outperform the demographic match schools, resident district and the state in reading. The math scores were on par with the resident district, but fell below the demographic match schools and the state.

2024

1.2a Reading: 4

1.2b Mathematics: 3.625

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.8

Comments/Evidence: Cornerstone outperformed the resident district as well as the state in reading. The reading proficiency scores dropped a bit from 2022 (down 4.81%) but individual grades showed good growth, especially 6th grade with an increase of 47.3%. Math proficiency was higher than the demographic match schools as well as the resident district. Scores showed an increase of 3.35% from 2022.

Source: MCA data available on MDE website or school self report if cell size is too small, Test data spreadsheets

1.3 MCA Proficiency, State Demographic Comparison by Race/Ethnicity and FRL: Are student demographic groups (with tested cell sizes greater than 10) performing as well as or better than the statewide average for that student group? Note that for schools with greater than 70% of students qualifying for FRL, demographic categories will also be filtered by FRL status. All relevant demographic groups will be individually scored per the rubric targets below and averaged to produce a score for each subject area (math/reading). The overall score for the metric is then produced by averaging the subject area scores.

1.3a Reading

1.3b Mathematics

1 = Does not meet standard	Demographic group falls more than 10 percentage points below the state average for that group.
2 = Approaching standard	Demographic group falls 6-10 percentage points below the state average for that group.
3 = Meets standard	Demographic group falls within 5 percentage points of the state average for that group.
4 = Exceeds standard	Demographic group is exceeding statewide performance for that group by more than 5 percentage points.

	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Math Proficiency				
All	26%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 2 – Latine	8.3%	21.8%	Included for information only	1
Average of math scores for each demographic group: 1				
	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Reading Proficiency	52.7%			
All	25%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 2 - Latine	28.1%	3	Included for information only	
Average of reading scores for each demographic group: 3				

2025

1.3a Reading: 3

1.3b Mathematics: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 2

Comments/Evidence: The Hispanic subgroup was the only group large enough for scores to be included. In reading, Cornerstone performed on par with the state with Cornerstone 3.1% lower than the state. In math, Cornerstone's scores were 13.5% lower than the state.

2024

1.3a Reading: 4

1.3b Mathematics: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 2.5

Comments/Evidence: Both Black and Latine demographic subgroups outperformed the state in reading but fell short in math.

Source: MCA data available on MDE 'MN Report Card'

1.4 MCA Progress : Are students maintaining or moving toward proficiency? Note: Maintaining proficiency is defined as students who were proficient (meeting or exceeding) remaining in either the meeting or exceeding category. Moving toward proficiency is defined as a student moving up one or more 'levels' (does not meet to partially meets; partially meets to proficient, etc.).

1.4a Reading

1.4b Mathematics

1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 35% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency.
2 = Approaching standard	35-50% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency.
3 = Meets standard	51.1-65% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency.
4 = Exceeds standard	More than 65% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency.

2025

1.4a Reading: 3

1.4b Mathematics: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 2

Comments: In reading, 52% of students were maintaining or moving toward proficiency which exceeded the state percentage of 47.8%. In math, the percentage for Cornerstone was 25.3%, which was below the state percentage of 42.8%.

2024

1.4a Reading: 3

1.4b Mathematics: 3

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3

Comments/Evidence: 58.6% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency in math and 63.9% in reading. Both exceed the state percentage, math by 2.3% and reading by 3.9%.

Source: MCA data available on MDE website or school self report if cell size is too small, Test data spreadsheets

1.5 MCA Growth (Comparison Group): Are students making progress at the same or better rate as the state, resident district, and their demographically comparable schools? Note that this measure uses the Minnesota Department of Education's definition of growth as a student maintaining at a level above "Does Not Meet" or increasing their proficiency level on the MCAs from the most recent prior year of testing data to the current year of testing data.

1.5a Reading

1.5b Mathematics

1 = Does not meet standard	More than 10 percentage points below comparison groups
2 = Approaching standard	6-10 percentage points below comparison groups
3 = Meets standard	Within 5 percentage points of comparison groups
4 = Exceeds standard	Exceeds comparison group by more than 5 percentage points

	Reading Growth	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Points earned
Charter	72.4%		
Resident district	47.5%	4	4
State	61%	4	4
			Reading Total: 4
	Math Growth	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Points earned
Charter	37.5%		
Resident district	36.4%	3	3
State	56.4%	1	1
			Math Total: 2

2025

1.5a Reading: 4

1.5b Mathematics: 2

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3

Comments/Evidence: In reading, the percentage of students who improved or maintained proficiency was 72.4% which exceeded the resident district (47.5%) and the state (61%). In math, the percentage of 37.5% was slightly higher than the resident district (36.7%) but below the state (56.4%).

2024

1.5a Reading: 3.5

1.5b Mathematics: 3.5

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.5

Comments/Evidence: CMES outperformed both the resident district as well as the state in both reading and math in their growth scores.

Source: MCA data available on MDE website or school self report if cell size is too small, Test data spreadsheets

1.6 Are students performing at or above target levels, as measured using the school's selected standardized assessments?

1.6a Reading

1.6b Mathematics

Cornerstone Montessori Elementary School will be using the Fastbridge Assessment

1 = Does not meet standard	Assessments indicate that a minimal proportion of tested students performed at or above target levels (less than 40%).
2 = Approaching standard	Assessments indicate that an inadequate proportion of tested performed at or above target levels (40%-50%).
3 = Meets standard	Assessments indicate that an adequate proportion of tested performed at or above target levels (50.1%-65%).
4 = Exceeds standard	Assessments indicate that a high proportion of tested students performed at or above target levels (more than 65%).

2025

1.6a Reading: 4

1.6b Math: 3

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.5

Comments: On the Fastbridge Assessment, 69% of students performed at or above target levels in reading and 54% in math. Both of these percentages exceeded the results of the previous year.

2024

1.6a Reading:

1.6b Math:

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores:

Comments: 63% of students performed at or above target levels in reading and 49% in math.

Source: Annual Report, End of year report, Test data spreadsheets

1.7 Are students making substantial and adequate gains over time, as measured using the school's selected standardized assessments?

1.7a Reading

1.7b Mathematics

CMES will be using the Fastbridge Assessment

1 = Does not meet standard	Analysis indicates that a minimal proportion of tested students made expected gains (less than 40%).
2 = Approaching standard	Analysis indicates that an inadequate proportion of tested students made expected gains (40%-50%).
3 = Meets standard	Analysis indicates that an adequate proportion of tested students made expected gains (50.1%-65%).
4 = Exceeds standard	Analysis indicates that an adequate proportion of tested students made expected gains (more than 65%).

2025

1.7a Reading:

1.7b Math:

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores:

Comments: 45% of students made expected gains in reading and 58% made the expected gains in math.

2024

1.7a Reading:

1.7b Math:

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores:

Comments: 45% of students made expected gains in reading and 30% of students made expected gains in math.

Source: Annual Report, End of year report, Test data spreadsheets

1.8 Is the school meeting state and authorizer-established targets for graduation rate?
This goal will not apply to the school based on the grades served.

Goal not applicable due to grades served.

Source: MDE Data Analytics Request

1.9 Does students' performance on post-secondary readiness assessments (i.e.: ACT, SAT, Accuplacer) reflect college and career readiness?

This goal will not apply to the school based on the grades served.

Goal not applicable due to grades served.

Source: MDE Website (SLEDs), Annual report

1.10 Is the school meeting its school-specific academic goal(s)? Each school has at least one measurable school-specific goal based on its mission statement. If the school has more than one goal, scores will be averaged.

a. CMES will outperform the State on the Science MCA for grade 5.

b. CMES will earn an annual AMI accreditation rating of "Recognized".

1 = Does not meet standard	School has clearly not met any of its school-specific academic goals.
2 = Approaching standard	School is making progress toward meeting all its school-specific academic goals.
3 = Meets standard	School has met its school-specific academic goals.
4 = Exceeds standard	School has met all school-specific academic goals and clearly exceeded expectations for one or more of those goals.

2025

Rating:

a. 2

b. 4

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3

Comments: Cornerstone's results on the Science MCA (36.8%) were lower than the state (45%) which is unusual as Cornerstone generally outperforms the state in Science.

In the annual accreditation, Cornerstone was fully recognized and one of the lead guides was also accepted into the AMI training of trainers program.

2024

Rating:

c. 4

d. 4

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 4

Comments: CMES continues to outperform the state in Science. 68.4% of fifth grade students met or exceeded on the Science MCA compared to the state average of 48.4%. The percentage is higher than 2022 by 4.4%. Also to be noted is the percentage of students who exceeded standards also increased by 2.5%.

CMES earned an accreditation rating of recognized at both the Primary and Elementary levels. The report cited numerous positive observations and pointed out the improvements made from the previous year.

Source: Annual report

1.11 Are English Learners (ELs) performing at or above the state average for ELs as measured by the percentage of the school's identified ELs who reached or went past their target on the ACCESS/Alternate ACCESS assessment?

1.11a: Reading

1.11b: Math

1 = Does not meet standard	More than 10 percentage points below state EL performance.
2 = Approaching standard	6-10 percentage points below state EL performance.
3 = Meets standard	Within 5 percentage points of state EL performance.
4 = Exceeds standard	Exceeds state EL performance by more than 5 percentage points.

2025

1.11a: Reading:

1.11b: Math:

Overall Rating:

Comments: The number of EL students completing the ACCESS was too small to be reported.

2024

1.11a: Reading:

1.11b: Math:

Overall Rating:

Comments: The number of EL students completing the MCA was too small to be reported.

Source: MDE website

1.12 Are students receiving special education services performing at or above the state average for students receiving special education services as measured by MCA/MTAS proficiency?

1.12a: Reading

1.12b: Math

1 = Does not meet standard	More than 10 percentage points below state special education performance.
2 = Approaching standard	6-10 percentage points below state special education performance.
3 = Meets standard	Within 5 percentage points of state special education performance.
4 = Exceeds standard	Exceeds state special education performance by more than 5 percentage points.

2025

1.12a: Reading:

1.12b: Math:

Overall Rating:

Comments: 30% of students receiving special education services were proficient in reading which exceeds the state average by 7.7%. 20% of students receiving special education services partially met standards for math, but none of the students were proficient.

2024

1.12a: Reading:

1.12b: Math:

Overall Rating:

Comments: 30.8% of students receiving special education services were proficient in reading which exceeds the state average by 5.2%. None of the students receiving special education services were proficient on the Math MCA. 15.4% were able to partially meet standards.

Source: MDE website

1.13 Early Learning: Are preschool and/or prekindergarten students performing at or above target levels on their final assessment, as measured using the school's selected preK and/or kindergarten readiness assessments?

This goal does not apply based on the grades served.

Source: Annual Report, School Selected Assessment Data Spreadsheet

1.14 Does the school's learning program exemplify the mission and vision of the school?

1 = Does not meet standard	The learning program does not exemplify the mission and vision of the school in policy or practice, and school leadership and/or the Board do not recognize the need to synchronize the two.
2 = Approaching standard	The learning program does not exemplify the mission and vision of the school. School leadership and the Board recognize the need to synchronize the two.
3 = Meets standard	The learning program exemplifies the mission and vision of the school. Staff are able to articulate this through daily teaching.
4 = Exceeds standard	The learning program exemplifies the mission and vision of the school. Staff are able to articulate this through daily teaching. Board, academic, and operational decisions are made with the school's mission in mind.

2025**Rating: 4**

Comments: Cornerstone is living the mission and vision. This is clearly observed during site visits, through board documents and quarterly reports. When visiting the school, the commitment of students, teachers, staff, leadership and parents is observable and reinforced in discussions with all stakeholders. Classroom observations showed students engaged and teachers invested in the learning. It is clear that the true Montessori model is being followed and students are enjoying learning. There is a thoughtful approach to professional development and to the use of data to support students. Cornerstone continues to demonstrate a proactive approach and a strong commitment to strengthening the school community.

2024**Rating:**

Comments: It is evident during site visits and through ongoing communication and submitted reports that Cornerstone works very hard to educate the whole child through a comprehensive and robust Montessori education. Decisions made by the board and by school leaders are made through the lens of what is best for the children and what will further the mission and vision of the school. The high level of staff and student retention speaks to the satisfaction of staff, parents and students with the Cornerstone program.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, strategic plan or other documentation

1.15 Are students accepted to and enrolling in post-secondary programs at a high rate? Note: Post-secondary programs can include training in the trades, vocational programs, and 2 and 4 year college programs.

This goal will not apply to the school based on the grades served.

Source: MDE Sleds Data, Annual Report (School reported data)

1.16 Are students equitably accessing college and/or career preparation opportunities (e.g. AP, IB, CIS, PSEO, Honors, apprenticeships, internships) at high rates?

This goal will not apply to the school based on the grades served.

Source: MDE SLEDS Data, Annual Report (School Reported Data Chart)

SECTION 2: FINANCIAL VIABILITY – DOES THE SCHOOL EXHIBIT STRONG FISCAL HEALTH?

2.1 Does the school have an active finance committee that meets regularly and reports to the full board?

1 = Does not meet standard	The school has no active finance committee
2 = Approaching standard	The school's finance committee meets only as needed and only to review financials and/or the finance committee does not report its findings to the full board.
3 = Meets standard	The finance committee meets monthly, examines financial statements, and provides a thorough report of its findings to the full board.
4 = Exceeds standard	The finance committee meets at least monthly and examines financial statements, as well as short and long-range financial issues. Thorough reports of findings are provided to the board.

2025

Rating: 4

Comments: The school has an active finance committee that meets at least monthly and keeps a close eye on enrollment and all financial issues affecting the school.

2024

Rating:

Comments: The finance committee is active and is constantly searching for better financial solutions. Findings are consistently reported to the full board.

Source: Monthly board packets; Annual Report, Site visits

2.2 Does the board have a fund balance policy that includes fund balance goals over time?

1 = Does not meet standard	The school board does not have a fund balance policy
2 = Approaching standard	The school board has a fund balance policy but it does not include established goals over time
3 = Meets standard	The school board has a fund balance policy including goals over time
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE.

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The fund balance policy stipulates a 20% minimum fund balance.

2024

Rating:

Comments: The school board has a fund balance policy that indicates the need for a minimum of a 20% fund balance.

Source: Monthly board packets; Board policy manual, Quarterly Report

2.3 Does the school have a clean audit with no major findings?

1 = Does not meet standard	The audit is not “clean” OR has at least one of the following: (1) a material weakness on internal controls, (2) a finding on compliance with state law, or (3) three or more other findings
2 = Approaching standard	The audit has two findings, other than internal controls or compliance, but is considered “clean”
3 = Meets standard	The audit is “clean” and has one finding, other than internal controls or compliance
4 = Exceeds standard	The audit has no findings and is “clean”

2025

Rating: 4

Comments: The school has a clean audit with no findings.

2024

Rating:

Comments: The school has a clean audit with no findings.

Source: Annual financial audit

2.4 Does the school establish and maintain a balanced budget?

- Budget is approved and provided to UST before June 30;
- Includes a cash flow projection for the year showing positive cash flow;
- Is adjusted in a timely fashion when needed;
- Meets established fund balance policy goals; and
- Does not require major* program cuts)?

**Major program cuts are defined as cuts that impact a school’s ability to deliver its core programming to students in a way that negatively impacts student experience.*

1 = Does not meet standard	A budget is not approved by June 30; the budget is not adequately detailed; no cash flow projection is established; lower than expected enrollment requires major budget adjustments; or the budget does not meet the fund balance policy goals set forth by the board.
2 = Approaching standard	A detailed budget is approved before June 30 but may not include a cash flow projection for the year; established budget may require adjustment due to lower than expected enrollment; budget meets the fund balance policy goals set forth by the board.

3 = Meets standard	The detailed budget is approved before June 30 and includes a cash flow projection for the year; established budget is based on realistic enrollment; and is adjusted if needed. The budget meets the fund balance policy goals set forth by the board and allows for maintenance of core programming.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
2025	
Rating: 3	
Comments: A detailed budget is approved prior to June 30 with a conservative enrollment projection.	
2024	
Rating: 3	
Comments: CMES establishes a budget which is approved before June 30 and is based on a realistic, conservative enrollment projection.	
Source: Monthly board packets, UST site visits, UST meetings with business manager(s)	

2.5 Budgeted Enrollment Realization: Does the school's target ADM (as established by initial board-approved budget) match its actual ADM? (Calculated as actual ADM divided by budgeted ADM.)	
1 = Does not meet standard	Enrollment realization is 90% or less.
2 = Approaching standard	Enrollment realization is 90-95%.
3 = Meets standard	Enrollment realization is greater than 95%.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
2025	
Rating: 3	
Comments: The school's target ADM was 138 and the actual ADM was 136 for an enrollment realization of 98%.	
2024	
Rating: <u> 3 </u>	
Comments: The 2022-23 budget was set at 141 ADM. The actual ADM was 140.55 which results in a 99% enrollment realization.	
Source: Monthly board packets, Quarterly Report, UST site visits, UST meetings with business manager(s)	

2.6 Does the school have sufficient cash on hand to meet its near-term obligations?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The school has fewer than 30 days cash on hand.
2 = Approaching standard	The school maintains 30-59 days cash on hand.
3 = Meets standard	The school maintains a minimum of 60 days cash on hand or is meeting the cash on hand requirements of its bond covenants, whichever is greater.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
2025 Rating: 2 Comments: The audited cash on hand was 51.8 days.	
2024 Rating: 3 Comments: The audited cash on hand was 110.1 days, which far exceeds the bond covenants.	
Source: Annual Report, Auditor Report, Financial Statements, Board policies	

2.7 For established schools (in operation for at least 4 years) does the school have a sufficient fund balance?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The school's fund balance is less than 10% of annual expenditures.
2 = Approaching standard	The school's fund balance is between 10-15% of annual expenditures.
3 = Meets standard	The school's fund balance is more than 15% of annual expenditures.
4 = Exceeds standard	The school's fund balance is more than 20% of annual expenditures AND overall academic outcomes fall within the 'meets standard' range.
2025 Rating: 4 Comments: The fund balance in SY24 was 34.5%.	
2024 Rating: 4 Comments: The fund balance reported in the 2022-23 audit is 42.2%. This exceeds the 20% minimum in the fund balance policy.	
Source: Annual Report, Auditor Report, Financial Statements, Board policies	

2.8 Is the school meeting bond covenants (if applicable)?

1 = Does not meet standard	The school is not meeting one or more bond covenants.
2 = Approaching standard	The school is meeting all bond covenants in the current year, but has been out of compliance with one or more covenants in the past three years.
3 = Meets standard	The school has consistently met all bond covenants.
4 = Exceeds standard	Not Applicable

2025**Rating: 3****Comments:** The school continues to meet all bond covenants.**2024****Rating:** **Comments:** The school is consistently meeting all bond covenants.**Source:** Annual Report, Auditor Report, Financial Statements, Board policies**SECTION 3: IS THE ORGANIZATION EFFECTIVE AND WELL RUN?****3.1 Do all board members meet the statutory requirements for initial and ongoing training on board roles and responsibilities, governance, finance and employment practices?**

1 = Does not meet standard	Three or more board members are/have been out of compliance during the school year.
2 = Approaching standard	Two or fewer board members are/have been out of compliance during the school year.
3 = Meets standard	All board members meet training requirements
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE.

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The board members have all met the training requirements and continue to participate in ongoing training throughout the school year.

2024

Rating:

Comments: All board members meet training requirements and participate in ongoing training throughout the school year.

Source: Monthly board packets, UST site visits, Statement of compliance sheet

3.2 Does the board understand and comply with the Open Meeting Law and maintain orderly records including its bylaws, policies, board/committee minutes, and board packets?

1 = Does not meet standard	The board does not understand the requirements of the Open Meeting Law and has been out of compliance more than once in the last year and/or the board does not maintain its records in an orderly fashion
2 = Approaching standard	The board exhibits working knowledge of the requirements of the Open Meeting Law and has been out of compliance no more than once in the last year and maintains its records properly, with minor exceptions.
3 = Meets standard	The board understands and meets the requirements of the Open Meeting Law and maintains its records in an orderly fashion.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The board understands and complies with Open Meeting Law. The records are maintained both digitally and on paper.

2024

Rating:

Comments: Through board observations and conversations with various board members, it is clear that the Board understands and follows Open Meeting Law.

Source: Board minutes, ongoing correspondence, UST site visits

3.3 Are all the school's educational staff appropriately licensed?

1 = Does not meet standard	At least one educational staff is not appropriately licensed or does not hold appropriate and current waivers or variances.
2 = Approaching standard	At least one educational staff has been on a waiver or variance for more than one year.
3 = Meets standard	All educational staff are appropriately licensed.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: All staff members are appropriately licensed. Two staff members are out of field special education teachers.

2024

Rating:

Comments: All staff are appropriately licensed. There is one staff member who does not hold a current license but works with a fully licensed staff. CMES has one teacher with out of field permission for Special Education.

Source: MDE STAR Discrepancy Reports (self-reported data, crosscheck with licensure file checks) D-1

3.4 Does the school complete criminal background checks in accordance with MN Statute and UST expectations?

1 = Does not meet standard	The school cannot certify that it completes criminal background checks of staff and the board.
2 = Approaching standard	The school certifies that it completes criminal background checks of the staff but not the board.
3 = Meets standard	The school certifies that it completes criminal background checks of staff and the board, as required by school policy.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The school completes criminal background checks for all staff and board members.

2024

Rating:

Comments: CMES completes criminal background on all new staff and board members as well as volunteers who have contact with students.

Source: UST site visit, board chair interview, background check policy

3.5 Is the school compliant with other applicable law? Note that this measure includes, but is not limited to:

- Meeting admissions and enrollment practice/policy requirements
- Meeting governance model requirements
- Meeting Title IX regulations (e.g. policies/procedures, trainings, Title IX Coordinator)

1 = Does not meet standard The school is not in compliance with other applicable law.

2 = Approaching standard NOT APPLICABLE

3 = Meets standard The school is in compliance with other applicable law.

4 = Exceeds standard NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The school is in compliance with all applicable law.

2024

Rating:

Comments: The school is compliant with applicable law and has updated the enrollment policy to conform with MN Statutes. In checking the school webpage, the Title IX Coordinator was not listed and reporting forms and policies for Title IX were not readily available. Due to statutory changes, CMES should look at updating the Title IX resources available on the website.

Source: Website compliance check, Quarterly Report, UST site visit, board chair interview

3.6 Do all board members exhibit understanding of the role of the board and utilize nonprofit governance best practices including:

- Understanding of board and school leader roles (governance vs. management)
- Annual board self-evaluation
- Annual school-leader evaluation
- Annual approval of professional development plan for school leader (if applicable)
- Annual evaluation of Educational Service Provider (CMO/EMO) if applicable
- Orientation process for new members
- Regular Strategic planning (at least once every five years)

1 = Does not meet standard	At least some board members do not understand the role of the board and the role of the school leader. Board policies and practices are not transparent or not present. Board meetings often address issues not central to the role of the board and/or fail to address core functions such as leader evaluation and school financial/academic health.
2 = Approaching standard	Some board members, but not all, exhibit understanding of their roles as board members and the role of the school leader. Board policies and practices are not always transparent and/or are not fully developed. The board inconsistently addresses issues central to its role such as leader evaluation, leader professional development plan approval (if applicable), and school financial/academic health.
3 = Meets standard	The Board exhibits understanding of its role and the role of the school leader. The board policies and practices are generally transparent and systems are in place to maximize effectiveness of the board, including an orientation process for new members, annual board self-evaluation, annual leader (and EMO/CMO if applicable) evaluation, annual approval of leader development plan (if applicable) and a plan for conducting and tracking initial and ongoing training. The board engages in regular strategic planning. The board is able to adequately sustain its membership through recruitment efforts.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
2025 Rating: 3 Comments: The board and school leader have a good understanding of their roles and work well together. The board engages in strategic planning and undergoes annual trainings based on areas of need including training in financial matters in October as part of the audit presentation. The governance committee provided ongoing training at board meetings.	
2024 Rating: 3 Comments: The board conducts an annual self-evaluation as well as an evaluation of the school leader. The board has orientation for new board members and participates in ongoing training throughout the year. The board engages in regular strategic planning and is consistently looking for ways to improve all areas of the school.	
Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, board minutes, interview with board chair	

3.7 Does the board regularly review, update, and approve its bylaws and policies such that they maintain compliance with state law and current best practices?

1 = Does not meet standard	Board policies and/or bylaws are outdated and not reviewed regularly.
2 = Approaching standard	Board policies and/or bylaws are reviewed and approved as needed, but are not comprehensively reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis.
3 = Meets standard	Board policies and bylaws are reviewed for content and legal compliance, updated, and approved on a regularly scheduled basis, no less than once every three years.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: Board policies and bylaws are updated on a regular basis.

2024

Rating:

Comments: The board policies are regularly reviewed and updated as well as the bylaws.

Source: Board minutes, board policies, Governance binder, Quarterly Report, UST site visit

3.8 Does the board submit a complete board packet (including agenda, minutes, director report, other relevant documents, check register, cash flow sheet, enrollment report, balance sheet and income and expense report), to be received by all members of the board, school leadership, and UST at least three days prior to all board meetings?

1 = Does not meet standard	Board packets are not submitted on time AND are incomplete
2 = Approaching standard	Board packets are submitted on time (more than 75 percent of the time) but incomplete OR not submitted on time (less than 75 percent of the time) but complete
3 = Meets standard	Board packets are submitted on time (more than 75 percent of the time) and complete
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: Board packets are submitted on time and are complete.

2024

Rating:

Comments: Board packets are consistently submitted on time and are complete.

Source: Monthly board packets; Board materials tracking document (G-1 CS info)

3.9 Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to English Learners (ELs)? This includes:

- **Following MN Standardized Statewide EL Procedures for identification**
- **Following MN Standardize Statewide EL Procedures for entrance and exit.**
- **Maintaining an established EL program with a written plan for service at all grade and proficiency levels**
- **Securing appropriate staffing levels with staff who hold appropriate licenses and have knowledge of current legislation and research based best practices for serving EL students.**
- **Supplying relevant professional development to all staff**
- **Ensuring that information on student EL status is available to all classroom teachers**
- **Providing staff with appropriate training.**

1 = Does not meet standard	The school is <u>not</u> fulfilling its legal obligations regarding ELs and requires substantial improvement
2 = Approaching standard	The school is fulfilling all of its legal obligations regarding ELs but requires some improvements
3 = Meets standard	The school is fulfilling its legal obligations regarding ELs and requires no considerable improvements
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: There are currently 18 students who qualify for EL services. The support is generally 1:1 which is primarily support on work from Montessori lessons or interest driven-research. Students are exited from the EL program when the composite ACCESS scores are 4.5 at a minimum.

2024

Rating:

Comments: Students are identified for EL services through the Home Language survey as well as teacher and/or parent recommendations. Currently, 21 students are identified and are receiving services. These services are delivered 1:1 or in small groups. The lessons focus on reading skills, vocabulary, interest-driven research with written work or reading comprehension. 58% of students identified for EL services scored in the low risk category for reading and 50% in math. On the ACCESS, the cell size was too small to report, but per the annual report, 6.7% of the students completing the ACCESS scored as proficient.

Source: UST site visits, Reference EL Packet, Formalized complaints at MDE, or Critical Elements review (SP-1)

3.10 Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to students with individual education plans (IEPs)? This includes:

- **Having a school-specific TSES manual that is board-approved.**
- **Engaging a special education director who is actively involved in working with special education staff and school leadership.**
- **Securing appropriate staffing levels with staff who hold appropriate licenses and have knowledge of current legislation and research based best practices for serving students with IEPs.**
- **Contracting with entities to provide effective services to students when necessary.**
- **Completing annual IEP meetings on time.**
- **Having been subject to no investigations related to special needs students that resulted in findings.**
- **Having no findings related to special education funding on annual financial audit.**
- **Providing staff with appropriate training.**

1 = Does not meet standard	The school is not fulfilling its legal obligations regarding students with special needs and requires substantial improvement
2 = Approaching standard	The school is fulfilling all of its legal obligations regarding students with special needs but requires some improvements
3 = Meets standard	The school is fulfilling its legal obligations regarding students with special needs and requires no considerable improvements
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The special education numbers have increase dramatically in the past year. In SY23, 15.2% of students qualified for special education services and in SY24, that number increased to 28.8%. There has also been an increase in the needs of the students including 4 students in Federal Setting 3 and 3 – 4 students with high Federal setting 2. Cornerstone has 3 full-time special education teachers, one full time social worker and 12 paraprofessionals. They also employ 2 contracted teachers through Twin Cities Education Consultants – 1 ECSE instructor and 1 Due Process Coordinator.

2024

Rating:

Comments: CMES has a school-specific TSES manual and has a special education director through Indigo Education. There have been no special education complaints or investigations related to special needs students. Students are identified for special education services through a Child Find process. This process begins with 2 six-week intervention periods which is followed by Child Study. The Child Study team

includes the special education director, teachers and specialists. Through Child Study, a plan is developed with parental input.

Currently, Cornerstone has two special education teachers on-site as well as a school social worker. Two contracted special education teachers serve as an ECSE teacher/consultant and a due process coordinator. Specialists who work to serve students include occupational therapist, Speech and Language Pathologists, School Psychologists and DAPE instructors. 12 special education paraprofessionals are employed as well.

Source: Quarterly report, UST site visits, Reference: special education investigation search on MDE website and special education training materials; Special education director interview

3.11 Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to the delivery of a quality Prekindergarten instructional program. This includes:

- Ensuring Early Childhood Health and Developmental Screening is completed.
- Securing appropriate staffing.
- Supplying relevant professional development to all staff.
- Implementing culturally responsive comprehensive child assessment/s.
- Utilizing the Early Childhood Indicators of Progress (ECIPs).
- Supporting an effective transition to Kindergarten.
- Referring students to community-based resources as needed.

This goal does not apply based on the grades served

Source: Site Visits, Interviews, Quarterly Reports

3.12 Does the school have a high attendance rate?

1 = Does not meet standard	The attendance rate is less than 85 percent
2 = Approaching standard	The attendance rate is between 85 and 89.9 percent
3 = Meets standard	The attendance rate is 90-94.9 percent
4 = Exceeds standard	The attendance rate is more than 95 percent

2025

Rating: 1

Comments: Per the MDE report card, the consistent attendance rate for CMES was 64.2% which is an increase from the previous year. This percentage falls short of the state average of 74.5%,

2024

Rating:

Comments: Per the MDE report card, the consistent attendance rate for CMES was 56% versus 69.8% at the state level.

Source: Annual reports, MDE website (data downloads)

3.13 Is the school able to maintain a high percentage of teacher retention?

1 = Does not meet standard	Fewer than 70 percent of teachers remained at the school last year (excluding retirements).
2 = Approaching standard	Between 70 and 84 percent of teachers remained at the school last year (excluding retirements).
3 = Meets standard	More than 85 percent of teachers remained at the school last year (excluding retirements).
4 = Exceeds standard	Over the course of the contract (or at least 3 years) teacher retention has consistently remained high (>85 percent)

2025

Rating: 2

Comments: Teacher retention for SY24 was lower than normal with 78% of teachers returning.

2024

Rating:

Comments: Of the 15 teachers employed in 2022-23, 13 teachers remained for 2023-24 for a retention rate of 87%.

Source: Annual report

3.14 Are the school's teachers and staff participating in a broad base of professional development in service of students' academic and behavioral needs and supportive of the school's mission? Types of development opportunities include, but are not limited to:

- Required health and safety trainings.
- IX training processes.
- Supporting students with IEPs.
- Supporting English Learners.
- Mission-related.
- Equity and cultural relevance.

1 = Does not meet standard	The school a limited number of training opportunities. Participation in professional development is low, with less than 50% of staff participate in the opportunities.
----------------------------	--

2 = Approaching standard	The school offers a menu of development opportunities that include required trainings. Participation in most or all of these trainings is presented as optional resulting in low participation (less than 50% of staff participate).
3 = Meets standard	The school offers a menu of development opportunities that include required trainings as well as learning opportunities that forward the school's academic, behavioral and mission-related priorities. Participation is mandated for required trainings.
4 = Exceeds standard	The school offers a robust menu of development opportunities that include required trainings as well as learning opportunities that forward the school's academic, behavioral and mission-related priorities. Including opportunities for subject-area and curriculum-specific trainings. Participation is mandated for required trainings.
2025 Rating: 4 Comments: The school offers relative professional development for staff that is mandated for all staff. The trainings for SY24 included Disability Sensitivity, Building Resilient Schools and Homes, Anti-Racism and trainings on Mental Health.	
2024 Rating: 4 Comments: The school offers a variety of trainings including many geared toward supporting children in a Montessori environment and teaching the whole child. Other focus areas include trauma-informed instruction, mental health and various areas of special education. As noted previously, CMES should ensure that the Title IX training is consistent with statutory requirements.	
Source: Annual report (Professional Development Tracking Chart)	

3.15 Does the school generally retain its students from October 1st through the close of the school year?	
1 = Does not meet standard	Student retention rates are more than 10% below the school's agreed-upon target rates.
2 = Approaching standard	Student retention rates are 5-10% below the school's agreed-upon target rates.
3 = Meets standard	The school is consistently fully enrolled. Student retention rates are within 5% or above the school's agreed-upon target rates
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
2025	

Rating: 3

Comments: 132 of 138 students remained for the entire school year which is an attrition rate of 95%.

2024

Rating:

Comments: 135 of 139 students remained for the entire 2022-23 school year. Attrition rate for the school year was 89%.

Source: Annual report, renewal application

3.16 Does the school exhibit a high level of parent satisfaction as measured by the following?

3.16a The percentage of parents surveyed who “agree” or “strongly agree” that they are satisfied with the school overall. (*“Overall, I am satisfied with how my child is supported at Cornerstone Montessori Elementary School”*).

3.16b Survey response rate

1 = Does not meet standard

3.16a Less than 70% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school overall.

3.16b The school’s survey response rate was less than 20%.

2 = Approaching standard

3.16a 75-85% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school overall.

3.16b The school’s survey response rate was 20-24%.

3 = Meets standard

3.16a 85.1-95% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school overall.

3.16b The school’s survey response rate was more than 25-30%.

4 = Exceeds standard

3.16a 95% or more of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school overall.

3.16b The school’s survey response rate was greater than 30%.

2025

3.16a Rating: 4

3.16b Rating: 2

Overall Rating: 3

Comments: The response rate for the parent survey was 23%. 96.3% of respondents indicated that they would recommend Cornerstone to others and 92.5% indicated that they were satisfied with the support their child receives at school.

2024

3.16a Rating: 3

3.16b Rating: 3

Overall Rating: 3

Comments: 25% of families responded to the school survey. 93.3% indicated overall satisfaction with the school.

Source: Annual report, School parent satisfaction survey--overall satisfaction indicator

3.17 Is the school's physical plant safe and conducive to learning? This includes:

- Providing adequate security.
- Meeting health and safety code requirements.
- Providing accessibility for all students.
- Ensuring the facility, furniture and equipment is clean and well-maintained.
- Providing appropriate sized spaces for enrollment and student-teacher ratios.
- Layout and design meet the academic and social needs of students, teachers, staff, families and the community.

1 = Does not meet standard

The facility requires much improvement in order to provide a safe environment that is conducive to learning. Significant health and safety requirements have not been met OR the school lacks many conditions such as the following: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students.

2 = Approaching standard

Significant health and safety requirements are being met, but the facility needs some improvement in order to provide a safe environment that is conducive to learning. It partially – but not fully – provides conditions such as the following: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size

	appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students.
3 = Meets standard	Significant health and safety code requirements are being met AND the facility generally provides a safe environment that is conducive to learning, based on conditions such as: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students.
4 = Exceeds standard	All health and safety code requirements are being met AND the facility generally provides a safe environment that is conducive to learning, based on conditions such as: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students. Additionally, the facility meets the mission of the school.
2025 Rating: 4 Comments: The school and surroundings meet the needs of the students and provide opportunities for outdoor activities. The facility is safe and is adequate for the type of programming necessary to meet the mission and vision of the school.	
2024 Rating: 4 Comments: The school environment is conducive to learning and supports the mission and vision of the school. The greenhouse and outdoor learning areas provide more opportunities for students and staff. Lack of space was mentioned in many of the focus groups, but the school is creative about the use of space and works hard to meet the needs of all children. All health and safety requirements are met and the environment is safe.	
Source: Authorizer observation	

3.18 Does the school have systems and structures in place, including an effective multi-tiered system of support (MTSS), to effectively identify and support students needing academic and/or behavioral supports in a timely fashion? This includes:

- A clear process to identify students needing support, understood and implemented consistently.
- A robust system of tiered supports.
- Timely execution of these supports.

- **Use of data to evaluate the effectiveness of supports and the system.**
- **Effective communication between stakeholders (teachers, school staff, families, and students).**

1 = Does not meet standard

The school does not have adequate systems to identify students needing supports. When students are identified the systems in place move slowly, taking weeks or months to execute the eventual support. Communication within systems is poor and internal/external stakeholders (teachers, school staff, parents, students) do not always receive timely or adequate communication.

2 = Approaching standard

The school has systems to identify students needing supports, but they may not always work as designed. When students are identified the systems in place move at a moderate pace, taking several weeks to a month to execute the eventual support. Communication within systems is patchy and internal/external stakeholders (teachers, school staff, parents, students) receive communication, but it may not always be timely or adequate.

3 = Meets standard

The school has systems to identify students needing supports, which work reliably and are understood and used regularly by individuals throughout the system (teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators, counselors, parents, etc.). When students are identified the systems in place move efficiently, taking days or weeks to execute the needed support. Communication within systems is reliable and internal/external stakeholders (teachers, school staff, parents, students) receive all necessary communication in a clear and timely fashion.

4 = Exceeds standard

The school has systems with built in redundancies (multiple opportunities for reporting) to identify students needing support. The systems work reliably and are understood and used regularly by individuals throughout the system (teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators, counselors, parents, etc.). When students are identified the systems in place move efficiently, taking hours or days to execute the needed support unless mandated timelines are longer. Communication within systems is reliable and internal/external stakeholders (teachers, school staff, parents, students) receive all necessary communication in a clear and timely fashion.

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The school continues to employ both a literary and math specialist who work with students who are struggling which is indicated through Fastbridge assessments as well as teacher observations and classwork. A full-time school social worker works with students who need behavioral support.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: Literacy and math specialists are in place to work with children who are performing below grade level which is monitored by Fastbridge. Children needing behavioral support meet with the school social worker or with the MSW interns.

Source: Quarterly report, Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews

3.19 There are opportunities and structures in place for families to engage in their child's education that include the following:

- 3.19a Processes to communicate academic performance and other pertinent school information that are accessible to families including the consideration of language needs (e.g. conferences).
- 3.19b Processes to elicit feedback from families are accessible and seek to reach the broader school community including consideration of language needs. Feedback processes include but are not limited to an annual survey.
- 3.19c Opportunities for parents/guardians to support their child's education and/or the school (e.g. volunteering, parent organization, family events).

1 = Does not meet standard

- a. The school does not have a plan to communicate academic performance and other pertinent school information. Communication is not available in languages other than English.
- b. The school does the school have a plan to elicit feedback from families or the plan reaches only a limited set of families.
- c. Less than 25% of families/guardians participated in any engagement opportunity.

2 = Approaching standard

- a. The school has a plan to communicate academic performance and other pertinent school information, however the implementation of this plan is inconsistent or in the development phase.
- b. The school has a plan for eliciting feedback from families representing the broad school community, however, implementation of this plan is inconsistent or in the development phase.
- c. Between 25.1 - 40% of families/guardians participated in an engagement opportunity.

3 = Meets standard

- a. The school has a comprehensive plan to communicate academic performance and other pertinent school information with families, which is consistently executed. The plan includes an awareness of the language preferences and needs of families and strategies for providing communication multiple languages as needed.
- b. The school has a comprehensive plan to elicit feedback from all families. The plan includes an awareness of the language preferences and needs of families, strategies for providing communication multiple languages as needed and methods for ensuring representation from the broad school community.

c. Between 40.1 - 55% of families/guardians participated in an engagement opportunity.
4 = Exceeds standard a. The school has a comprehensive plan to communicate academic performance and other pertinent school information with families, which is executed with fidelity. School survey data and interviews with families provide evidence of parent satisfaction with home-school communications. b. The school has a formalized process to elicit feedback from families reflective of the broad school community, which is executed with fidelity. The school is able to demonstrate how family feedback is reviewed and utilized in a timely manner. School survey data and interviews with families provide evidence of parent knowledge of and satisfaction with feedback opportunities. c. More than 55% of families/guardians participated in an engagement opportunity.
2025 3.19a Rating: 4 3.19b Rating: 3 3.19c Rating: 4 Overall Rating: 3.67 Comments: Parent are involved in their child's education at Cornerstone and the school works to provide numerous opportunities for them engage. A major goal for SY 24 was to increase communication with families around children's academic experiences in the classroom. To support this goal, there was a return to sending monthly newsletters with photos and updates. Parent engagement is high on the school board with parents holding three seats.
2024 Rating a: <u> 4 </u> Rating b: <u> 3 </u> Rating c: <u> 4 </u> Overall Rating: 3.67 Comments: CMES encourages parents to volunteer during the school day and works to find ways for parents to be involved in their child's education. Although the response rate for the family survey was lower than they wished (25%), the school is working on finding ways to get a higher response from families. Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews

3.20 Is the school committed to creating a welcoming, inclusive, and equitable environment that is open to all students? This is evidenced by the following:
3.20a. Marketing/outreach targets socioeconomically and racially diverse populations, which includes having materials available in multiple languages.

3.20b. Enrollment policies and practices are accessible and transparent. Supports are available to families as needed to navigate the application and enrollment process. 3.20c. The school demonstrates a commitment to cultivating a board and staff that is reflective of the student population.	
1 = Does not meet standard	a. The school’s marketing strategy marginalizes or ignores students from diverse backgrounds and/or those who are low income. Materials are only available in English. b. Enrollment policies and practices are not transparent and/or result in accessibility barriers for low income students and students of color. c. The board and staff are not representative of the students the school serves.
2 = Approaching standard	a. The school’s marketing strategy includes a plan to recruit students from diverse backgrounds and/or those who are low income. However, implementation of the plan is inconsistent and materials are only available in English. b. Enrollment policies and practices are transparent. However, families encounter challenges navigating the enrollment process. c. While the board and/or staff are not representative of the students the school serves, the school is committed to recruiting board members and staff who are representative and has identified recruitment strategies to this end.
3 = Meets standard	a. The school’s marketing strategy includes an actionable plan to recruit students from diverse backgrounds and/or those who are low income. The plan is actively utilized. Materials are available in multiple languages. b. School enrollment policies and practices are clear and easily navigated by families. Methods for accessing support for families needing assistance are readily apparent. c. The school employs strategies to recruit and retain board members and staff who are representative of the student population. Board and staff composition reflect these efforts.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
2025 3.20a Rating: 3 3.20b Rating: 3 3.20c Rating: 3 Overall Rating: 3 Comments: The school’s commitment to equity and inclusion is embedded in the mission “to support children from culturally and economically diverse backgrounds living in or near St. Paul’s East Side...” This commitment is reflected in the diverse student population it serves. Through intentional marketing strategies, CMES reaches out to a wide range of communities.	

2024

Rating a: 3

Rating b: 3

Rating c: 3

Overall Rating: 3

Comments: When speaking with the board members in focus groups, there was discussion about marketing and working to broaden the scope of the recruitment but to maintain focus on the East Side of St. Paul. The school is also aware of and working to recruit employees who are representative of the student body. All of these issues are at the forefront of the school leaders as well as the board.

Source: Quarterly report, Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews