

Evaluation Rubric

Northwest Passage High School

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: Academic Performance

Is the Learning Program a Success?

1.1 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?

1.1a Reading

1.1b Mathematics

Note: A minimum of 60% of eligible students must test in order for this measure to be used for accountability purposes. If less than 60% of students are tested, but data are able to be publicly displayed, information will be presented for informational purposes.

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------|--------|---------------|
| | | | | |
| 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 groups by more than 5 percentage points | | | |
| | Reading Proficiency | Score | Weight | Points Earned |
| Charter School | 63.6% | | | |
| Average of demographic match schools | 36.8% | | 37.50% | 1.5 |
| Resident District | 53 | 4 | 37.50% | 1.5 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|-------|--------|------------------|
| State | 52.4% | 4 | 25% | 1 |
| | | | 100% | Reading Total: 4 |
| | | | | |
| | Math Proficiency | Score | Weight | Points Earned |
| Charter School | CTSTR | | | |
| Average of demographic match schools | CTSTR | 1 | 37.50% | |
| Resident District | CTSTR | 1 | 37.50% | |
| State | CTSTR | 1 | 25% | |
| | | | 100% | Math Total: |

2025

1.1a Reading: 4

1.1b Math: CTSTR

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

Comments: The reading proficiency score increased by 30 percentage points from 2023 and exceeded the demographic match schools, resident district and the state. The math scores were too small to report.

2024

1.1a Reading: N/A

1.1b Math: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1

Comments/Evidence: Of the 18 students who took the Math MCA, 2 partially met standards and none tested as proficient. In reading, the participation rate was too low to be reported.

2023

1.1a Reading: __1.375__

1.1b Math: __1.75_

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1.562

Comments/Evidence: Math proficiency increased from 14.3% to 23.53% and is above the demographic match schools. Both math and reading scores are below the resident district as well as the state proficiency but the number of students tested is also much smaller at NWPBS (12 students for reading and 16 for math).

Data Source: MCA data or school reports, 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

2025

1.2a Rating: N/A

1.2b Rating: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments: There are no demographic groups large enough to score this benchmark.

2024

1.2a Rating: N/A

1.2b Rating: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments/Evidence: There are no demographic groups large enough to score this metric.

2023

1.2a Rating: __N/A__

1.2b Rating: __N/A__

Overall Rating: __N/A__

Comments/Evidence: There are no demographic groups large enough to score this metric.

Data Source: MCA data available on MDE Report Card, school self-report, 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. |
| 2025 | |
| 1.3a Reading: N/A | |
| 1.3b Mathematics: N/A | |
| Overall Rating: N/A | |
| Comments: No growth information is available as the cell sizes are too small. | |
| 2024 | |
| 1.3a Reading: N/A | |
| 1.3b Mathematics: N/A | |
| Overall Rating: N/A | |
| Comments/Evidence: No growth information is available as the cell sizes are too small. | |
| 2023 | |
| 1.3a Reading: __N/A__ | |
| 1.3b Mathematics: __N/A__ | |
| Overall Rating: __N/A__ | |
| Comments/Evidence: No growth information is available. | |
| Source: MCA data available on MDE Report Card | |

| | |
|--|---|
| 1.4 School Selected Assessment: Reading & Math Performance | |
| Are students performing at or above target levels, as measured using the school's selected standardized assessments? | |
| <i>School selected assessment:</i> NWEA spring administration | |
| <i>1.4a Reading</i> | |
| <i>1.4b Mathematics</i> | |
| 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 students performed at or above target levels (40-49%) |
| 3 = Meets standard | Assessments indicate that an adequate proportion of tested students performed at or above target levels (50-65%) |
| 4 = Exceeds standard | Assessments indicate that a high proportion of tested students performed at or above target levels (more than 65%). |
| 2025 | |
| 1.4a Reading: 3 | |
| 1.4b Math: 3 | |
| Overall Rating: 3 | |
| Comments: In reading, 57% of tested students performed at or above target levels and 54% in math. | |

| |
|--|
| 2024 |
| 1.4a Reading: 1.4b Math: Overall Rating: |
| Comments/Evidence: |
| 2023 1.4a Reading: __3 1.4b Math: __3_ Overall Rating: ___3_ |
| Comments/Evidence: In reading, 51% of students performed at or above target levels and 57% in math. |
| Data Source: Annual Report, End of year report, Test data spreadsheets |

| |
|--|
| 1.5 School Selected Assessment: Reading & Math Growth Are students making substantial and adequate gains over time, as measured using the school’s selected standardized assessments? <i>School selected assessment:</i> NWEA fall-to-spring administration <i>1.5a Reading</i> <i>1.5b Mathematics</i> |
|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 1 = Does not meet standard | Analysis indicates that a minimal proportion of tested students made expected gains or maintained a level of performance above the national average for their grade level (less than 40%). |
| 2 = Approaching standard | Analysis indicates that an inadequate proportion of tested students made expected gains or maintained a level of performance above the national average for their grade level (40-49%). |
| 3 = Meets standard | Analysis indicates that an adequate proportion of tested students made expected gains or maintained a level of performance above the national average for their grade level (50-65%). |
| 4 = Exceeds standard | Analysis indicates that an adequate proportion of tested students made expected gains or maintained a level of performance above the national average for their grade level (more than 65%). |

| |
|--|
| 2025 1.5a Reading: 4 1.5b Math: 4 Overall Rating: 4 |
|--|

Comments: In math, 84% of students made adequate gains and 73% made adequate gains in reading.

2024

1.5a Reading: 4

1.5b Math: 3

Overall Rating: 3.5

Comments: In math, 65% of students made expected gains on the NWEA and 68% in reading.

1.5a Reading: ___3_

1.5b Math: __4_

Overall Rating: __3.5__

Comments: In reading, 60% of students made expected gains and 72% in math.

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

1.6 High School Graduation

Is the school meeting state and authorizer-established targets for graduation rate?

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 1 = Does not meet standard | The school's one-year graduation rate was below 75% and did not meet state targets. |
| 2 = Approaching standard | The school's one-year graduation rate was between 75% and 79.9% |
| 3 = Meets standard | The school's one-year graduation rate was between 80% and 90% |
| 4 = Exceeds standard | The school's one year graduation rate was above 90% |

2025

Rating: 1

Comments: The four year graduation rate was 52%. The five year rate was 67%; six year rate was 50% and the seven year rate was 100%.

2024

Rating: 1

Comments: The graduation rate for SY23 was 55.9% which is a large increase from SY22.

2023

Rating: 1

Comments: The graduation rate for SY22 was 26.2%

Source: MDE Data Analytics Request, Annual report

1.7 Postsecondary Readiness Assessments

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

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 1 = Does not meet standard | Less than 60% of students demonstrated readiness |
|----------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| 2 = Approaching standard | 60-89% of students demonstrated readiness |
| 3 = Meets standard | 90-94% of students demonstrated readiness |
| 4 = Exceeds standard | More than 95% of students demonstrated readiness |
| 2025 | |
| Rating: 1 | |
| Comments: On the ACT for SY24, the following percentages of students taking the assessment met the college readiness benchmarks: English – 40%; Math – 20%; Reading – 50%; Science – 60%. The composite score for Northwest Passage was 19.28 which is slightly below the state score of 20.73. | |
| 2024 | |
| Rating: | |
| Comments: | |
| 2023 | |
| Rating: 1 | |
| Comments: Information not reported. | |
| Source: MDE Data Report Card, Annual Report | |

| | |
|--|---|
| 1.8 School-Specific Goal | |
| Is the school meeting its school-specific academic goal(s)? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -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. | |
| <i>1.8a Goal:</i> NWPHS employs a project-based model. 80% of students enrolled for the full academic year will complete at least 5 of their 7 personalized learning plan (PLP) goals. | |
| <i>1.8b Goal:</i> NWPHS believes in the power of expeditionary learning. At least 50% of enrolled students will participate in one expedition per year. | |
| | |
| 1 = Does not meet standard | <i>1.8a:</i> Less than 65% of students enrolled for the full academic year have completed five or more of their PLP goals <i>1.8b:</i> Less than 35% of enrolled students participated in an expeditionary learning experience |
| 2 = Approaching standard | <i>1.8a:</i> 65-79.9% of students enrolled for the full academic year have completed five or more of their PLP goals <i>1.8b:</i> 35-49.9% of enrolled students participated in an expeditionary learning experience |
| 3 = Meets standard | <i>1.8a:</i> 80-90% of students enrolled for the full academic year have completed 5 or more of their PLP goals <i>1.8b:</i> 50-75% of enrolled students participated in an expeditionary learning experience |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| 4 = Exceeds standard | <p><i>1.8a:</i> More than 90% of students enrolled for the full academic year have completed 5 or more of their PLP goals</p> <p><i>1.8b:</i> More than 75% of enrolled students participated in an expeditionary learning experience</p> |
|----------------------|---|

| |
|---|
| <p>2025</p> <p>1.8a Rating: 2 1.8b Rating: 4 Overall Rating: 3</p> <p>Comments: 77% of students enrolled for the full academic year completed five or more of their PLP goals. There were over 115 expeditionary learning experiences offered during the school year and more that 75% of students participated.</p> |
|---|

| |
|---|
| <p>2024</p> <p>1.8a Rating: 1.8b Rating: Overall Rating:</p> |
|---|

| |
|-------------------------|
| <p>Comments:</p> |
|-------------------------|

| |
|--|
| <p>2023</p> <p>1.8a Rating: 1.8b Rating: Overall Rating: 1</p> |
|--|

| |
|---|
| <p>Comments: Information not provided.</p> |
|---|

| |
|-------------------------------------|
| <p>Source: Annual report</p> |
|-------------------------------------|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>1.9 English Learner Performance</p> | |
| <p>Are students learning English (English Learners/EL students) performing at or above the state average for English Learners as measured by MCA proficiency? Note that for schools with greater than 70% of students qualifying for FRL, demographic categories will also be filtered by FRL status.</p> | |
| <p><i>1.9a Reading</i></p> | |
| <p><i>1.9b Math</i></p> | |
| <p>1 = Does not meet standard</p> | <p>More than 10 percentage points below state EL performance.</p> |
| <p>2 = Approaching standard</p> | <p>6-10 percentage points below state EL performance.</p> |
| <p>3 = Meets standard</p> | <p>Within 5 percentage points of state EL performance.</p> |
| <p>4 = Exceeds standard</p> | <p>Exceeds state EL performance by more than 5 percentage points.</p> |
| <p>2025</p> | |
| <p>Rating: N/A</p> | |
| <p>Comments: The number of students who qualify for EL services is not large enough to count.</p> | |
| <p>2024</p> | |
| <p>Rating: N/A</p> | |
| <p>Comments: NWPBS is not currently serving any students who qualify for EL services.</p> | |

2023

Rating: ___N/A__

Comments: NWPHS is not currently serving any students who qualify for EL services.

Source: MDE website

1.10 Students Receiving Special Education Services

Are students receiving special education services performing at or above the state average for students receiving special education services as measured by MCA proficiency? Note that for schools with greater than 70% of students qualifying for FRL, demographic categories will also be filtered by FRL status.

1.10a: Reading

1.10b: 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

1.10a Reading: N/A

1.10b Math: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments: The number of students receiving special education services who completed the MCA was too small to report.

2024

1.10a Reading: N/A

1.10b Math: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments: The number of students receiving special education services who completed the MCA was too small to report.

2023

1.10a Reading: N/A

1.10b Math: __4__

Overall Rating: __N/A__

Comments: The count for reading is too small to be scored; however, for math, the students receiving special education services at NWPHS score 20% proficient compared to the state's proficiency rate of 13.8%.

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

1.11 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 to NWPHS due to grades served.

1.12. Exemplary Learning Program

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: 3

Comments: NWPHS continues to exemplify the mission and vision of the school through both day to day programming as well as recognitions and partnerships. In 2024, NWPHS was recognized as a School of the Year through the Minnesota Association of Alternative Programs. To support the "Explore our World" piece of the mission, 20 overnight learning expeditions were offered as well as over 99 out of school field experiences. Both staff and students are able to articulate the mission and vision of the school and it is clear when visiting that decisions and programming is made with the mission and vision at the forefront.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: There is a sense of pride in the school and the students that is easily detectable when visiting. It is clear that the staff is there for the students and that all decisions are made with the students at the focus. NWPHS was once again awarded the MACS Innovation award and was also a semifinalist for the Building Hope Impact Award. These awards are well-deserved and are a good indication of the work being done to help students at NWPHS.

2023

Rating: 2.5

Comments: The mission and vision of the school are evident in site visits and in correspondence with the school. It is clear that students and teachers alike are cognizant of the mission and are easily able to articulate this, especially what makes NWPHS different and why they feel more successful in the environment. Due to some staffing/enrollment/attendance issues, it is difficult at times to fully meet the needs of all students. Decisions are made carefully so as to stay true to the mission but there is a question of whether that mission will continue to attract enough students to keep the program viable. Options are being explored to work to remedy the enrollment issue and to continue to provide students with the learning environment in which they will be most successful.

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

1.13 Post-Secondary Acceptance

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.

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 1 = Does not meet standard | <p><i>1.13a:</i> Less than 60% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program.</p> <p><i>1.13b:</i> Less than 40% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program</p> |
| 2 = Approaching standard | <p><i>1.13a:</i> Between 60-70% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program</p> <p><i>1.13b:</i> Between 40-50% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program</p> |
| 3 = Meets standard | <p><i>1.13a:</i> Between 70.1 -85% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program</p> <p><i>1.13b:</i> Between 50.1-59.9% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program</p> |

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| 4 = Exceeds standard | <p><i>1.13a:</i> Over 85% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program</p> <p><i>1.13b:</i> Over 60% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program</p> |
|----------------------|--|

2025

1.13a Rating: 3

1.13b Rating: 1

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

Comments: 35% of students in the graduating class were enrolled in a post-secondary program.

| |
|---|
| 2024 |
| <p>Rating</p> <p>13a.</p> <p>13b.</p> <p>Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores:</p> |
| <p>Comments:</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>2023 Rating 13a. 13b.</p> <p>Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1</p> |
| <p>Comments: Information not provided.</p> |
| <p>Source: School reported data</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>1.14 Are students equitably accessing rigorous coursework (AP, IB, CIS, PSEO, Honors) at high rates?</p> | |
| <p>1 = Does not meet standard</p> | <p>a. Less than 30% of all students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year. b. Less than 30% of BIPOC students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year.</p> |
| <p>2 = Approaching standard</p> | <p>a. 30-45% of all students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year. b. 30-45% of BIPOC students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year.</p> |
| <p>3 = Meets standard</p> | <p>a. 45%- 60% of all students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year. b. 45%-60% of BIPOC students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year.</p> |
| <p>4 = Exceeds standard</p> | <p>a. Over 60% of all students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year. b. Over 60% of BIPOC students access rigorous courses.</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>2025</p> <p>1.14a Rating: 1 1.14b Rating: N/A</p> <p>Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1</p> <p>Comments: 10% of students were enrolled in PSEO. The number of students enrolled in other rigorous coursework was not available. The number of BIPOC students accessing the coursework was also not available.</p> |
| <p>2024</p> <p>Rating 1.14a: 1 1.14b: N/A</p> <p>Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1</p> <p>Comments: 10% of students take part in PSEO.</p> |

2023

Rating

1.14a: 1

1.14b: N/A

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1

Comments: Information not provided.

Source: MDE SLEDS Data, School Reported Data, Interview data

Section 2: Financial Viability

Does the school exhibit strong fiscal health?

| | |
|---|---|
| 2.1 Finance Committee | |
| 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: 3 | |
| Comments: The finance committee meets at least monthly and keeps a close eye on enrollment and the budget. A thorough report is presented to the board each month. | |
| 2024 | |
| Rating: 3 | |
| Comments: The director, finance manager and board chair work together on the budget and other financial matters on a regular basis. This information is brought to the full board at the monthly meetings. | |
| 2023 | |
| Rating: __3__ | |
| Comments: The Finance manager works with the Director on the proposed budgets and then brings them to the school board for input and approval. | |
| Source: Monthly board packets; Annual Report, Site visits | |

| | |
|---|--|
| 2.2 Fund Balance Policy | |
| 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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |
| 2025 | |
| Rating: 3 | |
| Comments: The school has a fund balance policy stipulating the maintenance of the 20-30% fund balance. | |
| 2024 | |
| Rating: 3 | |
| Comments: The school has a fund balance policy that stipulates a 20 – 30% fund balance is maintained. | |

| |
|--|
| 2023 |
| Rating: |
| Comments: |
| Source: Monthly board packets, Board policy manual, Quarterly Report |

| | |
|--|---|
| 2.3 Financial Audit | |
| 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’s audit was clean with no findings. | |
| 2024 | |
| Rating: 4 | |
| Comments: The financial audit was clean with no findings. | |
| 2023 | |
| Rating: __4__ | |
| Comments: The school’s audit was clean with no findings. | |

Source: Annual financial audit

2.4 Budget

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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 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; |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- budget meets the fund balance policy goals set forth by the board. |
| 3 = Meets standard | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The board approves the budget prior to June 30 and includes a conservative enrollment projection.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: The board approves the budget prior to June 30. Revisions are made as needed. The budget for 2022-23 ended in a \$713,268 deficit.

2023

Rating: ___3_

Comments: A budget is approved prior to June 30 and revised as needed based on enrollment.

Source: Monthly board packets, UST site visits, UST meetings with business manager(s)

2.5 Budget Enrollment Realization

Does the school's target ADM, as established by the initial board-approved budget, match its actual ADM?

Calculated as actual ADM divided by budgeted ADM.

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 1 = Does not meet standard | Enrollment realization is less than 90%. |
| 2 = Approaching standard | Enrollment realization is 90-94.9%. |
| 3 = Meets standard | Enrollment realization is greater than 95% |
| 4 = Exceeds standard | <i>Not Applicable</i> |

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The projected ADM for the school year was 170 and the actual was 169 for a 99% enrollment realization.

2024

Rating: 1

Comments: 175 students started the school year and the student count at the end of the year was 147 for an enrollment realization of 84%.

2023

Rating: 2

Comments: The budget for 22-23 was built on an enrollment of 150 students. Current enrollment is 135 students. The budget enrollment realization is 90%.

Source: Monthly board packets, Quarterly Report, UST site visits, UST meetings with business manager(s)

2.6 Cash on Hand

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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The school had 100 days cash on hand.

2024

Rating:

Comments:

| |
|--|
| 2023 |
| Rating: 1 |
| Comments: Information unavailable. |
| Source: Annual Report, Auditor Report, Financial Statements, Board policies |

| | |
|---|--|
| 2.7 Current Fund Balance | |
| 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 <i>and</i> overall academic outcomes fall within the “meets standard” range. |

| |
|---|
| 2025 |
| Rating: 4 |
| Comments: The fund balance for SY24 was 35%. |

| |
|--|
| 2024 |
| Rating: 4 |
| Comments: The fund balance for SY23 was 31.06%. |

| |
|--|
| 2023 |
| Rating: __3__ |
| Comments: Per the revised budget, NWPHS has a fund balance of 23%. |
| Source: Annual Report, Auditor Report, Financial Statements, Board policies |

| | |
|---|--|
| 2.8 Bond Covenants | |
| 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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |
| 2025 | |
| Rating: 3 | |
| Comments: The school is consistently meeting bond covenants. | |
| 2024 | |
| Rating: __N/A__ | |

Comments:

2023

Rating: __N/A__

Comments:

Source: Annual Report, Auditor Report, Financial Statements, Board policies

Section 3: Organizational Effectiveness

Is the organization effective and well run?

3.1 Board Training

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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The board members are all in compliance regarding training requirements.

2024

Rating: 2

Comments: At least two board members are out of compliance with statutory required board training.

2023

Rating: __1__

Comments: Per the Quarter 3 report, 6 board members who were seated in November 2022 have not completed the statutory required training. There is also no record of the ongoing annual training for any board member.

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

3.2 Open Meeting Law

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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |
| | |

| | |
|--|--|
| 2025 | |
| Rating: 2 | |
| Comments: The board understands and follows the Open Meeting Law. The minutes online have been posted through January 2025 and these need to be updated. | |
| 2024 | |
| Rating: 2 | |
| Comments: The board understands the requirements of Open Meeting Law. The board minutes have been posted on the website through April, which is an improvement. | |
| 2023 | |
| Rating: ___1_ | |
| Comments: NWPHS has not kept up to date with posting board agendas and board minutes on the website. This has caused a delay in the approval of the school's contract with MDE. | |
| Source: Board minutes, ongoing correspondence, UST site visits | |

| | |
|--|--|
| 3.3 Staff Licensure | |
| 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, variances, or out-of-field permissions. |
| 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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |
| 2025 | |
| Rating: 3 | |
| Comments: All staff are appropriately licensed. | |
| 2024 | |

| |
|---|
| Rating: 3 |
| Comments: The educational staff are appropriately licensed. |
| 2023 |
| Rating: __3__ |
| Comments: All staff are appropriately licensed per MDE license lookup. |
| Source: MDE STAR Discrepancy Reports (self-reported data, crosscheck with licensure file checks) D-1 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3.4 Background Checks | |
| 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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |
| 2025 | |
| Rating: 3 | |
| Comments: The school completes background checks for all staff and board members. | |
| 2024 | |
| Rating: 3 | |
| Comments: The school completes criminal background checks on new staff, paras and board members. | |

| |
|---|
| 2023 |
| Rating: __3__ |
| Comments: The school completes background checks for staff, board and volunteers who interact with the students. |
| Source: UST site visit, board chair interview, background check policy |

| | |
|---|--|
| 3.5 Legal Compliance | |
| Is the school compliant with other applicable laws? Note that this measure includes, but is not limited to: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |
| 3 = Meets standard | The school is in compliance with other applicable law. |

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 4 = Exceeds standard | <i>Not Applicable</i> |
| 2025 | |
| Rating: 3 | |
| Comments: The school is in compliance with all applicable laws. | |
| 2024 | |
| Rating: 3 | |
| Comments: NWPHS has updated policies based on new legislature and has a Title IX grievance policy. | |
| 2023 | |
| Rating: __1__ | |
| Comments: As was indicated by MDE on the contract revisions, the enrollment policy submitted with the contract does not match the policy on the website. There is no record of board trainings for the current school year. | |
| Source: Website compliance check, Quarterly Report, UST site visit, board chair interview | |

| | |
|--|--|
| 3.6 Governance Best Practices | |
| Do all board members exhibit understanding of the role of the board and utilize nonprofit governance best practices including: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 and/or academic health. |
| 2 = Approaching standard | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 and/or academic health. |

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| 3 = Meets standard | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The board and school leader understand their roles with respect to one another. The school leader has a professional development plan that is reviewed and updated annually. The board completes an annual self-evaluation and completes training as necessary.

2024

Rating: 2

Comments: The board completes a self-evaluation as well as an evaluation of the Executive Director. The Executive Director has a professional development plan. The school's strategic plan remains in progress.

2023

Rating: 2

Comments: NWPBS will be approving a new strategic plan in conjunction with a school improvement plan at the end of June 2023. A board self-evaluation is completed in April and the board utilizes the MACS self-evaluation template. The board conducts the review of the director at the March board meeting.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, board minutes, interview with board chair

3.7 Board Bylaws & Policies

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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The bylaws and board policies are reviewed and updated on a regular basis.

| |
|--|
| 2024 |
| Rating: 3 |
| Comments: The policies are updated on an ongoing basis and the board is looking at hiring a policy revision company. Bylaws were revised and are compliant. |
| 2023 |

| |
|---|
| Rating: ___2_ |
| Comments: NWPHS has bylaws in place, but it is unclear when they were last revised. |
| Source: Board minutes, board policies, Governance binder, Quarterly Report, UST site visit |

| | |
|--|---|
| 3.8 Board Packets | |
| 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 <i>and</i> are incomplete |
| 2 = Approaching standard | Board packets are submitted on time (more than 75 percent of the time) but incomplete <i>or</i> 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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |

| |
|--|
| 2025 |
| Rating: 3 |
| Comments: Board packets are complete and submitted on time. |

| |
|--|
| 2024 |
| Rating: 3 |
| Comments: Board packets are complete and are submitted on time. |

| |
|---|
| 2023 |
| Rating: ___3_ |
| Comments: Board packets are complete and submitted on time |
| Source: Monthly board packets; Board materials tracking document (G-1 CS info) |

3.9 EL Compliance

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 <i>not</i> 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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |

2025

Rating: N/A

Comments: Northwest Passage has an outside EL consultant if needed to support students who qualify for EL services.

2024

Rating: N/A

Comments NWPHS does not currently serve any EL students but does have an outside EL consultant who would support students as needed.

2023

Rating: ___N/A_

Comments: NWPHS does not currently serve any students who qualify for EL services. A plan is in place should the need arise.

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

3.10 SPED IEP Compliance

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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: 41.7% of students attending Northwest Passage qualify for special education services. There are currently 5 special education teachers, nine paras and a full-time special education coordinator. The school strives for a high level of inclusion by pairing cross-categorical licensed special education teachers with general education teachers. Many services are contracted including audiologist, school psychologist, school social worker, occupational therapist and rehabilitation counselor.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: NWPHS has struggled to recruit and retain special education teachers which has stretched the team thin. The school believes in a high level of inclusion by pairing special education teachers with the general education teachers and with the assistance of paraprofessionals. Four special education teachers and one special education coordinator work with the students who make up approximately 37% of the student population. Contracted services include audiology, rehab counselor, pre-employment transition services, speech/language pathology, social work, counseling, DH/H, DAPE, Occupational therapy, School nurse and School Psychology.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: Most students qualifying for special education services at NWPHS have been identified prior to enrollment. If a student has not been previously identified, a Child Find process is in place and could be initiated by parents/guardians or teachers/staff. Should a child be brought up in Child Find, there is a data

collection period with pre-referral interventions in place. The student is discussed at the Student Support Team meeting and a determination is made regarding a referral. The special education model for the school includes a high level of inclusion with support. The school does have a school-specific TSES manual.

NWPHS currently employs 4 special education teachers but is working to hire two more case managers. There is a Special Education Coordinator as well as a Special Education Director. Contracted services include: Audiologist, Rehabilitation Counselor, Pre-Employment Transition Services, Speech/Language Pathologist, Social Worker/Counselor, Deaf/Hard of Hearing, DAPE, Occupational Therapy, School Nurse, School Psychologist.

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 PreKindergarten Program Compliance

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, and
- Referring students to community-based resources as needed.

This goal does not apply based on grades served.

3.12 Attendance

Does the school have a high attendance rate?

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 1 = Does not meet standard | The attendance rate is less than 85% |
| 2 = Approaching standard | The attendance rate is between 80-89.9% |
| 3 = Meets standard | The attendance rate is 90-94.9% |
| 4 = Exceeds standard | The attendance rate is more than 95% |

2025

Rating: 1

Comments: Per the MDE report card, the consistent attendance rate was 27.5%.

2024

Rating: 1

Comments: The attendance rate is 73% which is a slight increase from the previous year.

2023

Rating: __1__

Comments: NWPHS has a current attendance rate of 71%.

Source: Annual reports, MDE website (data downloads)

3.13 Teacher Retention

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

Excluding Retirement, Other Educational Occupation, Licensed to Non-licensed Position

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

2025

Rating: 4

Comments: Teacher retention for SY24 was 88%. The school's teacher retention is consistently above 85%.

2024

Rating: 4

Comments: Teacher retention for SY23 was 87%.

2023

Rating: 2

Comments: Teacher retention for SY22 was 70%.

Source: Annual Report

3.14 Student Retention

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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The student retention rate is 94%.

2024

Rating: 2

Comments: The student retention rate is approximately 78%.

2023

Rating: 2

Comments: Student retention rate is approximately 76%.

Source: Annual report, renewal application

3.15 Parent Satisfaction

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

3.19a The percentage of parents surveyed who “agree” or “strongly agree” that they are satisfied with the school overall.

3.19b Survey response rate

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 1 = Does not meet standard | 3.15a - Less than 70% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school overall. 3.15b - The school’s survey response rate was less than 20%. |
| 2 = Approaching standard | 3.15a - 75-85% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school overall. 3.15b - The school’s survey response rate was 20-25%. |
| 3 = Meets standard | 3.15a - 85.1-95% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school overall. 3.15b - The school’s survey response rate was more than 25-30%. |
| 4 = Exceeds standard | 3.15a - 95% or more of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school overall. 3.15b - The school’s survey response rate was greater than 30%. |

2025

Rating

3.15a: 3

3.15b: 4

Overall Rating: 3.5

Comments: 92% of respondents indicated their overall satisfaction with Northwest Passage. The response rate for the survey was 37%.

2024

| |
|---|
| 3.15a Rating: 3 3.15b Rating: 4 Overall Rating: 3.5 |
| Comments: The parent survey response rate was 33%, 92% indicated overall satisfaction with the school. |
| 2023 3.15a Rating: <u> 3 </u> 3.15b Rating: <u> 4 </u> Overall Rating: 3.5 |
| Comments: 89.3% of parents indicated an overall satisfaction rating with NWPBS. The response rate for the SY21-22 school year was 37%. |
| Source: Annual report, School parent satisfaction survey--overall satisfaction indicator |

3.16 School Safety

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 appropriately 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 <i>or</i> the school lacks many conditions such as the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; - a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; |
|----------------------------|--|

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - adequate maintenance and security; - well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; and/or - 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; - a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; - adequate maintenance and security; - well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; and/or - accessibility to all students. |

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| 3 = Meets standard | <p>Significant health and safety code requirements are being met <i>and</i> the facility generally provides a safe environment that is conducive to learning, based on conditions such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; - a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; - adequate maintenance and security; - well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; and/or - accessibility to all students. |
| 4 = Exceeds standard | <p>All health and safety code requirements are being met <i>and</i> the facility generally provides a safe environment that is conducive to learning, based on conditions such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; - a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; - adequate maintenance and security; - well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; and/or - accessibility to all students. <p>Additionally, the facility meets the mission of the school.</p> |

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The school has purchased the buildings and are currently in the midst of a building project that will improve the teaching spaces as well as various other improvements to the space.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: The school facility provides a safe environment and is well-maintained. Plans are moving forward to improve the facility and possibly expand the teaching space.

2023

Rating: 2.5

Comments: The physical plant is sufficient, but the school is exploring options to better meet the needs of the students and to help promote the type of programming that will not only attract students but retain current students.

Source: Authorizer observation

3.17 MTSS

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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The school does not have adequate systems to identify students needing support. - 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The school has systems to identify students needing support, 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The school has systems to identify students needing support, 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 Dean of Students works with all staff to help identify students in need to additional support and also helps to put that support in place. In SY24, the school began the process of MTSS through Brightworks to help staff address both academic and behavioral support.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: The school now employs a full-time reading specialist as well as a math specialist. The Dean of Students continues to help with behavioral issues. NWPHS has partnered with the Regional Centers of Excellence to improve the learning program for students needing additional assistance.

2023

Rating: __3__

Comments: NWPBS employs a full-time Dean of Students to help with behavioral issues. There are also several interventionists including reading, math and behavioral supports. Parent/family conferences are used to determine if circumstances outside of school are impacted a student’s academic or behavioral performance. Mental health services are provided through a network of both in-school and outside agencies.

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

3.18 Equity & Inclusion

Is the school committed to creating a welcoming, inclusive, and equitable environment that is open to all students? This is evidenced by the following:

- 3.18a. Marketing/outreach targets socioeconomically and racially diverse populations, which includes having materials available in multiple languages.
- 3.18b. Enrollment policies and practices are accessible and transparent. Supports are available to families as needed to navigate the application and enrollment process.
- 3.18c. The school demonstrates a commitment to cultivating a board and staff that is reflective of the student population.

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 1 = Does not meet standard | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 | <i>Not Applicable</i> |

2025

Rating

3.18a: 3

3.18b: 3

3.18c: 3

Overall Rating: 3

Comments: With the building purchases and upgrades, the school has increased their marketing efforts, especially for the Headwaters program. Various marketing venues and recruitment efforts have been undertaken including monthly information nights, newspaper advertisements, social media posts, various partnerships including with local youth serving agencies and participation in community events.

2024

3.18a Rating: 3

3.18b Rating: 3

3.18c Rating: 3

Overall Rating: 3

Comments: NWPHS continues to work on recruiting and retaining both students and staff from all backgrounds. The school is adding a blending learning online component and it is hoped that this will increase enrollment for students unable or unwilling to physically attend school.

2023

3.18a Rating: __3__

3.18b Rating: __2__

3.18c Rating: __3

Overall Rating: __2.6_

Comments: NWPHS is currently working on bolstering their marketing strategy to recruit more students from all backgrounds and socio-economic levels. It is unknown if marketing materials are available in multiple languages. Currently the board is made up of 5 teachers, 2 parents of current students and 2 community members.

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