

FY2025 Evaluation

Saint Paul Conservatory for Performing Artists

The University of St. Thomas (St. Thomas) is committed to fulfilling its role as a charter school authorizer by holding its schools accountable for a range of results. Through clear reporting by the schools and oversight by the authorizer, St. Thomas will uphold our legal obligation to make sure the schools we authorize are reaching (or making adequate progress toward) the purposes, goals, and benchmarks outlined in their charter contract and Minnesota statute. This collective body of evidence will also form the basis for contract renewal decisions. In keeping with the primary purpose of charter schools under *Minnesota Statutes* §124E.01, Subd. 1, improving all pupil learning and all student achievement as measured by the Academic Performance indicators will be the most important factor in determining contract renewal. The School's success in meeting the additional statutory purposes identified by the School will be considered as secondary factors.

St. Thomas uses a standard charter contract with unique, school-specific terms that capture different approaches to achieving student success. The individuality of each school will be preserved in the Accountability System and self-reporting on the results of its respective outcomes through the Annual Report and additional reports as described in the Oversight System section. Failure to provide adequate information to allow the goals to be scored will result in a score of 1, does not meet standard.

Authorizer reporting on school outcomes will take place annually and will be in alignment with the goals set forth through the Accountability System. St. Thomas will report findings to the school's leader and board and encourage constructive dialogue on continuous improvement efforts.

The Accountability System is presented below and is composed of two sections, the Evaluation Framework and the Evaluation Rubric.

Evaluation Framework

The Evaluation Framework sets forth the indicators (general categories) of performance which include academic performance, financial viability, board governance, operations, and legal compliance. the Evaluation Framework also provides the general measures (means to evaluate an indicator), including contextual and methodological information where appropriate. The Evaluation Framework is used in conjunction with the Evaluation Rubric.

Evaluation Rubric

The Evaluation Rubric sets forth the metrics (means to quantify a measure) and targets (specific performance thresholds for success in meeting the standard) for determining whether a school has met its performance requirements according to the expectations set forth in the Evaluation Framework. Each metric in the evaluation rubric has performance targets rated on a four-point scale, compliance indicators cannot exceed standard:

4 = Exceeds standard

3 = Meets standard

- 2 = Approaching standard
- 1 = Does not meet standard

The St. Thomas (UST) Accountability System, including the Evaluation Framework and Evaluation Rubric will be used 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 and to evaluate any charter school seeking Change of Authorizer Status.

The University of St. Thomas regards schools that are meeting expectations (a score of 3 or above) to be performing well against the standards. In order to be considered for a full term contract renewal (5 years), schools must achieve average scores of 2.5 or greater in all three areas and meet the additional specifications laid out in the contract renewal rubric. In order to be considered for expansion without submission of additional compelling data, schools must have scored an average of 3.0 or greater on Academic Performance indicators over the past three years while demonstrating strength across both qualitative and quantitative indicators.

St. Thomas expects each of its authorized charter schools to use academic and non-academic performance metrics that are SMART:

- [S]pecific
- [M]easurable
- [A]ttainable
- [R]elevant, and
- [T]ime-bound

The St. Thomas Accountability System includes evaluation of school-specific metrics, as well as an evaluation of the general metrics that St. Thomas has for each of its authorized charter schools.

Each St. Thomas-authorized charter school will provide the information necessary to score Accountability System metrics, if not reported elsewhere, in the Annual Report. Based on the reported results, as well as its site visits, review of publicly available data, and regular contact with the school, St. Thomas will annually assess the school's performance regarding academic success, fiscal viability, and organizational effectiveness using the Evaluation Rubric that follows. The four-point rating system used in the rubric allows St. Thomas to summarize each school's level of achievement and their progress toward meeting the outcomes delineated in the Evaluation Framework.

Please note that the Accountability System below represents a template that will be modified during contract negotiation to enable St. Thomas to appropriately evaluate each of its authorized schools.

Evaluation Framework

Indicators

The University of St. Thomas Evaluation Framework seeks to set forth the indicators and measures that capture school performance. Indicators are general categories of performance and include academic performance, financial viability, and organizational effectiveness, which encompasses board governance, operations, and legal compliance. These indicators seek to answer specific questions and are grouped as follows:

Indicator(s)	Question	Rubric Section
Academic Performance	Is the learning program a success?	1
Financial Viability	Does the school exhibit strong fiscal health?	2
Organizational Effectiveness: -Board Governance -Operations -Legal Compliance	Is the organization effective and well-run?	3

Measures

Measures are the means to evaluate an indicator, not the specific goals (metrics and targets) which are found in the evaluation rubric. The information below also includes contextual and methodological information where such information is not found in the specific in the rubric.

Section 1: Academic Performance - Is the learning program a success?

The intent of the Academic Performance section is to provide a multi-faceted understanding of Student academic performance at the charter school. Many measures are aligned to the state's World's Best Workforce Priorities. The measures used to understand academic performance include:

- Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) Data: All authorized schools shall participate fully in the MCAs;
- At least one additional school-selected standardized assessment which must be approved by the authorizer in advance of the evaluation rubric's finalization and be utilized for a minimum of three years before a change in assessment can be requested;
- At least one mission-specific academic goal;
- Program alignment with chartered mission and vision;
- Graduation rate data; and
- College and career readiness data.

Data from these assessments will be compiled and evaluated as described below. Each area may have multiple metrics for success as reflected by the Evaluation Rubric included in the contract.

Methodology for Selection of Comparison Schools or Virtual Comparison School

Several academic performance indicators involve the use of demographically similar comparison schools or a virtual demographically matched comparison group. In an effort to be as clear and transparent as possible, the methodology for the selection of comparison schools is addressed below. The process for creating virtual comparison groups is run by the Minnesota Department of Education and is also provided below. Relevant measures will specify whether a virtual comparison group or demographic comparison schools are used; however, if under any circumstances the MN Department of Education ceases to produce or is unable to provide virtual comparison group data in the same or a similar manner, regular comparison schools will be used throughout all relevant measures.

Identification of Demographic Comparison Schools

1. Data files containing student demographic information are downloaded from the Minnesota Department of Education website.
2. Data is filtered in the following order:
 - a. Schools in the seven-county metro area—to approximate the area in which the authorized school is located;
 - b. Schools within 5% of the authorized school's percentage of students qualifying for free/reduced price lunch—to approximate poverty levels;
 - c. Schools within 5% of the authorized school's percentage of students receiving English Learner services; and

- d. Schools within 5% of the authorized school's percentage of students receiving special education services.
3. Schools of differing types than the authorized school are removed—to ensure relevance. For example, to the extent possible, elementary schools are matched with other elementary schools; non-ALC high schools are matched with other non-ALC high schools, etc. Matches do not seek to match the specific school model, type, or philosophy, as our expectation is that students can succeed in many school models and that any model selected should meet the needs of students.

The goal of the process described above is to generate 3-5 schools serving a similar population with which the authorized school can be compared. It is important to note that at times, the process above will produce too many or too few matches. In that case, the parameters of items b, c, and d above may be adjusted to find an adequate number of the best possible matches. Due to shifting demographics in schools, matches may vary from year to year.

Matches will be shared with schools for comment prior to construction of final data sheets, and schools may request the inclusion of additional schools or present a rationale for excluding a certain school; however, the authorizer may or may not grant such requests based on its discretion. All resident district schools serving relevant grades will be included in the 'resident district' column.

While every school is different and demographic matching will not create exact apples-to-apples comparisons, St. Thomas's desire is to arrive at a group of comparison schools that are relevant, fair, and allow for insight into the authorized school's performance.

Description of Virtual Comparison School Process Executed by the Minnesota Department of Education

To assess the relative performance of an individual charter LEA, for each student within a given charter, a student with similar characteristics (currently defined as matching in grade, gender, race/ethnicity, special education status, English learner status, and free and reduced-price meal eligibility) will be randomly drawn from a pool consisting of all Minnesota public school students not enrolled in the charter for which the comparison group is being created. Collectively, this comparison group can be thought of as a "virtual school" in the sense that it will include the same number of students, in the same grades, with the same demographic characteristics as the actual charter LEA to which it is being compared, thus more closely matching the student composition, and expected student performance, of the Charter than any one actual Minnesota school to which that Charter might be compared.

A unique virtual school will be created separately for each charter LEA. The performance of the students in this virtual school will then be calculated. To account for the possibility that a single iteration, or "run," of this process may produce an atypical comparison group for a given charter LEA, the procedure will be repeated multiple times for each charter LEA, and the performance of the comparison virtual schools over those multiple runs will be averaged on each of the six High Quality Charter School measures. This virtual school creation process is repeated for each year of data included in the analysis.

Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment Measures

The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) Measures data includes the current MCA assessment as well as all equivalent state standardized tests.

Students in tested grades who are eligible to take the MCA (i.e.: all students not exempted based on an IEP) will illustrate their progress through the MCA goal series. These goals ensure that students are making progress toward or maintaining high levels of proficiency on the state's academic standards as evidenced through the state's MCA exam. These goals will be scored based on school-wide results.

MCA Proficiency

St. Thomas -authorized charter schools should perform as well as or better than the state, the district where the school resides, and a Minnesota Department of Education generated virtual comparison group or identified schools with comparable demographics (methodology for selection of comparison schools and information on virtual comparison groups is described above). SPCPA has elected to use the virtual comparison group wherever applicable.

MCA Proficiency for Students in Various Demographic Groups

Students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch (FRL), English Learner services, Special Education services, and in all racial/ethnic demographic groups at St. Thomas -authorized charter schools should perform as well as or better than their demographic counterparts statewide.

MCA Progress

MCA data will be analyzed to determine whether students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency. Students should be maintaining at a proficient level from one year to the next or should be increasing their proficiency level.

MCA Progress Comparison Using Minnesota North Star System

Students in authorized schools should progress at the same or better rate as the state, resident district, and their comparable schools/virtual comparison group. SPCPA has elected to use the virtual comparison group wherever applicable.

School Selected Standardized Assessment(s) Measures

In addition to state tests, all schools must select one or more standardized assessments that allow St. Thomas to better understand student attainment and growth.

All St. Thomas -authorized charter schools serving one or more relevant grades (3-11) who are eligible (i.e.: all students not exempt from standardized testing based on their IEP) must participate in additional standardized assessment testing administered in the spring of each year. These measures provide another way to analyze the school's academic progress.

The school's selected assessment(s) must allow the authorizer to examine student performance to a target level as well as assess gains over time as set forth in the school's Evaluation Rubric metrics and targets.

If a school has more than 10 students tested in each grade level, then it should report on these goals for each grade and for the entire school. If there are fewer than 10 students in any grade, then the school should report on this goal for the entire school, only. Scoring for this goal will be on a school-wide level.

Mission Specific Academic and Alignment Measures

Mission Specific Academic Goal

Based on the school's mission, each school must propose at least one school-specific academic goal (including metric and targets) to be considered and approved by St. Thomas. The goal should reflect the school's unique mission/vision and must be measurable. The school is responsible for providing the data necessary to measure progress on this goal. Failure to provide adequate information to allow the goal to be scored will result in a score of 1, does not meet standard. SPCPA considers goal 1.13; post-secondary acceptance, to be its mission specific academic goal.

Academic Program Alignment to Mission and Vision

UST expects the learning programs of authorized schools to exemplify the mission and vision set forth in the school's application for authorization and will assess alignment accordingly.

Other Academic Measures

Graduation Rate

Schools serving grades 9-12 must demonstrate their ability to move students to graduation as defined in the Evaluation Rubric.

College Readiness

Schools serving grades 9-12 must have at least one assessment and resulting goal (metric and target) addressing college and career readiness as defined in the Evaluation Rubric.

Section 2: Financial Viability - Does the school exhibit strong fiscal health?

The parties acknowledge that the Minnesota Charter School Law (124E) requires a charter school to meet generally accepted standards of fiscal management. This includes meeting all St. Thomas, MDE, and statutory reporting deadlines, and remaining current on all financial obligations, including, but not limited to: pension payments, payroll taxes, insurance coverage, loan payments and terms. The intent of the Financial Viability section is to ensure the successful operation of the school into the future and to ensure the proper use of public funds.

Keeping in mind that measures are the means to evaluate an indicator (financial viability), not the specific goals (metrics and targets) which are found in the evaluation rubric, the measures used to understand financial performance include:

- Structures promoting strong board oversight including appropriate policies (i.e.: fund balance policy) and practices (i.e.: finance committee) that promote financial health;
- Annual audit performed and submitted in accordance with MN law;
- Annual budget and monthly cashflow projection by June 30th of each fiscal year; and
- Performance on key financial metrics that demonstrate the school's financial position.
- School ability to meet bond covenants

Data from these sources will be compiled and evaluated. Each measure may have multiple metrics for success as reflected by the Evaluation Rubric.

Annual Audit

All authorized schools must receive an audit annually in accordance with MN law. St. Thomas expects that audits are clean with no major findings (i.e. "clean" opinion, no material weaknesses on internal controls, and no findings on compliance with state or federal laws). An audit finding shall be considered Minor unless St. Thomas determines a finding is Major. If St. Thomas believes an audit finding may be Major, it shall obtain an opinion from a qualified, third-party professional regarding the importance of the finding. St. Thomas shall also ask the charter school to respond to the finding. In general, a finding will be considered Major if it indicates a deliberate act of wrongdoing, reckless conduct or causes a loss of confidence in the abilities or integrity of the school or seriously jeopardizes the continued operation of the school.

Classification of a finding as Major shall be at the sole discretion of St. Thomas and would result in the school being placed on intervention.

Section 3: Organizational Effectiveness (Board Governance, Operations, and Legal Compliance) – Is the organization effective and well run?

A successful charter school requires a board and leadership team with competency in a variety of governance, operational, and compliance-related areas. The Organizational Effectiveness indicator seeks to capture a school's performance through a variety of qualitative and quantitative measures. The intent of the Organizational Effectiveness section is to ensure that schools are following all St. Thomas, MDE, and statutory compliance requirements, providing academic programs that meet state and federal requirements, properly governing schools, and utilizing certain accepted best practices all in service of providing students with a safe, stable, and effective school.

As noted above measures are the means to evaluate an indicator, not the specific goals (metrics and targets). The measures used to understand organizational effectiveness include:

- Systems to properly maintain policies and bylaws.
- Compliance with bylaws and policies.
- Demonstrated commitment of all members to continuous learning, and nonprofit best practices including:

- a. Ability to understand and abide by appropriate board and school leader roles (i.e.: governance vs. management).
 - b. Annual leader review (see above), including a formal, documented review process, timelines, and criteria. Completed by March of each year.
 - c. Annual board self-review March of each year.
 - d. Annual evaluation of any Educational Service Providers, if applicable.
 - e. Utilizing an effective recruitment and orientation process for new members, which at a minimum includes background on issues presently facing the board and an introduction to key documents (i.e.: policy manual, board bylaws, contract with authorizer).
 - f. Engaging in strategic planning at least once every five years, or more frequently if significant programmatic or other changes are slated to occur, and utilizing the strategic plan to drive the direction and priorities of the school.
- The Board of Directors will regularly review, update, and approve its bylaws and policies such that they maintain compliance with state law and current best practices.
 - Distribution of a complete packet (as described in Evaluation Rubric) at least three days prior to all board meetings.
 - Maintenance of orderly records at all times by the Board of Directors, which includes meeting minutes, board documents (bylaws, articles of incorporation, policies, etc.), and financial statements. Records will meet the requirements of the Open Meeting Law, will be kept on site, and will be made available to the public in accordance with Open Meeting Law.
 - Levels of parent, teacher and student satisfaction as measured by student and teacher retention, and an annual parent satisfaction survey which requests satisfaction with the school overall as one item. Teachers who are retiring or who are no longer qualified to serve in their previous role, or whose roles are no longer available due to programmatic changes are not counted against the school's teacher retention goal. Teachers who have left the classroom but are retained by the school in an alternate position (i.e.: Teachers on Special Assignment) are also not counted against the school's retention goal.
 - Student attendance rates.
 - Fulfillment of legal obligations regarding students who qualify for special education services as indicated by conditions such as the following:
 - a. Clear understanding of current legislation, research and effective practices relating to the provision of special education services by appropriate staff.
 - b. Access to appropriate training and information for all staff.
 - c. Effective and timely implementation of individual education plans, informed by the appropriately documented needs of individual students.
 - d. Well-managed relationships with students, parents, and external providers that comply with law and regulation.
 - e. School-specific and board-approved TSES manual.
 - f. Retention of appropriate staff (including teachers, a qualified special education director, and contracted service providers) as required by student population.
 - g. No adverse findings in complaints database.
 - h. Results from most recent MDE program and financial audits.
 - Fulfillment of legal obligations regarding students identified for English Learner (EL) services as indicated by conditions such as the following.

- a. Clear understanding of current legislation, research and effective practices relating to the provision of EL services by appropriate staff;
- b. Access to appropriate training and information by all school staff. Following of MN Standardized Statewide EL Procedures (or subsequent requirements) for identification, entrance, and exit.
- c. Effective program with written plan for service at all grade and proficiency levels.
- d. Retention of appropriate staff (including EL teachers, and contracted service providers) as required by student population.
- e. Results from most recent MDE program and financial audits.
- f. ACCESS Results, if indicated by the Evaluation Rubric.
- g. The school's Disciplinary Incident Reporting System (DIRS) data
- h. Structures and practices in place to support students requiring accommodations
- i. Practices and policies in place to support equity
- j. Practices and policies in place to create a welcoming an inclusive environment

Please note that if analysis of standardized test scores shows that students with special needs and/or students identified as ELs are progressing at rates below the school's non-special needs and/or EL populations, or at rates below their comparable statewide subgroups, then additional Accountability System goals may be developed in conjunction with St. Thomas to measure the school's progress with these students.

- The Board of Directors and School will comply with all applicable state and federal laws including but not limited to:
 - a. Minnesota Charter School Law (Minn. Stat. 124E)
 - i. Board initial and ongoing training
 - ii. Development of board-approved development plan for leader if applicable
 - iii. Governance model requirements
 - b. Minnesota Open Meetings Law (Minn. Stat. 471.705)
 - c. Teacher licensure: The school will hire well-qualified and appropriately licensed (or otherwise state-approved) teachers. (Minn. Stat. 122A.18 subd. 1)
 - d. Fair and open admission/enrollment policies and practices compliant with law.
 - e. Background checks: must be completed on staff, board members, and others with the potential for close contact with students.
 - f. Education of Special Education students (Minn. Stat. 125A.02, 125A.03, 125A.24, 125A.65)
 - g. Applicable state and local health and safety requirements. The school must maintain a safe facility that is conducive to learning.
 - h. Minnesota Human Rights Act (Chapter 63)
 - i. Equal opportunity in athletic programs (Minn. Stat. 121A.04)
 - j. Minnesota Pupil Fair Dismissal Act (Minn. Stat. 124A.40 to 121A.56)
 - k. Minnesota Public Schools Fee Law (Minn. Stat. 123B.34 to 123B.39)
 - l. Educational data and records (Minn. Stat. 13.32, 120A.22 subd. 7, and 121A.75)
 - m. Student legal records (Minn. Stat. 260B.171 subds. 3 and 5)
 - n. The Pledge of Allegiance (Minn. Stat. 121A.11 subd. 3)
 - o. Revenue for a charter school (Minn. Stat. 124E.20)

- p. PERA and TRA (Minn. Stat. 353, 354, and 354a)
- q. Ongoing presence of management and financial controls required by Section 8 of the contract
- r. Administration of an open enrollment process and lottery pursuant to Section 7 of the contract
- s. Public Employment Relations Act (Minn. Stat. 179A)
- t. School district audit requirements (Minn. Stat. 123B.75 to 123B.83)
- u. Student immunization records (Minn. Stat. 121A.15)

All violations of applicable law should be reported to St. Thomas. If St. Thomas believes a violation has occurred, and this violation was not reported, St. Thomas shall first ask the charter school to respond to the information upon which the concern would be based. If St. Thomas believes a violation has occurred which may be material, it shall also obtain an opinion from a qualified third-party professional(s) regarding the importance of the violation. In general, a violation will be considered Major if it indicates a deliberate act of wrongdoing, reckless conduct or causes a loss of confidence in the abilities or integrity of the school or seriously jeopardizes the continued operation of the school. Classification of a finding as material shall be the sole discretion of St. Thomas.

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 MCA Proficiency: Are students performing as well as or better than the state, the resident district, and the virtual comparison school on MCA math and reading exams?				
1.1a Reading				
1.1b 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)	75%			
Average of demographic match schools	73.3%	3	37.5%	1.125
Resident district	31.8%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	51.2%	4	25%	1
			100%	Reading Total: 3.625
	Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	38.3%			

Average of demographic match schools	53.08%	1	37.5%	.375
Resident district	23.4%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	35%	2	25%	.5
			100%	2.375

2025

1.1a Reading: 3.625

1.1b Mathematics: 2.375

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

Comments/Evidence: There was a slight increase in reading proficiency and the school continues to exceed the state in reading. There was also a slight increase in math proficiency from 30.8% to 38.3%. However, this is below the demographic match schools but well above the resident district and slightly above the state.

2024

1.1a Reading: 3.625

1.1b Mathematics: 2.375

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

Comments/Evidence: The reading proficiency scores continue to be strong with a slight increase from SY22. The math scores dropped from SY22 by 7%.

2023

1.1a Reading: 3.75

1.1b Mathematics: 2.875

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.31

Comments/Evidence: There was a significant drop in math scores compared to SY21 (decrease of 26%), but the scores remain higher than the State and resident district. There was a slight dip in the reading scores but the scores are well above the State and resident district scores.

2022

1.1a Reading: 3.63

1.1b Mathematics: 3.63

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.63

Comments/Evidence: Overall, SPCPA’s proficiency scores in reading and math are strong when compared to the resident district and the state. The proficiency rates are also on par with the demographically comparable schools in both subjects. Note that for SY2021, indicators related to standardized testing are being used for information purposes only and are not included in the school’s roll-up average presented in the final evaluation letter.

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

1.2 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 and not displayed separately. 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.

1.2a Reading

1.2b 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	38.3%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 1 - Hispanic	27.3%	15.5%	Included for information only	4
Average of math scores for each demographic group:				
	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score: 4

Reading Proficiency				
All	75%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 1 - Hispanic	CTSTR		Included for information only	
Average of reading scores for each demographic group:				

2025

1.2a Reading:
1.2b Mathematics: 4

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

Comments/Evidence: The math proficiency for the Hispanic subgroup exceeded the state. This was the only subgroup with numbers large enough for a score.

2024

1.2a Reading: N/A
1.2b Mathematics: 4

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

Comments/Evidence: The only demographic group large enough for a score is Hispanic in math.

2023

1.2a Reading: N/A
1.2b Mathematics: N/A

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

Comments/Evidence: All demographic groups are too small to report.

2022

1.2a Reading: N/A
1.2b Mathematics: N/A

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

Comments/Evidence:

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

1.3 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.).

1.3a Reading

1.3b Mathematics

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

2025

1.3a Reading: 3

1.3b Mathematics: 1

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

Comments/Evidence: 50.6% of students are considered to be moving toward proficiency in reading which was slightly higher than the state level of 47.8%. In math, 25% of students are moving toward proficiency which is lower than the state level of 42.8%.

2024

1.3a Reading: N/A

1.3b Mathematics: N/A

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

Comments/Evidence: There is no MCA progress information available in the Northstar reports.

2023

1.3a Reading:

1.3b Mathema

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

Comments/Evidence: This information is not available on the MDE Report Card.

2022

1.3a Reading:

1.3b Mathema

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

Comments/Evidence: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and changes to the data supplied by MDE, growth scores are no longer available.

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

1.4 MCA Progress (Comparison Groups): Are students making progress at the same or better rate as the state, resident district, and their virtual comparison school? 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.

1.4a Reading

1.4b 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

	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Reading Proficiency				
All	75%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 1 - Hispanic			Included for information only	
Average of reading scores for each demographic group:				

	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Math Proficiency				
All	38.3%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 1 - Hispanic			Included for information only	

Average of math scores for each demographic group:	
2025	
1.4a Reading: N/A 1.4b Math: N/A	
Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: N/A	
Comments / Evidence: No growth data is available as the cell sizes are too small to report.	
2024	
1.4a Reading: N/A 1.4b Mathematics: <input type="text" value="N/A"/>	
Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: N/A	
Comments/Evidence: No growth data available as the cell sizes are too small to report.	
2023	
1.4a Reading: N/A 1.4b Mathematics: <u>N/A</u>	
Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: <u>N/A</u>	
Comments/Evidence: Information not available.	
2022	
1.4a Reading:	N/A
1.4b Mathematics:	<u>N/A</u>
Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: <u>N/A</u>	
Comments/Evidence: As mentioned above, due to COVID-19 and changes to the data supplied by MDE, growth scores are no longer available.	
Source: MCA data available on MDE website or school self report if cell size is too small, Test data spreadsheets	

1.5 Are students performing at or above target levels, as measured using the school’s selected standardized assessments?	
1.5a Reading	
1.5b Mathematics	
<i>SPCPA will utilize the PSAT to determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed their grade level benchmark each year.</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 performed at or above target levels (40%-49%).
3 = Meets standard	Assessments indicate that an adequate proportion of tested 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

1.5a Reading: 4

1.5b Math: 1

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

Comments: The overall percentages of students in grade 9, 10 and 11 in ERW were 75.6% and 25% in math. The percentage of students who met both benchmarks was 17%.

2024

1.5a Reading: 4

1.5b Math: 1

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

Comments: The average percentage of students meeting benchmarks on the ERW portion of the PSAT in grades 9 – 11 is 80.3% and 36.7% for math. 37% of students met both benchmarks.

2023

Reading:

Math:

1.5a Reading:

1.5b Math:

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

Comments: The average percentage of students in grades 9 – 11 who met benchmarks in ERW on the PSAT: 80.67%. The average percentage of students in grades 9 – 11 who met benchmarks in math on the PSAT: 46%.

2022

Reading: Due to COVID-19, PSAT was not administered to 9th or 10th graders in 2020-21.
11th Grade: 91% at or above target levels

Math: Due to COVID-19, PSAT was not administered to 9th or 10th graders in 2020-21.
11th Grade: 63% at or above target levels

1.5a Reading:

1.5b Math:

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

Comments: Data provided in 2020-21 Annual Report (pp. 8 – 9)

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

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

1.6a Reading

1.6b Mathematics

SPCPA will measure growth in the following ways using the PSAT for math and reading:

1.6 i. Percentage of students who continued to meet or exceed the benchmark;

*1.6 ii. Percentage of students who moved within one year's growth that meet or exceed benchmark;
and*

1.6 iii. Percentage of students that moved from below the benchmark by more than 1 year's growth to within one year's growth of benchmark.

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%-49%).

3 = Meets standard

Analysis indicates that an adequate proportion of tested students made expected gains (50%-65%).

4 = Exceeds standard

Analysis indicates that an adequate proportion of tested students made expected gains (more than 65%).

2025

1.6a Reading:

i. 4

ii. 1

iii. 3

Reading average: 2.7

1.6b Math:

i. 1

ii. 1

iii. 1

Math average: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of the math and reading scores: 1.85

Comments: 80% of students continued to meet or exceed benchmarks in ERW and 20% in math.

2024

1.6a Reading:

i. 4

ii. 1

iii. 3

Reading average: 2.7

1.6b Math:

i. 3

ii. 1

iii. 1

Math average: 1.7

Enter the overall score produced by the average of the math and reading scores: 2.2

Comments: 78% of students improved their EBRW scores and 61% increased math scores. The average increase on EBRW was 53 points and 55 points on math.

2023

1.6a Reading:

i. 4

ii. N/A

iii. N/A

Reading average: 4

1.6b Math:

i. 3

ii. N/A

iii. N/A

Math average: 3

Enter the overall score produced by the average of the math and reading scores: 3.5

Comments: 51 students in 11th grade had PSAT scores from the fall of 2019 (9th grade). 37 students (73%) increased scores in ERW and 30 students (58%) increased scores in math. The average increase in ERW is 17.54% and 11.73% in math.

2022

1.6a Reading:

i. 96%

ii. N/A

iii. N/A

Reading average: 4

1.6b Math:

i. 71%

ii. N/A

iii. N/A

Math average: 4

Enter the overall score produced by the average of the math and reading scores:

Comments: Scores and ratings were entered for the class of 2022 only. Due to the small sample size, scores are calculated based on 1.6i only for both reading and math. From 2020-21 Annual Report (pp. 8 – 9)

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

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

1 = Does not meet standard	The school's graduation rate was below 75% and did not meet state targets.
2 = Approaching standard	The school's 4-year graduation rate was between 84.9% and 75% and/or did not meet state targets.
3 = Meets standard	The school's 4-year graduation rate was between 85% and 95% and met state graduation targets.
4 = Exceeds standard	The school's 4-year graduation rate was above 95% and met state targets for graduation.

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The graduation rate for SY24 was 88.2% which is slightly lower than SY23. The rate exceeds the state percentage of 84.2%.

2024

Rating:

Comments: The graduation rate for SY23 was 92%. This exceeds the state graduation rate of 83.3%

2023

Rating:

Comments: The school's graduation rate for SY22 was 91%.

2022

Rating:

Comments: In SY21, 91% of seniors graduated. SPCPA's graduation rate continues to exceed the state average, which was 88.3% in SY21.

Source: MDE Data Analytics Request

1.8 Does students' performance on post-secondary readiness assessments (i.e.: ACT, SAT, PSAT, 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

Reading: 2

Math: 1

Rating: 1.5

Comments: 80% of students met the benchmark in reading and 20% in math.

2024

Reading: 3

Math: 2

Rating: 2.5

Comments: 65% of students met the benchmark in math and 92% met the benchmark in reading.

2023

Reading: 2

Math: 1

Rating: 1.5

Comments: 77% of students achieved the benchmark in reading and 37% in math.

2022

Reading: 3 (91% achieved benchmark in reading)

Math: 2 (63% achieved benchmark in math)

Rating: 2.5

Comments: The WBWF Schoolwide goal is 60% or more of students across all demographic subgroups to achieve scores on the ACT that reflected a GPA of 3.0 or higher.

Source: MDE Website

1.9 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.

1.9a: Reading
1.9b: 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

1.9a: Reading: N/A

1.9b: Math: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments: Cell too small to report

2024

1.9a: Reading: N/A

1.9b: Math: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments: Cell was too small to report

2023

1.9a: Reading: N/A

1.9b: Math: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments: SPCPA did not serve students identified as English Learners in SY22.

2022

1.9a: Reading: N/A

1.9b: Math: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments: As noted in previous years SPCPA did not serve students identified as English Learners in SY18-SY21 and currently has 1 student who qualifies for EL services, so information is not provided. In the event that more students who qualify for EL services do enroll, SPCPA will contract for services.

Source: MDE website

1.10 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: Count is too small to report.

2024

1.10a: Reading: N/A

1.10b: Math: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments: Count is too small to report.

2023

1.10a: Reading: N/A

1.10b: Math: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments: The count is too small to report.

2022

1.10a: Reading: N/A

1.10b: Math: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments: For SY22, the number of students receiving Special Education services at SPCPA is less than 10, thus cell size is too small to report.

Source: MDE website

1.11 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: Through communication with various groups during site visits and other communications, it is clear that SPCPA continues to provide excellent programming with a strong focus on the mission and vision. Although the last few years have been challenging with respect to enrollment, building issues and some licensure issues, the administration and the board have worked hard to uphold the ethos of the school. Students relate a very positive experience at the school and site the support they receive both academically and artistically as reasons SPCPA is their school of choice.

2024

Rating: 4

Comments: While SPCPA continues to struggle with enrollment and this has been a challenge, the learning program and arts program remain strong. There is a sense of pride in the school that is felt and articulated from the various focus groups from the parents to the students to the staff. It is clear that all decisions made at the board level and school level and made with a focus on what is best for the students and the school overall. SPCPA continues to be recognized by US News and World Report as a "Best High School". The strong focus on the mission and vision is also evident in the number of students who are choosing to go on to continue studies in dance, theater or music (45%).

2023

Rating: 4

Comments: SPCPA has made a great effort to return to pre-pandemic levels with regard to student engagement and academic levels. The year started with a whole school assembly to remind all stakeholders of the mission and vision of the school. The commitment continues to pay off with college acceptance rates and that fact that many students are continuing in arts programs after high school. 52% of the graduates pursuing college are focusing on dance, music, theater, art or creative writing. 62% of those students were accepted into audition-based degrees. SPCPA was again recognized by US News and World Report as a “Best High School”.

2022

Rating: 4

2022

Rating: 4

Comments: SPCPA continues to demonstrate strong commitment to the school’s mission. This is apparent in programming and adjustments made to curriculum, facilities and the general program in order to better serve the students. Examples include the addition of a visual arts program, creation and addition of the creative writing program which included the hiring of six professional writers. SPCPA was recognized by US News and World Report as a “Best High School”. The facility updates include the renovation and expansion for a new gallery and additional art studio. SPCPA continues successful programs such as juries, j-term and student ambassadors.

100% of students who applied were accepted into between 1 – 13 schools (average 3.8 per applicant). 78% of graduates are attending college. 46% of college-bound students are pursuing majors in dance, theater or music (58% in conservatory programs requiring audition for admittance).

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

1.12 Maximizing instructional time: Are students missing instructional time due to disciplinary incidents? Note: Disciplinary incidents will be defined as those deemed reportable in the DIRS system with the exception of in-school suspension which will be tracked and reported separately.

1 = Does not meet standard

More than 15% of students have a DIRS reportable incident

2 = Approaching standard

More than 10%-15% of students have a DIRS reportable incident

3 = Meets standard

More than 5%-10% of students have a DIRS reportable incident

4 = Exceeds standard

5% or less of students have a DIRS reportable incident

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: Less than 10% of students have a DIRS reportable incident. During the 24-25 school year, 2 students received in-school suspension and 4 students received out-of-school suspensions.

2024

Rating: 4

Comments: There were 7 DIRS reportable incidents, all of which resulted in in-school suspension rather than out of school.

2023

Rating: N/A

Comments: N/A

2022

Rating: 4

Comments: There were 3 incidents reported.

Source: MDE DIRS Data, School reported data

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

1 = Does not meet standard

Less than 55% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program

2 = Approaching standard

Between 55%-65% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post- secondary program

3 = Meets standard

Between 70%- 85% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program

4 = Exceeds standard

Over 85% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program

2025

Rating: 4

Comments: 100% of students applying for post-secondary programs are accepted.

2024

Rating: 4

Comments: 100% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program.

2023

Rating: 4

Comments: 100% of students who applied were accepted into post-secondary institutions. 80% of students are planning to attend.

2022

Rating: 4

Comments: 100% of students who applied were accepted into between 1 – 13 schools with an average of 3.8 acceptances per applicant.

Source: MDE Sleds Data, School reported data

1.14 Are students equitably accessing rigorous coursework (AP, IB, CIS, PSEO, Honors) at high rates?

<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: 3 1.14b: N/A</p> <p>Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3</p> <p>Comments: 15% of students take PSEO courses and approximately 50% of students access either Advanced Placement or Honors level courses.</p>
<p>2024</p> <p>1.14a: 3 1.14b: N/A</p> <p>Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3</p> <p>Comments: Approximately 50% of students access one or more rigorous courses, either Advanced Placement or Honors level courses.</p>
<p>2023</p> <p>1.14a: 3 1.14b: N/A</p> <p>Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3</p> <p>Comments: 55% of 11th and 12th grade students enrolled in at least one AP course and 32% in one advanced (non-AP) course. This number is up from 30% and 25% in 2019-20. BIPOC information unavailable.</p>

2022

1.14a:

1.14b:

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

Comments: BIPOC information unavailable. SPCPA's goal for SY22 was to see a 15%-20% increase in registration for advanced and AP classes. Approximately 55% of students at the 11th – 12th graders enrolled in at least 1 AP class and 32% enrolled in at least one advanced class during school year 2021-22.

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

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 finance committee at SPCPA remains to be active and watches the enrollment numbers carefully. Financial information is presented to the board each month.	
2024	
Rating: 4	
Comments: The finance committee at SPCPA is very active and keeps a close eye on enrollment and other financial matters. Finances are presented to and discussed with the full board at the monthly board meetings.	

2023

Rating: 4

Comments: Financial statements and management reports are received and reviewed monthly by the Executive Director and presented to the Executive Committee and Finance Committee for review, discussion and approval. The Finance Committee meets prior to board meetings and consists of three board members (Board Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer and the Executive Director).

2022

Rating:

Comments: The Executive and Finance Committees meet prior to the regular board meetings to review financial statements and management reports before presenting them to the full board. The board closely tracks enrollment numbers and works with the school's superintendent to ensure the budget is conservative and realistic.

Source: Monthly board packets; 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 35% fund balance.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: SPCPA has a Fund Balance Policy that stipulates a 35% fund balance over time.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The school continues to operate under Fund Balance Policy 706 which includes an annual fund balance that is 35% of the total projected expenditure budget.

2022

Rating:

Comments: SPCPA continues to operate under the fund balance policy (706) that was adopted 1/19/2011. This policy includes an annual fund balance that is 35% of that fiscal year's projected expenditure budget.

Source: Monthly board packets; Board policy manual

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 audit is clean with no findings.

2024

Rating: 2

Comments: Per the financial audit, SPCPA failed to maintain an adequate debt service coverage ratio which is an issue of non-compliance with bond covenants. The school is aware of this and is working to remedy the issue.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The FY22 financial audit included no material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. Two items with regard to Minnesota legal compliance were cited: more than \$250,000 in the main checking account and insufficient collateral to properly collateralize deposits per state statute. Both items have been remedied.

2022

Rating:

Comments: CliftonLarsonAllen completed the FY21 audit. Per the audit report (p.1), the audit was clean 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: The budget is approved prior to June 30 and includes a conservative enrollment projection.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: SPCPA work to establish a realistic budget and makes revisions as necessary based on enrollment. In SY22, the school planned a deficit budget of -\$387,000 due to a decrease in enrollment.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: Revisions in the budget are based on enrollment. The detailed budget is shared with the Executive Committee and the board in May for approval in June.

2022

Rating:

Comments: For FY22, the budget is based on 400 ADM. The actual ADM is approximately 425. SPCPA budgeted conservatively because of the unknowns deriving from COVID-19 such as enrollment fluctuation, substitute shortages and addressing student learning loss. SPCPA approved a detailed budget prior to June 30.

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 projected ADM was 350 and the actual enrollment was 335 for an enrollment realization of 95%.

2024
Rating: 2.5
Comments: Initially, the budget was based on an enrollment projection of 395 for an enrollment realization of 89%. The budget was then revised based on an enrollment of 375 for an enrollment realization of 98%.

2023
Rating: 2

Comments: 415 was the budgeted enrollment and actual enrollment was 375 for an enrollment realization of 90%.

2023
Rating: 2
Comments: 415 was the budgeted enrollment and actual enrollment was 375 for an enrollment realization of 90%.

2022
Rating: __3__
Comments: As mentioned above, the actual ADM exceeds the budgeted ADM by approximately 25 students.

Source: Monthly board packets, 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: 3

Comments: The projected cash on hand is 73 days.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: The school maintains the minimum days cash on hand.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The projected cash on hand is 74 days.

2022

Rating: | 3 |

Comments: Projected cash on hand is 141 (minimum of 30 days) with a projected debt service coverage of 1.71x (minimum of 1.10x). Annual report (p. 64)

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 projected fund balance is 68%.	
2024	
Rating: 4	
Comments: The projected fund balance is 54%.	
2023	
Rating: 4	
Comments: The fund balance as of June 30, 2022 is \$3,205,446 or 62.5%.	
2022	
Rating:	<input type="text" value="4"/>
Comments: SPCPA currently has a fund balance of approximately 63% (\$3,040,631) with the jump from 52% last year primarily due to a forgiven PPP loan.	
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: 2

Comments: The school is meeting bond covenants this year but has been out of compliance in the past three years.

2024

Rating: 2

Comments: Per the financial audit, the school failed to meet the debt service coverage ratio, which is out of compliance with bond covenants.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The school has consistently met all bond covenants.

2022

Rating:

Comments: SPCPA has consistently met 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: All board members have met training requirements and participate in ongoing training throughout the school year.

2024

Rating: 3

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

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: All board members have stayed current with regard to mandatory and ongoing board training. In 2021-22, board training was led by board member Jeffrey Kempton on the strategic planning process focused on scenario planning.

2022

Rating:

Comments: There have been no issues with members completing trainings within statutory requirements. New board members are on-boarded through an initial meeting. All members are required to complete training in three core areas of board governance, finance and employment law. Annual training is completed at least once per school year based on identified areas for growth and/or review.

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 Open Meeting law and remains in compliance. Board records are maintained both online and on paper.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: The school understands and complies with Open Meeting law. Records are well-maintained and the school has not been out of compliance.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The SPCPA board continues to follow open meeting law. Board packets are submitted regularly and the minutes and agendas are kept up to date on the school website.

2022

Rating:

Comments: The Board understands and follows the open meeting law. SPCPA maintains all Board meeting agendas and minutes on its website as well as hard copies in the office of the Executive Director.

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 are appropriately licensed.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: All staff are appropriately licensed. The new legislation that allows arts instructors to teach without a license but with at least 5 years of experience has allowed for more Tier 1 licenses.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: All teaching staff are appropriately licensed. The new tiered licensure system has proven difficult as there is no option for professionals without a bachelors degree (community expert option has been eliminated).

2022

Rating:

Comments: All staff are appropriately licensed according to licensure file checks.

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 or others with potential for close student contact.
3 = Meets standard	The school certifies that it completes criminal background checks of staff, the board, and others with potential for close student contact, as required by school policy.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The school conducts criminal background checks for all staff, board members and any others who have contact with students.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: The school conducts criminal background checks on board members, staff and volunteers if they have contact with students.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: SPCPA includes board members and volunteers in the background check policy.

2022

Rating:

Comments: SPCPA follows Policy 404 per employment background checks. The policy also includes a provision for background checks for board members and volunteers.

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

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 compliant with all applicable laws.	
2024	
Rating: 3	
Comments: SPCPA is compliant with all applicable laws.	
2023	
Rating: 3	
Comments: SPCPA remains compliant with all applicable laws.	
2022	
Rating: <input type="text" value="3"/>	
Comments: SPCPA is compliant with other applicable laws. Policies have been updated to include the Safe and Supportive Schools Act and Lead in School.	
Source: UST site visit, board chair interview, background check policy	

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.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: The board at SPCPA continues to be strong and supportive. A self-evaluation is completed annually and uses the results of this evaluation to guide trainings and other work throughout the year. An annual evaluation of the school leader is also conducted. Strategic planning is specific to the scenarios that are presenting challenges to growth for the school and is ongoing.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: New board members are onboarded through an initial meeting. The board completes a self-evaluation annually with the intention of holding the board accountable and allowing for reflection on individual and collective action as well as to foster open communication. The board is making plans to update the strategic plan for the school.

2022

Rating:

Comments: The Board self-evaluation process for SY22 was paused to provide for more focus on COVID-19 mitigation strategies and planning. The self-assessment process and procedure will be revised in SY23 to align with the revised strategic planning process. In general, the data from the self-evaluation guides the work of the Board. All Board members participated in Strategic Planning training in October 2021.

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. The policies are reviewed through Civil Intelligence.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: SPCPA continues to contract with Civil Intelligence for policy review and also maintains a membership to MSBA for policy models and updates. The school is working with legal counsel to create and revise policies due to all of the legislative updates from 2023-24.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The board continues to contract with Civic Intelligence to assist with the policy review cycle.

2022

Rating:

Comments: The SPCPA Board reviewed the Bylaws during the 2019 workshop and annual training in collaboration with Civic Intelligence. Revised bylaws were adopted in March 2020.

Source: Board minutes, board policies, Governance binder, 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 complete and submitted on time.

2024

Rating: 3

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

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: Board packets are submitted at least three days prior to meetings on a consistent basis.

2022

Rating:

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

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 maintaining an established EL program with a written plan for service at all grade and proficiency levels, securing appropriate staffing, supplying relevant professional development to all staff, ensuring that information on student EL status is available to all classroom teachers, and following MN Standardized Statewide EL Procedures for identification, entrance, and exit. The school ensures that staff have appropriate training, hold appropriate licenses, and are familiar with current legislation and research related to best practices for serving EL students.

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: SPCPA has a plan for EL learners but currently have only 2 students who qualify for EL services. There is some difficulty in finding part-time EL instructors so students are supported in the classroom.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: Students required English language instruction are identified through cumulative records as well as parent or teacher recommendations. SPCPA currently has one student who requires EL services and this is provided on a 1:1 basis 160 minutes per week. Other students with EL needs are supported in the classroom.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: There are currently 4 students identified as EL at SPCPA. The students are identified through examination of cumulative records, ACCESS scores and the Minnesota Language Survey. There is one licensed teacher for EL instruction which may include pullout and collaboration with the mainstream teacher. The EL instructor serves as a resource for the general education teachers as well. Of the 4 EL students, three passed all classes with a cumulative GPA of 3.5 or higher and are on track to graduate at the close of the first semester in 2022-23. One student passed 7 of 10 courses and could graduate on time with credit recovery.

2022

Rating:

Comments: SPCPA does not currently have any identified EL students. If a student is identified as EL, SPCPA would contract for EL services to meet student needs.

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)? (i.e. The school has a TSES manual that is school-specific and board-approved; has a special education director actively involved in working with special education staff and school leadership; effectively contracts with entities to provide services to students when necessary; completes annual IEP meetings on time; has been subject to no investigations related to special needs students; and has received a clean audit by MDE in the last audited school year. The school ensures that staff have appropriate training and are familiar with current legislation and research related to best practices for serving students with IEPs.)

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: 11.6% of students attending SPCPA qualify for special education services. This is a 3.4% increase from the previous year. With this increase, SPCPA has hired an additional staff member in the special education department. This teacher qualified as a Tier 3 teacher with an out of field permission as an Academic and Behavioral Specialist. The lead special education teacher is licensed under SLP/EBD. This teacher completes all of the due process duties. The school also employs 3 full-time paraprofessionals. A full-time special education director manages all of the paperwork, evaluations, etc. The school contracts for a School Psychologist, ASD consultant and Special Transport Services.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: SPCPA receives referrals from parents, teachers and service providers for special education evaluations. The majority of the referrals are through teachers of struggling students. A Child Study team then reviews the information and determines how to proceed. The school employs one full time special ed teacher and has recently added a second. There are three paraprofessionals who provide additional support in the classrooms. There is an on-site special education director and the school contracts with a school psychologist, ASD consultant and speech therapist. Of the 9 students receiving special education services, all will graduate on time with a GPA from 2.5 – 3.9.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: To determine special education eligibility, information is gathered from individually administered assessments, classroom observations, input from the teachers and parents. This information is used to determine not only the present levels of performance but also to describe how the disability affects student progress with the general education curriculum. Data from this information is analyzed to find the gap between the student's current skills and the skills that expected of them. Progress on IEP goals is gathered and reported to parents 4 times per school year. Progress toward transition skills is also assessed and reported.

One full-time special education teacher and 3 paraprofessionals are employed for students receiving special education services. SPCPA also has a full-time special education director on site. Contracted services include psychological services, ASD consultation and speech and language services.

SPCPA currently provides special education services to 28 students in grades 9 – 12. Of the 28, 26 students are on track to graduate on time.

2022

Rating:

Comments: SPCPA has a school-specific TSES manual. The school employs a full time special education director as well as two licensed special education teachers and one paraprofessional. Contracted services include school psychologist, speech/language, Autism Spectrum Disorder, Physical health disabilities and Deaf/Hard of Hearing services. There have been no special education complaints.

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

3.11 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: 2

Comments: The attendance rate for SY24 was 89.2% which is a slight increase from the previous year.

2024

Rating: 2

Comments: The school had an attendance rate of 87%.

2023

Rating: 1

Comments: Per the annual report, the schoolwide attendance rate for SY21-22 was 80.55%.

2022

Rating:

Comments: Per the annual report, the schoolwide attendance rate for SY2020-2021 was 93.02%. This was a slight decrease from 93.59% in SY2019-2020. (p.10)

Source: Annual reports, MDE website (data downloads)

3.12 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: 1

Comments: Per the annual report, 34 of 69 teachers returned for SY24 for a teacher retention rate of 69%

2024

Rating: 2

Comments: Per the annual report, the school had approximately 70% teacher retention.

2023

Rating: 2

Comments: Per the annual report, at the beginning of SY22, 27% of the teachers from the previous year were not returning, 34% of the teachers for the year were new and 39% were returning from the previous school year. (approximately 73% teacher retention)

2022

Rating:

Comments: SPCPA retained approximately 85% of teachers for SY22.

Source: Annual report

3.13 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: 365 students were enrolled after October 1 and 362 were enrolled at the end of the school year. 329 students remained enrolled for the full school year.

2024

Rating: 2

Comments: The student attrition rate was approximately 12% with 88% of students remaining for the full school year.

2023

Rating: 2

Comments: For SY22, SPCPA had a 15% student attrition rate. This is higher than historically, which usually falls between 12% and 14%.

2022

Rating:

Comments: For SY21, SPCPA had 440 students enrolled on or before October 1; 21 students joined after October 1 and 24 students left the school after October 1. 413 students remained enrolled for the full school year.

Source: Annual report, renewal application

3.14 Does the school exhibit a high level of parent satisfaction?

1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 75% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school OR the school failed to achieve a response rate greater than 25%.
2 = Approaching standard	More than 75% but less than 85% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school and the school achieved a response rate greater than 25%.
3 = Meets standard	More than 85% but less than 95% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school and the school achieved a response rate greater than 25%.
4 = Exceeds standard	At least 95% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school and the school achieved a response rate greater than 25%.

2025

Rating: $3 + 4 = 7 / 2 = 3.5$

Comments: The response rate was 30% and 90% of respondents indicate they are satisfied with the school.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: 87% of parents indicated that they are satisfied with the school. There was a 33% response rate.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: 88% of respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the school. The response rate was 30%.

2022

Rating:

Comments: On the parent survey at the end of SY21:

- 84% agree or strongly agree that SPCPA meets its mission statement
- 72% agree or strongly agree that SPCPA provides engaging academic curriculum
- 89% agree or strongly agree that SPCPA provides an engaging arts curriculum.
- 70% agree or strongly agree that SPCPA has an equitable curriculum
- 80% feel that SPCPA is a place where all people feel welcome
- 68% agree or strongly agree that staff and administration communicate effectively

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

3.15 Is the school's physical plant safe and conducive to learning?

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: 3	
Comments: The school has had a difficult year with regard to facilities. Flooding in a neighboring building impacted rooms used by the school. The dance studios were not completed within the timeline set because of issues with builders and materials. The school leadership did their best to meet all of these challenges and were able to continue to meet the needs of the students.	
2024	
Rating: 3	
Comments: For SY25, the dance studios will be in the Lowry building, which eliminates the need for the River Centre as well as some of the use of the skyways. This will be the first time that all of the students will be in one building which will increase class time, safety and decrease costs. The facility continues to meet health and safety code requirements.	

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The physical plant at SPCPA continues to be conducive to learning, but challenges with the location continue, including the skyways. The SPCPA board is well aware of these challenges and is working to find viable solutions.

2022

Rating:

Comments: The physical environment at SPCPA is safe and conducive to learning. To adjust to changes in programming SPCPA has expanded their space to accommodate the new Visual Arts program as well as space for a new gallery and an additional arts studio. 84% of parents in the survey reported that their child feels safe at school.

Source: Authorizer observation

3.16 Do the school's disciplinary practices eliminate disparities as they relate to students of color?

1 = Does not meet standard

The school suspended/expelled BIPOC students at a rate more than 15% percentage points higher than the rate for their white peers.

2 = Approaching standard

The school suspended/expelled BIPOC students at a rate more than 5-10% percentage points higher than their white peers.

3 = Meets standard

The school suspended/expelled BIPOC students at approximately the same rate as their white peers.

4 = Exceeds standard

Not applicable

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: Of the 6 suspensions in SY24 (2 in-school, 4 out-of-school), 50% of the students were BIPOC.

2024

Rating: 2

Comments: Of the 6 students who received in-school suspensions, 5 were students of color.

2023

Rating: N/A

Comments: The information with regard to BIPOC students is not available.

2022

Rating:

Comments: Three incidents were reported in DIRS.

Source: MDE DIRS Data, School reported data

3.17 Does the school have appropriate structures in place to effectively identify and support students needing academic accommodations (either acceleration or remediation), mental health supports or other supports in a timely fashion?

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 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 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: Teachers identify students needing support and this support is provided through some guided study halls and intervention support as needed. Peer tutoring is utilized when necessary and available.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: The school continues to utilize guided study halls and after school support, both of which are available to all students. National Honor Society Peer Tutors are also used to help students who are struggling as are parent volunteer tutors in math. 15% of federal special education funds are used for Coordinated Early Intervention Services to address the needs of students not qualified for Special Education.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: In response to student and parent feedback, a “Wellness for Artists” course was added for all students in Grade 9 as well as the Grade 9 specific student halls. These study halls help students develop study and organizational skills and are also for community building. The student halls are facilitated by the Student Support Specialist. A Student Achievement Specialist has been added to focus on academic achievement, college readiness and college planning for students. A full-time Dean of Students assists with student behavior management, student discipline and attendance support.

2022

Rating:

Comments: SPCPA has several positions in place to help offer support to students. The Dean of Students helps with attendance issues; the Student Achievement Coordinator monitors student grades and meets with students receiving a D or lower in classes; there is a guided study hall which is required for all underclassmen; after school support is available as classroom teachers set aside at least half and hour at the end of the day for students to receive assistance as needed.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews

3.18 Is the school committed to anti-racism and equity by engaging in/ providing the following on an annual basis:

- **Representative/ Culturally relevant curriculum**
- **Specific staff/ board trainings**
- **Board and staff composition**
- **Opportunities for members of the school community to provide feedback on the school’s diversity, equity, and inclusion practices and policies**

1 = Does not meet standard

Staff do not engage in cultural competency training. The board/ staff are not representative of the students the school serves and there is no plan to engage the school’s broader community.

2 = Approaching standard	Staff/ Board members inconsistently engage in cultural competency training. The school is committed to recruiting staff/ board members who are representative of their school's community as evident by recruitment practices.
3 = Meets standard	Students/ families of all backgrounds report that the school feels welcoming and accepting. Staff/ Board members regularly engage in cultural competency training, and equity is included in the school's strategic plan. The school routinely engages the school's broader

community, as evidenced by staff/ board composition. And the school utilizes a curriculum that is not only representative of the student's it serves; it also represents a multitude of backgrounds and perspectives.

4 = Exceeds standard NOT APPLICABLE

2025
Rating: 3
Comments: The school continues to be aware of the composition of the student body, teaching staff, arts staff and board.

2024
Rating: 3
Comments: In 2020, a goal was set that 50% of all arts teachers would be BIPOC. In SY22-23, this goal was realized. 2 out of 8 board members are BIPOC. The curriculum emphasizes works of BIPOC authors and contributors.

2023
Rating: 3
Comments: SPCPA continues to offer trainings in cultural competency for all staff. Recruiting teachers and artists of color continues to be a priority.

2022
Rating:
Comments: During J-term, all staff participate in 13 workshop days. The trainings included cultural competency training. SPCPA actively recruits teachers of color to ensure the demographics of the student population is reflected in staffing to the extent possible.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews

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

- **Marketing/outreach targets socioeconomically and racially diverse populations**
- **Materials available in multiple languages**
- **Robust EL/ SPED Programming**
- **Enacting policies that reduce enrollment barriers**

1 = Does not meet standard	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. The school has an undeveloped EL or SPED program. Additionally, school policies and practices are not transparent and/or result in accessibility barriers for low income students and students of color.
2 = Approaching standard	The school’s marketing strategy includes a plan to recruit students from diverse backgrounds and/or those who are low income. However, materials are only available in English. The school has an

	underdeveloped EL or SPED program. School policies and practices are generally transparent and do not create accessibility barriers for low income students or students of color.
3 = Meets standard	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 and the school has robust EL and SPED programs. Additionally, school policies and practices are clear, transparent, and do not have negative impacts on low income students or students of color.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 4

Comments: The school continues to make a conscious effort to reach students of all demographic groups. The school policies are clear and transparent and representative of all students.

2024

Rating: 4

Comments: SPCPA is making a conscious effort to reach students of all demographic groups. The school was represented at the Academia Cesar Chavez school fair. Marketing and promotional materials are representative of the entire student body as is the new school website.

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The location of the school continues to cause concern and is a possible reason for the enrollment issues. There is some talk about a new site and/or ways to improve the current site and make it safer for students. Beginning in 2021, funds were allocated for advertising in downtown St. Paul. The online presence has been expanded, especially through the social media presence for wider coverage. The prospective student page on the website was updated.

2022

Rating:

Comments: SPCPA has worked to enhance their presence in downtown St. Paul through text and images added to the windows on the exterior of the Lowry building. There is a skyway mural and photographs throughout the second floor as well as online marketing via social media platforms. The SPCPA website offers the information available in 12 languages. The 513 Admissions Policy assures that the admissions and enrollment process allows an equitable and fair opportunity for access to the school by all eligible students.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews

3.20 School-specific non-academic goals:

a. For the 2020-2021 school year, 32% of students at SPCPA are students of color. SPCPA is striving to recruit and retain by the 2022-2023 school year and beyond 40% or more students of color.

b. For 2020-2021, 32% of arts teachers are teachers of color. SPCPA is striving to recruit and retain by the 50% arts teachers of color by the 2022-2023 school year.

1 = Does not meet standard

a. The school missed its goal around student recruitment and retention by 5-10%.

b. The school missed its goal around recruitment and retention of teachers of color by 5-10%.

2 = Approaching standard

a. The school missed its goal around student recruitment and retention by 1-5%.

b. The school missed its goal around recruitment and retention of teachers of color by 1-5%.

3 = Meets standard	<p>a. The student population is at least 32% students of color in SY2022 and at least 40% students of color in SY2023 and beyond.</p> <p>b. For SY2022 at least 32% of arts teachers will be people of color. This will increase to at least 50% by SY2023 and the school will seek to maintain that level going forward.</p>
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: 36.9% of the school population are students of color and over 50% of the arts teachers.

2024

Rating: 3

Comments: As mentioned previously, over 50% of the arts teachers are BIPOC and approximately 30% of the academic teachers. This is much higher than the state level of 11.5%. 36% of the students are BIPOC. This is close to the state average of 37.7%

2023

Rating: 3

Comments: In SY22, the percentage of students of color at SPCPA was 35.5%.

2022

Rating:

Comments: 35.8% of the SPCPA student population are students of color, which is increased from 32% in SY21. At the time of this report, there was no access to the current percentage of teachers of color but this percentage was also 32% in SY21.

Source: Site Visits, Interviews, Quarterly Reports