

Evaluation Rubric

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

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

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

SECTION I – IS THE LEARNING PROGRAM A SUCCESS?

1.1 3rd Grade MCA Reading Proficiency: Are students proficient in reading?	
1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 40% of are proficient in reading.
2 = Approaching standard	40-55.0% of students are proficient in reading.
3 = Meets standard	55.1%-75.0% of students are proficient in reading.
4 = Exceeds standard	More than 75% of students are proficient in reading.
2025	
Rating: 1	
Comments: 15.7% of third grade students scored as proficient in reading. This is significantly lower than the state average of 46.5% but an increase from the 2024 average of 12%.	
2024	
Rating: Enter the number that most closely matches your assessment: <input type="text" value="1"/>	
Comments/Evidence: 12% of third grade students scored as proficient in reading which is slightly higher than the score in 2022 (11.6%) but significantly lower than the state average (48%).	
Data Source: Minnesota Department of Education <i>School Report Card</i> , Test Data spreadsheets	

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

1.2a Reading

1.2b Mathematics

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

	Reading Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	34.5%			
Average of demographic match schools	21.9%	3	37.5%	1.125
Resident district	34.1%	3	37.5%	1.125
State	49.9%	1	25%	.25
			100%	Reading Total: 2.5
	Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	9.5%			
Average of demographic match schools	12.53%	3	37.5%	1.125
Resident district	25.9%	1	37.5%	.375
State	43.5%	1	25%	.25
			100%	Math Total: 1.75

2025

1.2a Reading: 2.5

1.2b Mathematics: 1.75

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 2.125

Comments/Evidence: Proficiency scores in reading and math for elementary increased from SY23 by 3.1% in math and 4.6% in reading. Both reading and math scores for CPA Elementary exceeded the demographic match schools. In middle school, math proficiency increased by .8%

and reading scores decreased by the same. The math scores for high school decreased by 4.1% and fell below the demographic match schools. In reading, the scores increased by 8.6% and exceeded the demographic match schools.

2024

1.2a Reading: 1.75

1.2b Mathematics: 1.75

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1.75

Comments/Evidence: Scores in both math and reading are on par with the demographic match schools but fall short of scores of the resident district as well as the state.

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

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

1.3a Reading

1.3b Mathematics

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

	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Math Proficiency				
All	9.5%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 1 - Asian	11%	43.2%	Included for information only	1
Demographic Group 2 - Black	4.4%	21.9%	Included for information only	1
Demographic Group 3 - Hispanic	10.1%	22.4%		1
Average of math scores for each demographic group: 1				
	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Reading Proficiency				
All	34.5%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 1 - Asian	28.9%	44.6%	Included for information only	1

Demographic Group 2 - Black	15.5%	31.1%	Included for information only	1
Demographic Group 3 - Hispanic	21.7%	28.7%		2
Average of reading scores for each demographic group: 1.3				

2025

1.3a Reading: 1.3

1.3b Mathematics: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1.15

Comments/Evidence: Each subgroup is performing below the state average; however the Hispanic subgroup increased reading proficiency as well as math.

2024

1.3a Reading: 1

1.3b Mathematics: 1

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

Comments/Evidence: All demographic groups scored well below the state average. Many of the scores decreased from the previous year.

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

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

1.4a Reading

1.4b Mathematics

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

2025

1.4a Reading: 1

1.4b Mathematics: 1

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

Comments/Evidence: In math, 9.1% of students improved or maintained proficiency which is a decrease from SY23 and well below the state percentage of 42.8%. 23.8% of students improved or maintained proficiency in reading.

2024

1.4a Reading: 1

1.4b Mathematics: 2

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1.5

Comments/Evidence: 28.7% of CPA students improved or maintained proficiency in math compared to 56.3% of students statewide. In reading, 48% improved or maintained which was 12% below state proficiency.

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

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

1.5a Reading

1.5b Mathematics

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

	Reading Growth	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Points earned
Charter	41.8%		
Resident district	47.5%	3	3
State	61%	1	1
			Reading Total: 2

	Math Growth	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Points earned
Charter	24.8%		
Resident district	36.4%	1	1
State	56.4%	1	1
			Math Total:1

2025

1.5a Reading: 2

1.5b Mathematics: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1.5

Comments/Evidence: In reading, growth scores were slightly lower than the resident district. Both reading and math growth scores were well below the state.

2024

1.5a Reading: 2

1.5b Mathematics: 1.5

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1.75

Comments/Evidence: In reading, growth scores were slightly higher than the resident district but lower than the state. Math proficiency was below both the resident district as well as the state.

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

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

1.6a Reading

1.6b Mathematics

The school has selected to use the Fastbridge Assessment in Grades K – 12.

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

2025

1.6a Reading: 3

1.6b Math: 2

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

Comments: In reading, the percentage of students performing at or above target levels are: Elementary – 49.2%; Middle School – 48.9%; High School – 61.9%. Elementary and High School numbers increased from SY24. In math, 51.6% of students in Elementary were performing at or above target levels which is a significant increase from SY24. High school percentages increased as well with 55.4% of students at or above target levels. In Middle School, the percentage decreased to 24%.

2024

1.6a Reading: 2

1.6b Math: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1.5

Comments: In reading the breakdown of students performing at or above target levels is as follows: Elementary – 42%, Middle School – 55.1%, High School – 35%. In math the percentages of students performing at or above target levels are much lower in elementary school with 25%. Middle School and High School are somewhat lower with 43.6% in middle school and 33% in high school.

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

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

1.7a Reading

1.7b Mathematics

The school has selected to use the Fastbridge Assessment for Grades K – 12.

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

2025

1.7a Reading: 2

1.7b Math: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1.5

Comments: In the Elementary School, 36.3% of students made expected gains, in reading. 43.9% in Middle School and 57.5% in High School made expected gains in reading. In Math, the percentage of students making expected growth: Elementary 37.1%; Middle School 36.2%; High School 34.5%.

2024

1.7a Reading: 3

1.7b Math: 3

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

Comments: These scores are based on the NWEA in grades 9 – 12. In reading, 55% of students made expected gains and 51% in math.

**The growth scores for grades K – 8 on Fastbridge were not included in the annual report, so this score is based only on grades 9 – 12 on NWEA. To have K – 8 scores included in the benchmark, please submit these scores.

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

1.8 Is the school at or above the State 4-year graduation rate?

1 = Does not meet standard	The school's 4-year graduation rate was 10% below the State graduation rate
2 = Approaching standard	The school's 4-year graduation rate was between 9.9% and 5.1% below the state 4-year graduation rate.
3 = Meets standard	The school was within 5 percentage points of the state 4-year graduation rate
4 = Exceeds standard	The school's 4-year graduation rate was higher than the State.

2025

Rating: 2

Comments: The graduation rate for 2023-24 was 75.6% which was a decrease from 2022-23 and is lower than the state percentage of 84.2%.

2024

Rating: 4

Comments: The graduation rate for 2022-23 was 88.7% which was higher than the state (83.3%). The rate was also higher than the rate for 2021-22 by 7%.

Source: MDE Data Analytics Request

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

1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 60% of students demonstrated readiness.
2 = Approaching standard	60-80% of students demonstrated readiness.
3 = Meets standard	80.1-95% of students demonstrated readiness.
4 = Exceeds standard	More than 95% of students demonstrated readiness.

2025

Rating: 1

Comment: The composite score for SY23 was 16.1, which is an increase from SY22. Approximately 25% of students demonstrated readiness in reading and 11% in math.

Rating:

Comments: The percentage of students demonstrating readiness was not reported and is not available on the MDE website. 57% of students at CPA took the ACT and the composite score was 15.82. The composite score for the state was 20.91. For a rating to be entered, the school will need to submit the percentage of students who achieved a "passing" score on the ACT.

Source: MDE Website (SLEDS), Annual report

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

CPA is using the presence of the 5E Model Indicators in the classrooms as the school-specific academic goal.

1 = Does not meet standard	29% or fewer of the 5E Indicators are strong or very strong across all 5 Essentials
2 = Approaching standard	30-39% of the 5E Indicators are strong or very strong across all 5 Essentials
3 = Meets standard	40-49% of the 5E Indicators are strong or very strong across all Essentials
4 = Exceeds standard	50% or more of the 5E Indicators are strong or very strong across all 5 Essentials

2025

Rating: 1

Comment: As in SY23, there were no indicators that were strong or very strong. Elementary, was partially organized with improvement in areas of Effective Leaders and Supportive Environment. In Middle School, they were not yet organized for improvement and High School was moderately organized for school improvement.

2024

Rating:

Comments: Per the annual report, there were no indicators that were strong or very strong. In Elementary, the organization was partially organized for improvement with the areas of Effective Leadership and Supportive Environment showing improvement. Middle School was not yet organized for improvement which was a decline from partially organized in 2020-21. The areas of Collaborative Teachers and Effective Leaders showed growth. High School showed the most growth moving from partially organized to moderately organized and with all five of the indicators showing growth.

Source: Annual report

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

1 = 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

Overall Rating: 2

Comments: On the ACCESS, 40.7% of students reached or exceeded their target which is a large increase from SY23 and is slightly lower than the State percentage of 46.4%.

2024

Overall Rating:

Comments: On the ACCESS, 18.5% of students reached or exceeded their target. This is 10.4% lower than the state average. The average progress toward target language goals was more encouraging with 40.9% of students making progress compared to a state average of 47.3%.

Source: MDE website

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

1.12a: Reading

1.12b: Math

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

2025

1.12a: Reading: 1

1.12b: Math: 1

Overall Rating: 1

Comments: In reading, 13.4% of students receiving special education services showed proficiency which is an increase of 7.4% from SY23. In Math, 7.8% showed proficiency which is a slight increase from SY23. Both reading and math scores were below the state percentages of 25.5% for reading and 24.7% for math.

2024

1.12a: Reading:

1.12b: Math:

Overall Rating:

Comments: In reading, students receiving special education services showed 6% proficiency in math and 7.5% in reading. These scores were well below the state (math – 24.6%; reading 25.7%)

Source: MDE website

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

The school has selected Fastbridge Early Reading Assessment.

1 = Does not meet standard	Assessments indicate that a minimal proportion of tested students performed at or above target levels (less than 40%).
----------------------------	--

2 = Approaching standard	Assessments indicate that an inadequate proportion of tested students performed at or above target levels (40%-50%).
3 = Meets standard	Assessments indicate that an adequate proportion of tested students performed at or above target levels (50.1%-65%).
4 = Exceeds standard	Assessments indicate that a high proportion of tested students performed at or above target levels (more than 65%).
2025 Rating: 4 Comments: 82% of students made typical to aggressive growth in reading and 88% made typical to aggressive growth in math on the EarlyReading and EarlyMath assessments.	
2024 Rating: 3 Comments: In reading, 82% of students made typical to aggressive growth on the EarlyReading assessment and 40% of students made typical to aggressive growth on the EarlyMath assessment.	
Source: Annual Report, School Selected Assessment Data Spreadsheet	

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

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

2025

Rating: 4

Comment: Through communication with various groups during site visits and other communications, it is clear that Community of Peace Academy continues to provide excellent programming with a strong focus on the mission and vision. Students relate a very positive experience at the school and site the support they receive as reasons CPA is their school of choice.

2024

Rating:

Comments: Through observations and interviews, Community of Peace consistently exemplifies the mission and vision and this is articulated in all focus groups, from parents to students to staff and board members. The word “community” is heard throughout the school and is also seen in authentic circumstances in all areas of the school. CPA was awarded the National School of Character and this award is definitely well-deserved. A great effort has been made to return to pre-pandemic levels in academics, expectations and overall performance with no excuses. There is a pride about the school and its program that can be felt throughout the building.

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

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

1 = Does not meet standard
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Less than 60% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program b. Less than 40% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program

2 = Approaching standard

- a. Between 60-70%% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program
- b. Between 40-50% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post- secondary program

3 = Meets standard

- a. Between 70.1%-85% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program
- b. Between 50.1%-60% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program

4 = Exceeds standard

- a. Over 85% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program
- b. Over 60% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program

2025

1.15a: 4

1.15b: 4

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

Comments: As reported in the annual report, 100% of high school students who applied to post-secondary programs were accepted. Per the MDE SLEDS date, 67% of students at CPA were enrolled in a post-secondary program within 16 months of graduating.

1.15a:

1.15b:

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

Comments: Per the annual report, 100% of high school students who applied to post-secondary programs were accepted into the program. Per the MDE SLEDS data, 57% of CPA high school students enrolled in a post-secondary program.

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

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

1 = Does not meet standard

- a. Less than 30% of all students accessed one or more college and/or career preparation opportunities in the past year.

- b. BIPOC students accessed college and/or career preparation opportunities at a rate more than 10 percentage points below the rate for their white peers.

2 = Approaching standard

- a. 30-45% of all students accessed one or more college and/or career preparation opportunities in the past year.
- b. BIPOC students accessed college and/or career preparation opportunities at a rate 5-10 percentage points below the rate for their white peers.

3 = Meets standard

- a. 45.1%- 60% of all students accessed one or more college and/or career preparation opportunities in the past year.
- b. BIPOC students access college and/or career preparation opportunities at roughly the same rate as their white peers.

4 = Exceeds standard

- a. Over 60% of all students accessed one or more college and/or career preparation opportunities in the past year.
- b. BIPOC students access college and/or career preparation opportunities at a rate 5 – 10 percentage points above the rate for their white peers.

2025

1.16a: 2

1.16b: 3

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

Comments: Five College in the School courses are offered in High School. 81 students access these courses. 24% of students are enrolled in PSEO. The number of BIPOC students accessing college/career preparation opportunities is approximately the same rate as their white peers.

2024

1.16a:

1.16b:

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

Comments: Per the MDE report card, the number of students accessing college or career preparation opportunities was too small to be reported. If the school has information that would help to provide a score for this benchmark, please submit.

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

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

2.1 Does the school have an active finance committee that meets regularly and reports to the full board?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The school has no active finance committee
2 = Approaching standard	The school’s finance committee meets only as needed and only to review financials and/or the finance committee does not report its findings to the full board.
3 = Meets standard	The finance committee meets monthly, examines financial statements, and provides a thorough report of its findings to the full board.
4 = Exceeds standard	The finance committee meets at least monthly and examines financial statements, as well as short and long-range financial issues. Thorough reports of findings are provided to the board.
2025	
Rating: <u> 4 </u>	
Comments: The finance committee remains active and meets with the financial manager at least monthly. A presentation on financials is given to all board members each month.	
2024	
Rating: <input type="text" value="4"/>	
Comments: CPA has an active finance committee that meets monthly and presents to the full board at each meeting.	
Source: Monthly board packets; Annual Report, Site visits	

2.2 Does the board have a fund balance policy that includes fund balance goals over time?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The school board does not have a fund balance policy
2 = Approaching standard	The school board has a fund balance policy but it does not include established goals over time
3 = Meets standard	The school board has a fund balance policy including goals over time
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE.
2025	
Rating: 3	

Comment: The fund balance policy stipulates the maintenance of a 20-30% fund balance.

2024

Rating:

Comments: CPA has a fund balance policy that stipulates the maintenance of a 20-30% fund balance as well as 60 days cash on hand.

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

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

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

2025

Rating: 4

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

Rating:

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

Source: Annual financial audit

2.4 Does the school establish and maintain a balanced budget?

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

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

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

3 = Meets standard	The detailed budget is approved before June 30 and includes a cash flow projection for the year; established budget is based on realistic enrollment; and is adjusted if needed. The budget meets the fund balance policy goals set forth by the board and allows for maintenance of core programming.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
2025	
Rating: 3	
Comments: The budget is approved prior to June 30 and includes a conservative projection for enrollment.	
2024	
Rating: <input type="text" value="3"/>	
Comments: The budget for CPA is approved prior to June 30 and is based on a conservative estimate for enrollment. The budget takes into account the fund balance policy as well as bond covenants.	
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 budget was based on a projected ADM of 856 and the actual number of students was 831 for an enrollment realization of 97%.	
2024	
Rating: <u> 3 </u>	
Comments: For 2022-23, the budget was based on an enrollment of 839 students. The actual number of students was 830 for an enrollment realization of 98%.	
Source: Monthly board packets, Quarterly Report, UST site visits, UST meetings with business manager(s)	

2.6 Does the school have sufficient cash on hand to meet its near-term obligations?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The school has fewer than 30 days cash on hand.
2 = Approaching standard	The school maintains 30-59 days cash on hand.
3 = Meets standard	The school maintains a minimum of 60 days cash on hand or is meeting the cash on hand requirements of its bond covenants, whichever is greater.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
2025	
Rating: 3	
Comments: The school recorded 190 days cash on hand.	
2024	
Rating	
Comments:	
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: 3	
Comments: The school's audited fund balance is 45%.	
2024	
Rating: <input type="text" value="3"/>	
Comments: CPA's fund balance is 43.5%.	
Source: Annual Report, Auditor Report, Financial Statements, Board policies	

2.8 Is the school meeting bond covenants (if applicable)?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The school is not meeting one or more bond covenants.
2 = Approaching standard	The school is meeting all bond covenants in the current year, but has been out of compliance with one or more covenants in the past three years.
3 = Meets standard	The school has consistently met all bond covenants.
4 = Exceeds standard	Not Applicable
2025	
Rating: 3	
Comments: The school continues to meet all bond covenants.	
2024	
Rating: <input type="text" value="3"/>	
Comments: The school consistently meets 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 meet training requirements.	
2024	
Rating: <input type="text" value="3"/>	
Comments: All board members are up to date with training requirements and have also participated in ongoing training throughout the year.	
Source: Monthly board packets, UST site visits, Statement of compliance sheet	

3.2 Does the board understand and comply with the Open Meeting Law and maintain orderly records including its bylaws, policies, board/committee minutes, and board packets?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The board does not understand the requirements of the Open Meeting Law and has been out of compliance more than once in the last year and/or the board does not maintain its records in an orderly fashion
2 = Approaching standard	The board exhibits working knowledge of the requirements of the Open Meeting Law and has been out of compliance no more than once in the last year and maintains its records properly, with minor exceptions.
3 = Meets standard	The board understands and meets the requirements of the Open Meeting Law and maintains its records in an orderly fashion.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
2025	
Rating: 3	
Comments: All board members understand and comply with Open Meeting Law.	

2024

Rating:

Comments: The school complies with Open Meeting Law and has not been out of compliance with any statutory requirements.

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:

Comments: All staff are appropriately licensed.

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

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

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

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The school completes criminal background checks for all staff, board members and volunteers who have contract with students.

2024

Rating:

Comments: The school completes background checks on all staff and board members as well as volunteers who have contact with students.

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

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

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

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

2 = Approaching standard NOT APPLICABLE

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

4 = Exceeds standard NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 3

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

2024

Rating:

Comments: The school is compliant with all applicable laws and has updated their enrollment policy. Some statutory requirements regarding Title IX have been updated and all schools must post their Title IX coordinator and grievance policies on the website. This did not appear to be readily available on the website and it would be good for the school to look into making this update.

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

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

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

1 = Does not meet standard At least some board members do not understand the role of the board and the role of the school leader. Board policies and practices are not transparent or not present. Board meetings often address issues not central to the role of the board and/or fail to address core functions such as leader evaluation and school financial/academic health.

2 = Approaching standard	Some board members, but not all, exhibit understanding of their roles as board members and the role of the school leader. Board policies and practices are not always transparent and/or are not fully developed. The board inconsistently addresses issues central to its role such as leader evaluation, leader professional development plan approval (if applicable), and school financial/academic health.
3 = Meets standard	The Board exhibits understanding of its role and the role of the school leader. The board policies and practices are generally transparent and systems are in place to maximize effectiveness of the board, including an orientation process for new members, annual board self-evaluation, annual leader (and EMO/CMO if applicable) evaluation, annual approval of leader development plan (if applicable) and a plan for conducting and tracking initial and ongoing training. The board engages in regular strategic planning. The board is able to adequately sustain its membership through recruitment efforts.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
2025	
Rating: 3	
Comments: The board and school leader have a good understanding of their roles and work well together. The board engages in strategic planning and undergoes annual trainings based on areas of need including training in financial matters.	
2024	
Rating: <input type="text" value="3"/>	
Comments: The board conducts an annual self-evaluation as well as evaluations of the executive director. The board engages in organized and effective strategic planning.	
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 the bylaws are updated regularly. The bylaws have been updated to include the statutory requirements pertaining to the changing of board structure.

2024

Rating:

Comments: Board policies are reviewed and updated regularly. The bylaws were reviewed and updated recently and are currently in compliance.

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

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

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

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: Board packets are complete and submitted on time.

2024

Rating:

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

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

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

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

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

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: 32% of students at Community of Peace qualify for English Learner services. The breakdown per school is: Elementary – 32.6%; Middle School – 37.1%; High School – 27.5%. The majority of EL learners are long time learners as opposed to newcomers. In Elementary, 3 EL teachers provide pull-out direct instruction in a small group 2 times per week for 30 minutes. In Middle School and High School, four teachers provide a combination of push-in and direct instruction through elective classes. To exit service, students must reach a composite score of at least 4.5 on the ACCESS and have 3 or more ACCESS domains greater than 3.5.

2024

Rating:

Comments: Community of Peace Academy follows the MDE guidelines for ELD identification and placement. 33.1% of students at CPA qualify for EL services. The majority of these students are long-term EL students compared to newcomers.

In the Elementary, there are 3 ELD teachers who meet with students in a pull-out direct instruction model for a minimum of two times per week for 30 minutes. The Middle School and High School model is a combination of pull-out and push-in services depending upon the needs of the student. There are two ELD teachers in both Middle School and High School. One ELD Coordinator works to ensure compliance with both state and federal EL requirements.

Performance of EL students compared to the state as follows:

Math	State	Overall	Elementary	Middle School	High School
	56.3%	28.7%	25%	29.7%	CTSTR

Reading	60%	48%	31.9%	52.7%	CTSTR
Source: UST site visits, Reference EL Packet, Formalized complaints at MDE, or Critical Elements review (SP-1)					

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

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

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

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: 21% of students at Community of Peace Academy qualify for special education services. This is an increase from previous years. The breakdown per school is: Elementary – 21.5%; Middle School – 18.2%; High School – 21.6%. CPA employs 11 special education teachers and 16 paraprofessionals. They contract with 2 part-time school psychologists, 2 full-time speech/language pathologists, 2 full-time occupational therapists, part-time Blind/visually impaired specialist and a Deaf/Hard of Hearing consultant. CPA also contract with an ASD consultant, DCD consultant, ABA and Behavior Interventionist as needed. A full-time special education director oversees the entire department and there is also a contract with NOVA Educational Consultants for due process work.

Rating:

Comments: At present, 18% of students at Community of Peace Academy qualify for special education services. To qualify for services, a student is evaluated if adequate progress has not been made after at least 2 research-based interventions. The student is referred to the Child Study team- which is led by the Special Education director. There are currently 14 special education teachers and 13 paraprofessionals at CPA. Contracted services include school psychologist, speech pathologist, occupational therapy, audiologist, consultant for blind/visually impaired and deaf/hard of hearing. Consultation for ASD, DCD, ABA and Behavior interventionist are on an as-needed basis. Students in Federal setting 1 and 2 are served by para support, push-in and pull-out services. CPA partners with the resident districts for some setting 3 and 4 services, career and technical education, and transition services for 18 – 21 year-old students.

In math, 6.4% of students are performing at grade level on the MCA compared to 25.9% at the state level. 10% of students are performing at grade level in math compared to 27.1% statewide.

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

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

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

1 = Does not meet standard The school is not fulfilling its legal obligations regarding preK students and requires substantial improvement

2 = Approaching standard The school is fulfilling all of its legal obligations regarding preK students but requires some improvements

3 = Meets standard The school is fulfilling its legal obligations regarding preK students and requires no considerable improvements

4 = Exceeds standard NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: CPA continues to utilize the COR Advantage assessment to assess each of the domains of the Early Childhood Indicators of Progress. All pre-k teachers are licensed, trained teachers. CPA uses early childhood screening during the first 90 days of pre-k to assess developmental levels. The adult to student ratio is 1:9. There is also one early childhood special education teacher, an ELD teacher and one special education paraprofessional.

Rating:

Comments: Community of Peace Academy utilizes the COR Advantage assessment as well as teacher-developed formative assessments to track the progress of preK students. All preK teachers are licensed teachers who participate in all of the professional development as elementary teachers. As well as the licensed teacher, there is a paraprofessional in each of the classroom for a student to teacher ratio of 1:9. There is also an early childhood special education teacher, and ELD teacher and a special education paraprofessional available to support the preK teachers and students. Approximately 80% of students have completed the early childhood screening prior to the beginning of the school year. For those students who have not completed the screening, it is completed onsite within the first 30 days of school.

Source: Site Visits, Interviews, Quarterly Reports

3.15 Does the school have a high attendance rate?

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

2025

Rating: 1

Comments: Per the MDE report card, the consistent attendance rate for SY24 was 62.3% which is an increase from SY23. The rate is below the state percentage of 74.5%.

2024

Rating:

Comments: The consistent attendance rate as reported on the MDE report card was 49.3% compared to 69.8% for the state.

Source: Annual reports, MDE website (data downloads)

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

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

2025

Rating: 2

Comments: The teacher retention rate was 84% which is an increase from the prior year.

2024

Rating:

Comments: Per the annual report, 58 of 79 teachers returned for the 2023-24 school year for a retention rate of 79%.

Source: Annual report

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

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

1 = Does not meet standard	The school a limited number of training opportunities. Participation in professional development is low, with less than 50% of staff participate in the opportunities.
2 = Approaching standard	The school offers a menu of development opportunities that include required trainings. Participation in most or all of these trainings is

	presented as optional resulting in low participation (less than 50% of staff participate).
3 = Meets standard	The school offers a menu of development opportunities that include required trainings as well as learning opportunities that forward the school's academic, behavioral and mission-related priorities. Participation is mandated for required trainings.
4 = Exceeds standard	The school offers a robust menu of development opportunities that include required trainings as well as learning opportunities that forward the school's academic, behavioral and mission-related priorities. Including opportunities for subject-area and curriculum-specific trainings. Participation is mandated for required trainings.
2025	
Rating: 3	
Comments: Community of Peace Academy provides one week of professional development prior to the start of the school year, one professional development day, five early release days and weekly Professional Learning Community meetings throughout the course of the school year. Teachers and paraprofessionals receive a stipend to further their own professional learning.	
2024	
Rating: <input type="text" value="3"/>	
Comments: The schoolwide emphasis for SY23 was on creating a culture of learning that fosters and promotes academic excellence, relationships and peace. Professional development was offered on a number of topics and along with the school-wide professional development, each licensed staff receives \$500 and each paraprofessional receives \$250 per school year to spend on professional development opportunities of their choosing.	
Community of Peace Academy instituted a performance evaluation system in 2014-15 and each year, this system is updated. The evaluation is based on Teacher Practice (45%), Student Achievement Growth (35%), Student Engagement (20%).	
Source: Annual report (Professional Development Tracking Chart)	

3.18 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
<p>2025</p> <p>Rating: 3</p> <p>Comments: 838 students were enrolled after October 31 and 819 remained for the entire school year for a student retention rate of 98%.</p>	
<p>2024</p> <p>Rating: <input type="text" value="3"/></p> <p>Comments: The student retention rate for SY22 was 97%.</p>	
<p>Source: Annual report, renewal application</p>	

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

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

3.19b Survey response rate

1 = Does not meet standard

3.19a Less than 74.9% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school overall.

3.19b The school’s survey response rate was less than 20%.

2 = Approaching standard

3.19a 75-85% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school overall.

3.19b The school’s survey response rate was 20-25%.

3 = Meets standard

3.19a 85.1-95% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school overall.

3.19b The school’s survey response rate was 25.1 - 30%.

4 = Exceeds standard

3.19a 95% or more of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school overall.

3.19b The school’s survey response rate was greater than 30%.

2025

Rating

3.19a: 3

3.19b: 1

Overall Rating: 2

Comments: 89.5% of parents surveyed indicated an overall satisfaction with the school. 93.9% felt the school provided a safe and supportive environment. The response rate for the survey was 7%.

2024

3.19a Rating: 3

3.19b Rating: 2

Overall Rating: 2.5

Comments: 105 families out of 436 completed the parent survey for a response rate of 24%. 93.3% indicated that they felt their children had a safe and supportive place to learn and 89.5% feel satisfied with the academic program.

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

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

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

1 = Does not meet standard	The facility requires much improvement in order to provide a safe environment that is conducive to learning. Significant health and safety requirements have not been met OR the school lacks many conditions such as the following: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students.
2 = Approaching standard	Significant health and safety requirements are being met, but the facility needs some improvement in order to provide a safe environment that is conducive to learning. It partially – but not fully – provides conditions such as the following: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students.
3 = Meets standard	Significant health and safety code requirements are being met AND the facility generally provides a safe environment that is conducive to learning, based on conditions such as: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students.
4 = Exceeds standard	All health and safety code requirements are being met AND the facility generally provides a safe environment that is conducive to learning, based on conditions such as: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students. Additionally, the facility meets the mission of the school.

2025

Rating: 4

Comments: The school facility is well-maintained and it is clear that the school celebrates the students based on the artwork and other student work around the school. The facilities are well-maintained and provide a safe environment for all students. The school utilizes spaces in the neighborhood to provide alternative areas for the students to be outside.

Rating:

Comments: The Community of Peace facility is well-maintained and is up-to-date with all health and safety code requirements. The facility provides a safe environment for all students. It is clear when walking through the building that the focus is on the students as there is a great deal of student work exhibited and showcased.

Source: Authorizer observation

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

- **A clear process to identify students needing support, understood and implemented consistently.**
- **A robust system of tiered supports.**
- **Timely execution of these supports.**
- **Use of data to evaluate the effectiveness of supports and the system.**
- **Effective communication between stakeholders (teachers, school staff, families, and students).**

1 = Does not meet standard

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

2 = Approaching standard

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

3 = Meets standard

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

4 = Exceeds standard

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

2025

Rating: 3

Comments: The collection of data for instructional and intervention purposes has been a priority for CPA. Through instructional coaches and a data coach, data is collected and analyzed and intervention plans are created based on this data. A portion of the PLC meeting time is dedicated to help teachers talk through how best to support students who are struggling. Behavior interventionists also help teachers to support students who are struggling with behavioral challenges. CPA continues to work with Twin Cities Counseling Co-op to provide mental health services.

Rating:

Comments: Community of Peace Academy employs four instructional coaches who help to improve teacher practice through data collection and also has a Data Coach who helps with the collection and analysis of the data in order to improve student outcomes. Teacher PLC's provide support to teachers in teams and are key in helping teachers work through data and opportunities for collection.

Two Positive Behavior Technicians work under the Elementary and Middle School Dean of Students to provide both proactive behavior support to students as well as assist with challenging classroom behavior. CPA has an agreement with Twin Cities Counseling Co-op for school-based mental health services.

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

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

3.22a Processes to communicate academic performance and other pertinent school information that are accessible to families including the consideration of language needs

(e.g. conferences).

3.22b Processes to elicit feedback from families are accessible and seek to reach the broader

school community including consideration of language needs. Feedback processes include but are not limited to an annual survey.

3.22c Opportunities for parents/guardians to support their child's education and/or the school (e.g. volunteering, parent organization, family events).

1 = Does not meet standard

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

2 = Approaching standard

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

3 = Meets standard

- a. The school has a comprehensive plan to communicate academic performance and other pertinent school information with families, which is consistently executed. The plan includes an awareness of the language preferences and needs of families and strategies for providing communication multiple languages as needed.
- b. The school has a comprehensive plan to elicit feedback from all families. The plan includes an awareness of the language preferences and needs of families, strategies for providing communication multiple languages as needed and methods for ensuring representation from the broad school community.
- c. Between 40.1 - 55% of families/guardians participated in an engagement opportunity.

4 = Exceeds standard

- a. The school has a comprehensive plan to communicate academic performance and other pertinent school information with families, which is executed with fidelity. School survey data and interviews with families provide evidence of parent satisfaction with home-school communications.
- b. The school has a formalized process to elicit feedback from families reflective of the broad school community, which is executed with fidelity. The school is able to demonstrate how family feedback is reviewed and utilized in a timely manner. School survey data and interviews with families provide evidence of parent knowledge of and satisfaction with feedback opportunities.

c. More than 55% of families/guardians participated in an engagement opportunity.

2025

Rating a: 3

Rating b: 3

Rating c: 4

Overall Rating: 3.33

Comments: Community of Peace Academy employs Hmong, Latino, Karen and African American family engagement specialists. These specialists conduct outreach, assist with translating and interpreting as necessary and they bring a cultural perspective and presence to meetings in order to strengthen relationships between home and school. The school continues to conduct home visits. There is a Family Engagement Committee to help assist with events and visits and work on how to best involve parents with the school community. 93.9% of parents participated in student conferences.

Rating a: 3

Rating b: 3

Rating c: 4

Overall Rating: 3.33

Comments: Community of Peace Academy has a strong commitment to family involvement and engagement. Examples of this include home visits for all students, family engagement specialists, weekly newsletters, family nights and programs, and a family engagement committee. 90.4% of respondents to the family survey indicated that they felt they received timely communication from teachers and from the school. This was reiterated during focus groups interviews as staff, parents and students all indicated a high level of satisfaction with school communication. There was an 81% attendance rate at parent teacher conferences. 94.2% of survey respondents indicated that they feel welcomed and valued in the school community.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews

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

3.23a. Marketing/outreach targets socioeconomically and racially diverse populations, which includes having materials available in multiple languages.

3.23b. Enrollment policies and practices are accessible and transparent. Supports are available to families as needed to navigate the application and enrollment process.

3.23c. The school demonstrates a commitment to cultivating a board and staff that is reflective of the student population.

1 = Does not meet standard

- a. The school's marketing strategy marginalizes or ignores students from diverse backgrounds and/or those who are low income. Materials are only available in English.
- b. Enrollment policies and practices are not transparent and/or result in accessibility barriers for low income students and students of color.

c. The board and staff are not representative of the students the school serves.

2 = Approaching standard

- a. The school's marketing strategy includes a plan to recruit students from diverse backgrounds and/or those who are low income. However, implementation of the plan is inconsistent and materials are only available in English.
- b. Enrollment policies and practices are transparent. However, families encounter challenges navigating the enrollment process.
- c. While the board and/or staff are not representative of the students the school serves, the school is committed to recruiting board members and staff who are representative and has identified recruitment strategies to this end.

3 = Meets standard

- a. The school's marketing strategy includes an actionable plan to recruit students from diverse backgrounds and/or those who are low income. The plan is actively utilized. Materials are available in multiple languages.
- b. School enrollment policies and practices are clear and easily navigated by families. Methods for accessing support for families needing assistance are readily apparent.
- c. The school employs strategies to recruit and retain board members and staff who are representative of the student population. Board and staff composition reflect these efforts.

4 = Exceeds standard NOT APPLICABLE

2025

Rating a: 3

Rating b: 3

Rating c: 3

Overall Rating: 3

Comments: Recruitment from diverse backgrounds continues to be a priority for marketing and student enrollment as well as staff hiring. Enrollment policies and procedures are easily navigated and if parents struggle, there are numerous resources available including family engagement specialists.

Rating a: 3

Rating b: 3

Rating c: 3

Overall Rating: 3

Comments: CPA works to recruit families from diverse backgrounds and from various socioeconomic circumstances. It is clear from their recruitment practices that all students are welcome. CPA also works to recruit and retain teachers from diverse backgrounds and is working to have a staff that is more reflective of the student community.

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

