

Evaluation Rubric

SPCPA |

SY2026

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 virtual comparison group 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

SY2025-2026 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2025)

	Reading Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	80.40%			
Average of demographic match schools	72.83%	4	37.5%	1.5
Resident district	40.80%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	51.30%	4	25%	1
			100%	Reading Total: 4
	Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	31%			
Average of demographic match schools	54.7%	1	37.5%	.38
Resident district	19.1%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	35%	3	25%	.75
			100%	Math Total: 2.63

SY2026

1.1a Reading: 4

1.1b Mathematics: 2.63

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.315

Comments/Evidence: There was a slight increase in reading proficiency, and the school continues to exceed the state in reading. There was a slight decrease in math proficiency from 38.3% to 31%. This is below the demographic match schools but well above the resident district and slightly below the state average.

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.

SY2026 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2025)

	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Math Proficiency				
All	31%	Included for information only	Included for information only	Included for information only
Hispanic/Latino	CTSTR	CTSTR	Included for information only	4
White	CTSTR	CTSTR		4
Average of math scores for each demographic group: 2				
	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Reading Proficiency				
All	80.4%	Included for information only	Included for information only	Included for information only
Hispanic or Latino	CTSTR	CTSTR	Included for information only	N/A
White	81.6%	CTSTR		4
Average of reading scores for each demographic group: N/A				

1.2a mathematics: N/A

1.2b reading: 4

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

Comments: No groups other than “White” qualify as large enough.

SY2024-2025 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2024)				
	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Math Proficiency				
All	38.3%	Included for information only	Included for information only	Included for information only
Hispanic/Latino	CTSTR	CTSTR	Included for information only	4
White	CTSTR	CTSTR	Included for information only	4
Average of math scores for each demographic group: 2				
	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Reading Proficiency				
All	69.10%	Included for information only	Included for information only	Included for information only
Hispanic or Latino	CTSTR	N/A	Included for information only	N/A
White	71.1%	59.1%	Included for information only	4
Average of reading scores for each demographic group: N/A				
1.2a mathematics: N/A 1.2b reading: 4 Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 4				
Comments: The only demographic group large enough for a score is Hispanic in math.				
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 Growth (Comparison Group): Are students making progress at the same or better rate as the state, resident district, and their virtual comparison group. 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.

1.3a Reading

1.3b 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

2026

1.3a reading: 4

1.3b Mathematics: 1

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

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

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: _N/A

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

2022

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: 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	80.4%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 1 -Hispanic	CSTR		Included for information only	

Average of reading scores for each demographic group:

	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Math Proficiency				
All	31%	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:
2026 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.
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: 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: _N/A_ Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: N/A_ Comments/Evidence: Information not available.
2022 1.4a Reading: N/A 1.4b Mathematics: _N/A_ Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: N/A 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

SPCPA will utilize the PSAT to determine the percentage of students who meet or exceed their grade level benchmark each year.

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%).

2026

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 77% reading and 28% in math. The percentage of students who met both benchmarks was 22%.

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

1.5a Reading: 4

1.5b Math: 2

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

Comments: The average percentage of students in 9-11 meeting benchmarks on the ERW portion of the PSAT is 80.67% and 46% for math.

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: 4

1.5b Math: 3

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

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?

1.5a Reading

1.5b 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 the expected gains (less than 40%).
2 = Approaching standard	Analysis indicates that an inadequate proportion of tested students made the expected gains (40%-49%).
3 = Meets standard	Analysis indicates that an adequate proportion of tested students made the expected gains (50%-65%).
4 = Exceeds standard	Analysis indicates that an adequate proportion of tested students made the expected gains (more than 65%).

SY2026

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: 89% of students continued to meet or exceed benchmarks in ERW and 34% in math.

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

i. 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:

Reading average:

1.6b Math:

i.3

ii.N/A

iii.N/A

Math average:

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

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:

1.6b Math:

i. 71%

ii.N/A

iii.N/A

Math average: 4

Overall average of Math and reading scores: 4

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.
2026 Rating: 3 Comments: The graduation rate for SY25 was 88.2% which is slightly higher than SY24. The rate exceeds the state percentage of 84.2%.	
2025 Rating: 3 Comments: The graduation rate for SY24 was 88.1% which is slightly lower than SY23. The rate exceeds the state percentage of 84.2%.	
2024 Rating: 3 Comments: The graduation rate for SY23 was 92%. This exceeds the state graduation rate of 83.3%	
2023 Rating: 3 Comments: The school's graduation rate for SY22 was 91%.	
2022 Rating: 3 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, 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.
2026 Reading: 2	

Math: 1 Rating: 1.5 Comment: 89% of students met the benchmark in reading and 32% in math.
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.

2026

1.9a: Reading: N/A

1.9b: Math: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments: Cell too small to report

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.

2026

1.10a: Reading: N/A

1.10b: Math: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments: Count is too small to report.

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.
2026 Rating: 4 Comments: The Board, administration, faculty and staff continue to strive towards meeting SPCPA's mission and vision. The school certainly faces challenges, as all schools do, however, the unique demands placed on the school, chiefly financial constraints and reporting requirements compound issues with changing demographics and enrollment, transportation changes, faculty turnover, particularly in the arts faculty, and the difficulty of balancing a rigorous academic program with a challenging arts curriculum. Site visits reveal a community of learners who thrive at the school and clearly feel that it is the best place to help them develop, however, the trend of fewer students planning for careers in the arts have forced an evaluation	

of the learning program and where to focus curricula and resources. However, site visits and communications with SPCPA still reveal an institution that is focused on its foundational principles and mission, despite many challenges.

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 cite 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

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
2026 Rating: 4 Comments: During the 24-25 school year we had two students suspended pending expulsion. Both students voluntarily withdrew prior to expulsion proceedings, representing approximately 1% of the students.
2025 Rating: 4 Comments: There were 5 reportable incidents, 2 in-school suspensions and 3 out of school which is approximately 2% of the students.
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 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. [NOTE: this is measured by a school survey 18 months after graduation and “trades” includes graduates with jobs in the performing arts.]
1 = Does not meet standard a. Less than 70% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program b. Less than 50% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program
2 = Approaching standard a. Between 70%-80% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program b. Between 50%-60% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program
3 = Meets standard a. Between 80%- 90% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program b. Between 60%- 70% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program
4 = Exceeds standard a. Over 90% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program b. Over 70% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program
2026 Rating: 4 Comments: 100% of students applying for post-secondary programs are accepted to between 1-16 schools.

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, High Level Arts Courses) at high rates?
1 = Does not meet standard a. Less than 30% of all students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year. b. BIPOC students accessed rigorous courses 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 rigorous courses in the past year. b. BIPOC students accessed rigorous courses at a rate 5-10 percentage points below the rate for their white peers.
3 = Meets standard a. 45%- 60% of all students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year.

b. BIPOC students access rigorous courses at roughly the same rate as their white peers.
4 = Exceeds standard a. Over 60% of all students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year. b. BIPOC students access rigorous courses at roughly the same rate as their white peers.
2026. 1.14a: 3 1.14b: CTSTR Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3 Comments: 16% of students take PSEO courses (5% higher than the state average) and 57% of students access Advanced Placement courses or Honors Level courses (33% higher than the state average).
2025 1.14a: 3 1.14b: N/A Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3 Comments: 15% of students take PSEO courses and approximately 50% of students access either Advanced Placement or Honors level courses.
2024 1.14a: 3 1.14b: N/A Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3 Comments: Approximately 50% of students access one or more rigorous courses, either Advanced Placement or Honors level courses.
2022 1.14a: 4_ 1.14b: _N/A Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores:4_ 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.
2026 Rating: 4 Comment: The finance committee at SPCPA is experienced and monitors enrollment and other financial matters. Finances are presented to and discussed with the full board at monthly board meetings.	
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: 4

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.

2026

Rating: 3

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

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: 3 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, quarterly reports

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"
2026 Rating: 4 Comment: Clean audit with no findings.	
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 re mediated.
2022 Rating: 4 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
2026 Rating: 3 Comment: SPCPA works to establish a realistic budget and makes revisions as necessary based on enrollment. The budget is approved prior to June 30 and includes a conservative enrollment projection.	
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: 3 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 less than 90%.
2 = Approaching standard Enrollment realization is 90-95%.
3 = Meets standard Enrollment realization is greater than 95%.
4 = Exceeds standard NOT APPLICABLE
2026 Rating: 3 Comments: The projected ADM was 325 and the actual enrollment was 315 for an enrollment realization of 97%.
2025 Rating: 3

Comments: The projected ADM was 350 and the actual enrollment was 335 for an enrollment realization of 95%.
2024 Rating: 2 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%.
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 meeting	The school maintains a minimum of 60 days cash on hand or is the cash on hand requirements of its bond covenants, whichever is greater.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
2026 Rating: 3 Comments: The projected cash on hand is 99 days.	
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 expenditures.	The school's fund balance is less than 10% of annual expenditures.
2 = Approaching standard expenditures.	The school's fund balance is between 10-15% of annual expenditures.
3 = Meets standard expenditures.	The school's fund balance is more than 15% of annual expenditures.
4 = Exceeds standard expenditures AND	The school's fund balance is more than 20% of annual overall academic outcomes fall within the 'meets standard' range.
2026	
Rating: 4	
Comment: The projected fund balance is 82%.	
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: 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
2026 Rating: 3 The school has consistently met all bond covenants.	
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: 3 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.
2026 Rating: 3 Comments: All board members have met training requirements and participate in ongoing training throughout the school year.	
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: 3 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
2026 Rating: 3 Comment: The SPCPA board follows open meeting law. Board packets are submitted regularly and the minutes and agendas are current on the school website. The Board meetings are open to the public, an advance announcement of date, time and place of all regular and special meetings are made on the school website, setting forth the agenda and major topics to be discussed. The following items are posted on SPCPA's website:	

• Calendar that lists both times and dates for School board and committee meetings • Minutes from SY24 and SY25. • Board policies
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: 3 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
2026 Rating: 3	

Comment: SPCPA provides a summary of educational staff positions and licenses in its annual report. All staff are appropriately licensed according to licensure file checks.

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 bachelor's degree (community expert option has been eliminated).

2022

Rating: 4

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

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

2026

Rating: 3

Comment: SPCPA follows policies per employment background checks. The policy also includes a provision for background checks for board members and volunteers.

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: 3	
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 - 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
2026	
Rating: 3	
Comments: SPCPA is compliant with all applicable laws. The school's admission policy is followed with fidelity. The policy was revised in 2022. SPCPA's governing board includes teachers, parents, and community members meeting the governance model requirements. SPCPA meets Title IX regulations.	

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:3 Comments: SPCPA is compliant with other applicable laws. Policies have been updated to includethe 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
2026 Rating: 3 Comments: The SPCPA board are experienced and do exhibit a solid understanding of the role of the board and utilize nonprofit governance best practices. The board actively uses its strategic plan to guide decisions. It is made up of 6 community members, 1 teacher, 1 parent, and the superintendent. 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.	
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: 3 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
2026 Ratings: 3 Comments: Board policies and bylaws are updated on a regular basis. The policies are reviewed through Civil Intelligence.	
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: 3 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
2026 Rating 3: Comments: Board packets are complete and submitted on time, at least 3 days before meetings. The St. Thomas liaison is also provided with an electronic copy.	
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: 3 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
2026 Rating: 3 Comment: SPCPA had one student that was identified as EL when enrolled. She (and her parents) declined services since enrollment. As such SPCPA does not employ an EL teacher. If an EL student were to enroll SPCPA would need to contract for services given the small FTE or look at a partnership agreement with another school, most likely also a charter.	
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: 3 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

2026

Rating: 3

Comment: SPCPA has a Special Education Director, 2 Special Education Teachers, and 2 paraprofessionals. SPCPA is fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to students with IEPs. SPCPA has a TSES manual that is school-specific and board-approved. special education director, is responsible for program development, coordination, and evaluation; in-service training; and general special education supervision and administration. SPCPA also contracts out for other services which include speech therapy, school counselor, hearing and vision screening, audiology, OT, DAPE provider, auditory therapy, school psychologist, ASD specialist, and Special Education Director for Due Process.

Methods of providing the special education services for identified pupils include the following:

- o One on one services
- o Small group
- o Direct
- o Indirect
- o Consultation

SPCPA has a Special Education Advisory Council consisting of the Special Education Site Coordinator, special education case managers, and parents. No complaints were found on the MDE compliant site and none have been registered with St. Thomas.

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 timespecial ed teacher and has recently added a second. There are three paraprofessionals who provideadditional 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 receivingspecial 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: 3

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

2026

Rating: 1

Comment: The attendance rate for SY25 was 65.4%, below the state average of 75.5%.

SPCPA maintains its own statistical formula for attendance based upon excluding students with excused or limited excused absences. Using this formula SPCPA reports attendance at 90.28%, a slight increase from the previous year.

2025

Rating: 2

Comments: The attendance rate for SY24 was 64.4%, an increase from the previous year.

2024 Rating: 1 Comments: The school had an attendance rate of 62.1%.
2023 Rating: 1 Comments: Per the annual report, the schoolwide attendance rate for SY21-22 was 55.1%.
2022 Rating: 1 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)
2026 Rating: 2 Comment: Per the annual report, SPCPA had a retention rate of 73%	
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: 3_ 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
2026 Rating: 3 Comments: 336 students were enrolled after October 1 and 320 were enrolled at the end of the school year. The retention rate was therefore 95.2%	
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:2

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 35%.
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 35%.
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 35%.
4 = Exceeds standard	At least 95% of parents surveyed indicated they are satisfied with the school and the school achieved a response rate greater than 35%.
2026 Rating: $3 + 4 = 7 / 2 = 3.5$ Comment: 88% of parents indicated that they are satisfied with the school. There was a 36% response rate	
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: 2.5 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.
2026	Rating: 3 Comment: The physical layout of SPCPA in the Lowry Building is challenging, but overall, the environment is safe and meets the learning needs of the faculty and students. Some continued issues with flooding from a neighboring parking deck continue, but do not render the impacted room unusable. A strong focus on artistic creation was evident throughout classroom observations, with materials, equipment, and resources well-aligned to support student learning and instructional needs. SPCPA maintains dedicated spaces for each artistic discipline, including music rooms, choral and instrumental rehearsal areas, performance stages, an art gallery, dance studios, graphic design rooms, and textile and ceramics studios. During both the fall and spring site visits, the celebration of the arts was visible throughout the building and within classrooms. SPCPA's facility meets all health and safety requirements, and no concerns were noted during either visit.
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:3

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 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.

2026

Rating: 3

Comment: SPCPA continues to utilize a combination of Guided Study Halls, with a licensed teacher, peer-tutoring, and extra support needs identified by teachers to aid students. All teachers provide extra help/acceleration after school. The school has a Student Services Team that meets regularly to identify potential issues early.

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: 3 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 an hour at the end of the day for students to receive assistance as needed.
Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews

3.17 Is the school committed to anti-racism and equity by engaging in/ providing the following:

- **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
2026 Rating: 3 Comment: School staff and faculty reflect the diversity of the student body. The school trains faculty/staff in cultural competencies and anti-racism. Interviews with students clearly demonstrate that they believe the school supports anti-racism and equity.	
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: 3 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

3.18 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
2026 Rating: 4 Comment: Marketing materials and policies demonstrate that SPCA continues to emphasize an inclusive and welcoming environment. The school uses social media widely, especially Instagram and Facebook, to market its programs to the 80+ communities that it serves. Marketing towards enrollment is far-reaching and targets all demographics of high school age students. SPCPA's special education program is strong and robust.	

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: 3 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

3.19 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
2026 Rating: 3 Comment: SPCPA typically has less than 5 students per year that receive an out-of-school suspension. 1-3 is more common. During the 24-25 school year SPCPA had two students suspended pending expulsion. Both students voluntarily withdrew prior to expulsion proceedings.
2025 Rating: 3 Comments: 5 students were suspended (both in-school and out of school). 2 of the students were white and 3 were of color.
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: 3_ Comments: Three incidents were reported in DIRS.
Source: MDE DIRS Data, School reported data