

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 5th Grade MCA Reading Proficiency: Are 5th grade students proficient in reading?	
1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 50% of students who have been served by the school for two or more years are proficient in reading.
2 = Approaching standard	50-65% of students who have been served by the school for two or more years are proficient in reading.
3 = Meets standard	65.1%-75.0% of students who have been served by the school for two or more years are proficient in reading.
4 = Exceeds standard	More than 75% of students who have been served by the school for two or more years are proficient in reading.
SY2025-2026 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2025)	
Rating: <u> 4 </u>	
Comments/Evidence: At 80.4%, TCGIS 5 th grade proficiency scores in reading were higher than the state (57.1%). The TCGIS reading scores were 12.2% higher than the previous year.	
SY2024-2025 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2024)	
Rating: <u> 3 </u>	
Comments/Evidence:	

At 68.20%, TCGIS 5th grade proficiency scores in reading were higher than the state (57.5%). The TCGIS reading scores were 6.3% higher than the previous year.

SY2023-2024 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2023)

Rating: Enter the number that most closely matches your assessment: 2

Comments/Evidence: At 61.9%, TCGIS 5th grade proficiency scores in reading were higher than the state (59.3%). The scores were 10.3% lower than the 2022 scores.

SY 2022-2023 (Based on academic results from SY2022)

Rating: Enter the number that most closely matches your assessment: 3

Comments/Evidence: 72.2% of fifth grade students tested as proficient in reading.

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

1.2 MCA Proficiency: Are students performing as well as or better than the state, the resident district, and 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)	71%			
Average of demographic match schools	69.42%	3	37.5%	1.125
Resident district	33.95%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	49.3%	4	25%	1
			100%	Reading Total: 3.75

	Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	50.3%			
Average of demographic match schools	67.99%	1	37.5%	.375
Resident district	26.88%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	46.55%	3	25%	.75
			100%	Math Total: 2.625

1.2a Reading: 3.75

1.2b Mathematics: 2.625

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.19

Comments/Evidence:

TCGIS scored well above the state and district reading proficiency scores and were comparable to the demographic match schools. There was an increase (+2.5%) in reading proficiency from the previous year.

TCGIS scores were above the state and district math proficiency scores but were significantly below the demographic match schools (-17.69%). TCGIS math proficiency levels remained the same from the previous year. Noting last year's comment, the 5th grade math proficiency rate was 40.4% ,an increase of +5.6%.

SY2024-2025 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2024)

	Reading Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	68.5%			
Average of demographic match schools	69.71%	3	37.5%	1.125
Resident district	33.12%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	49.45%	4	25%	1.0
			100%	Reading Total: 3.75
	Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	50.30%			

Average of demographic match schools	71.52%	1	37.5%	.375
Resident district	25.92%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	46.85%	3	25%	.75
			100%	Math Total: 2.625

1.2a Reading: 3.75

1.2b Mathematics: 2.625

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.19

Comments/Evidence:

TCGIS scored well above the state and district reading proficiency scores and were comparable to the demographic match schools. There was a slight decrease (-.53%) in reading proficiency from the previous year.

TCGIS scores were well above the state and district math proficiency scores but were significantly below the demographic match schools (-21.22%). TCGIS math proficiency levels also dropped from the previous year by - 2.84%. When comparing the different grade levels math proficiency rates, it is important to note that the 5th grade math proficiency levels have been consistently lower for the past two years when compared to the other grade levels. The 5th grade math proficiency was 34.80% (SY24) and 36.51% (SY23).

SY2023-2024 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2023)

	Reading Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	69.03%			
Average of demographic match schools	66.71%	3	37.5%	1.125
Resident district	33.27%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	42.19%	4	25%	1
			100%	Reading Total:
	Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	53.14%			
Average of virtual comparison group	67.07%	1	37.5%	.375
Resident district	25.44%	4	37.5%	1.5

State	46.70%	4	25%	1
			100%	Math Total:

1.2a Reading: 3.625

1.2b Mathematics: 2.875

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.25

Comments/Evidence: TCGIS scored well above both the state and resident district in reading and math. Both scores increased from the previous year with reading scores up by 2% and math up by 10.1%.

SY2022-2023 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2022)

	Reading Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	67.02%			
Average of demographic match schools	67.52%	3	37.5%	1.125
Resident district	33.51%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	50.56%	4	25%	1
			100%	Reading Total: 3.625
	Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	43.01%			
Average of virtual comparison group	65.57%	1	37.5%	.375
Resident district	25.02%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	45.09%	3	25%	.75
			100%	Math Total: 2.625

1.2a Reading: 3.625

1.2b Mathematics: 2.625

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.125

Comments/Evidence: The reading scores at TCGIS are well above the resident district as well as the state and are on par with the demographic match schools. There was a slight increase in the math proficiency scores and they are above the resident district, but below the scores of the demographic match schools 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 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.

1.3a 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.

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

	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Math Proficiency				
All	50.3%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 1 - Black	58.3%	22.5%	Included for information only	4
Demographic Group 2 – Hispanic/Latino	27.8%	22.4%		4
Demographic Group 3 – 2 or more races	50%	43.6%		4
Average of math scores for each demographic group: 4				
	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Reading Proficiency				
All	71%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.

Demographic Group 1 - Black	66.7%	31%	Included for information only	4
Demographic Group 2 – Hispanic/Latino	55.6%	28.7%		4
Demographic Group 3 – 2 or more races	63.6%	50.4%		4
Average of reading scores for each demographic group: 4				

1.3a Mathematics: 4

1.3b Reading : 4

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

Comments/Evidence:

For all 3 Demographic Groups, TCGIS significantly outperforms the state in both math and reading. With a significant increase in reading proficiency rates in demographic group 2 – Hispanic/Latino.

SY2024-2025 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2024)

	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Math Proficiency				
All	50.30%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 1 - Black	38.5%	21.9%	Included for information only	4
Demographic Group 2 – Hispanic/Latino	18.8%	22.4%		3
Demographic Group 3 – 2 or more races	41.4%	43.5%		3
Average of math scores for each demographic group: 3.33				
	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Reading Proficiency				
All	68.5%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 1 - Black	53.8%	31.1%	Included for information only	4

Demographic Group 2 – Hispanic/Latino	25.0%	28.7%		3
Demographic Group 3 – 2 or more races	58.6%	50.4%		4
Average of reading scores for each demographic group: 3.66				

1.3a Mathematics: 3.33

1.3b Reading : 3.66

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

Comments/Evidence:

For Demographic Group 1, TCGIS significantly outperforms the state in both math and reading and is comparable for Demographic Group 2 and Group 3.

SY2023-2024 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2023)

	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Math Proficiency				
All	53.14%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 1 - Black	33.3%	21.3%	Included for information only	4

Average of math scores for each demographic group: 4

	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Reading Proficiency				
All	69.03%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Demographic Group 1 - Black	66.7%	30.9%	Included for information only	4

Average of reading scores for each demographic group:

1.3a Reading: 4

1.3b Mathematics: 4

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

Comments/Evidence: Only one demographic group was large enough for scores and the proficiency was higher than the state in both reading and math. The math proficiency scores dropped by 6.7% from the previous year and the reading proficiency scores increased by 6.7%.

SY2022-2023 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2022)

	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Math Proficiency				
All	43.01%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Black or African American	40%	20.5%	Included for information only	4
Hispanic	20%	23.2%	Included for information only	3
White	43.8%	54.7%		2
Two or more races	42.9%	40.5%		3
Average of math scores for each demographic group: 3				
	Charter % Proficient	State % Proficient	% of Charter Student Population	Score
Reading Proficiency				
All	67.02%	Included for information only	Included for information only	N/A – Included for information only.
Black or African America	60%	31.2%	Included for information only	4
Hispanic	60%	32%	Included for information only	4
White	67.7%	59.7%		4
Two or more races	71.4%	49.3%		4
Average of reading scores for each demographic group: 4				

1.3a Reading: 4

1.3b Mathematics: 3

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

Comments/Evidence: In reading, all demographic groups large enough for proficiency scores outperformed the state as well as the resident district. Math proficiency of the most demographic groups are on par with both the state and resident district.

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

[Note that for this indicator the initial year will serve as a benchmark, after which point specific targets will be set for the individual school.]

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 – 65% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency.
4 = Exceeds standard	More than 65% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency.

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

1.4a Reading: 4

1.4b Mathematics: 4

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

Comments/Evidence:

The percentage of students maintaining or moving toward proficiency in math is 71.4% (an increase of 1.5%) and 77.9% in reading (a decrease of –1.7%).

SY2024-2025 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2024)

1.4a Reading: 4

1.4b Mathematics: 4

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

Comments/Evidence:

The percentage of students maintaining or moving toward proficiency in math is 69.9% (a decrease of - 6.2%) and 79.6% in reading (an increase of 1.0%).

SY2023-2024 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2023)

1.4a Reading: 4

1.4b Mathematics: 4**Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 4****Comments/Evidence:** The percentage of students maintaining or moving toward proficiency in math is 76.1% and 78.6% in reading.**SY2022-2023 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2022)****1.4a Reading: 4****1.4b Mathematics: 4****Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 4****Comments/Evidences:** The percentage of students maintaining or moving toward proficiency in math was 69.6% and 74.4% in reading.**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 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.****1.5a 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

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

	Reading Growth	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Points earned
Charter	77.9%		
Resident district	47.8%	4	4
State	60.6%	4	4
Reading Total: 4			
	Math Growth	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Points earned
Charter	71.4%		
Resident district	36.8%	4	4

State	55.9%	4	4
			Math Total: 4

1.5a Reading: 4

1.5b Mathematics: 4

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

Comments/Evidence:

TCGIS growth scores are considerably higher than both the district and state growth rates in both math and reading.

SY2024-2025 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2024)

	Reading Growth	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Points earned
Charter	78.6%		
Resident district	47.5%	4	4
State	61%	4	4
			Reading Total: 4
	Math Growth	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Points earned
Charter	69.9%		
Resident district	36.4%	4	4
State	56.4%	4	4
			Math Total: 4

1.5a Reading: 4

1.5b Mathematics: 4

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

Comments/Evidence:

TCGIS growth scores are considerably higher than both the district and state growth rates in both math and reading.

SY2023-2024 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2023)

	Reading Growth	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Points earned
--	----------------	---------------------------------------	---------------

Charter	78.6%		
Resident district	47.2%	4	4
State	60%	4	4
Reading Total: 4			
	Math Growth	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Points earned
Charter	76.2%		
Resident district	36.8%	4	4
State	56.3%	4	4
Math Total: 4			

1.5a Reading: 4

1.5b Mathematics: 4

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

Comments/Evidence: TCGIS growth scores in both reading and math exceed the resident district as well as the state.

SY2022-2023 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2022)

	Reading Growth	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Points earned
Charter	74.4%		
Resident district	49.5%	4	4
State	63.2%	4	4
Reading Total: 4			
	Math Growth	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Points earned
Charter	71.4%		
Resident district	41.4%	4	4
State	60.0%	4	4
Math Total: 4			

1.5a Reading: 4

1.5b Mathematics: 4

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

Comments/Evidence: In both reading and math, growth scores of the students at TCGIS outperform the state and resident district.

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

1.6 Are students in grades 3-8 performing at or above target levels, as measured using the school's selected standardized assessments?

1.6a Reading -- Are students in grades 3-8 performing at or above the 30th percentile, nationally as measured by FastBridge aReading scores?

1.6b Mathematics - Are students in grades 3-8 performing at or above the 30th percentile nationally, as measured by FastBridge aMath?

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 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%).

SY2025-2026

1.6a Reading: __4__

1.6b Math: __4__

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: __4__

Comments:

89% of students performed at or above the target level in reading and 80% in math.

SY2024-2025

1.6a Reading: __4__

1.6b Math: __4__

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: __4__

Comments:

80.32% of students performed at or above the target level in reading and 83.5% in math.

SY2023-2024

1.6a Reading: __4__

1.6b Math: __4__

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: __4__

Comments: Per the annual report, 73.5% of students performed at or above the target level in reading and 82% in math.

SY2022-2023

1.6a Reading: 4

1.6b Math: 4

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

Comments: The percentage of students performing at or above grade level on the Fastbridge reading assessment was 94% and 89% on the Fastbridge Math.

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

1.7 Are students making substantial and adequate gains over time, as measured using the school's selected standardized assessments (fall to spring Rate of Improvement)?

1.7a Reading – Are students making substantial and adequate gains over time, as indicated by the Rate of Improvement (ROI) on FastBridge aReading scores (from Growth Report)?

1.7b Mathematics – Are students making substantial and adequate gains over time as indicated by the Rate of Improvement (ROI) on FastBridge aMath (from Growth Report)?

1 = Does not meet standard	Analysis indicates that a minimal proportion of tested students made expected gains (less than 40%).
2 = Approaching standard	Analysis indicates that an inadequate proportion of tested students made expected gains (40%-49%).
3 = Meets standard	Analysis indicates that an adequate proportion of tested students made expected gains (50%-65%).
4 = Exceeds standard	Analysis indicates that an adequate proportion of tested students made expected gains (more than 65%).

SY2025-2026

1.7a Reading: 3

1.7b Math: 4

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

Comments:

In reading, 62% of students made expected gains on the Fastbridge assessment and 85% made expected gains in math.

SY2024-2025

1.7a Reading: 3

1.7b Math: _4_

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: __3.5__

Comments:

In reading, 59.12% of students made expected gains on the Fastbridge assessment and 65.94% made expected gains in math.

SY2023-2024

1.7a Reading: __3__

1.7b Math: __3__

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: __3__

Comments: In reading, 61.5% of students made expected gains on the Fastbridge assessment and 59% made expected gains in math.

SY2022-2023

1.7a Reading: 4

1.7b Math: 4

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

Comments: 70% of students made expected gains in reading as measured by the Fastbridge Reading assessment and 69% of students made expected gains in math.

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

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

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.

Rating: __NA__

Comments: Not Applicable

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	60-89% of students demonstrated readiness.
3 = Meets standard	90-94% of students demonstrated readiness.
4 = Exceeds standard	More than 95% of students demonstrated readiness.

Rating: __NA__

Comments: Not Applicable

Source: MDE Website

1.10 Based on its mission of innovative education of the whole child through German immersion, TCGIS seeks to ensure that students will continue to demonstrate proficiency in German according to the following metrics:

- 1.10A On an annual basis, 90% of 2nd graders will pass the listening portion of the Student Oral Proficiency Assessment (SOPA), and 70% will pass the speaking portion.
- 10.1B On an annual basis, 75% of students will pass the A1 exam (administered in 3rd grade).
- 10.1C On an annual basis, 70 % of students will pass the A2 exam (administered in 6th grade).
- 10.1D On an annual basis, 80% of eighth graders who take the DSD I exam will achieve a score of 12 on written and speaking sections and 14 on listening and reading (ZfA required standard to pass.)

1 = Does not meet standard

- 1.10A Less than 76% of 2nd graders passed the listening portion of the Student Oral Proficiency Assessment (SOPA) and less than 56% passed the speaking portion.
- 10.1B Less than 62% of students passed the A1 exam (administered in 3rd grade).
- 10.1C Less than 57% of students passed the A2 exam (administered in 6th grade).
- 10.1D Less than 67% of eighth graders who took the DSD I exam achieved a score of 12 on written and speaking sections and 14 on listening and reading (ZfA required standard to pass.)

2 = Approaching standard

- 1.10A 77-84% of 2nd graders passed the listening portion of the Student Oral Proficiency Assessment (SOPA) and less than 57-64% passed the speaking portion.
- 10.1B 62-69% of students passed the A1 exam (administered in 3rd grade).
- 10.1C 57-64% of students passed the A2 exam (administered in 6th grade).
- 10.1D 67-74% of eighth graders who took the DSD I exam achieved a score of 12

on written and speaking sections and 14 on listening and reading (ZfA required standard to pass.)
3 = Meets standard 1.10A 85-92% of 2nd graders passed the listening portion of the Student Oral Proficiency Assessment (SOPA) and less than 65 - 72% passed the speaking portion. 10.1B 70-77% of students passed the A1 exam (administered in 3rd grade). 10.1C 65-72% of students passed the A2 exam (administered in 6th grade). 10.1D 75-82% of eighth graders who took the DSD I exam achieved a score of 12 on written and speaking sections and 14 on listening and reading (ZfA required standard to pass.)
4 = Exceeds standard 1.10A More than 92% of 2nd graders passed the listening portion of the Student Oral Proficiency Assessment (SOPA) and more than 72% passed the speaking portion. 10.1B More than 77% of students passed the A1 exam (administered in 3rd grade). 10.1C More than 72% of students passed the A2 exam (administered in 6th grade). 10.1D More than 82% of eighth graders who took the DSD I exam achieved a score of 12 on written and speaking sections and 14 on listening and reading (ZfA required standard to pass.)
SY2025-2026 1.10a Rating: _oral (1) + speaking (1) = _1 _ 1.10b Rating: _1_ 1.10c Rating: _4_ 1.10d Rating: _4_ Overall Rating: _2.5_ a. TCGIS did not administer the Student Oral Proficiency Assessment to second graders. b. 51% of third graders completing the A1 exam successfully passed. 68% passed reading, 65% passed writing, 95% passed listening, and 80% passed speaking. All scores were lower from the previous year with the exception of Speaking. c. 83% of 6th graders passed the A2 exam, which is a significant increase (+20%) from the previous year. d. 85% of 8th grade students completing the DSD1 exam achieved the required standard to pass which is an increase of 10% from the previous year.
SY2024-2025 1.10a Rating: _oral (2) + speaking (4) = _3 _ 1.10b Rating: _3_ 1.10c Rating: _2_

1.10d Rating: 3

Overall Rating: 2.75

Comments:

- a. On the Student Oral Proficiency Assessment, 83% of second graders passed the listening portion and 77% passed the speaking portion. The listening scores show a 1% decrease from 2023 scores; however, there was an increase of 4% in speaking.
- b. 72% of third graders completing the A1 exam successfully passed. 90% passed reading, 79% passed writing, 96% passed listening and 79% passed speaking. All scores were higher from the previous year with the exception of Speaking.
- c. 63% of 6th graders passed the A2 exam, which is a significant decrease (-22%) from the previous year.
- d. 75% of 8th grade students completing the DSD1 exam achieved the required standard to pass which is a decrease of 9% from the previous year.

SY2023-2024

1.10a Rating: 3

1.10b Rating: 2

1.10c Rating: 4

1.10d Rating: 4

Overall Rating: 3.25

Comments:

- a. On the Student Oral Proficiency Assessment, 84% of second graders passed the listening portion and 73% passed the speaking portion. The scores show a decrease in the 2022 scores (90% in listening and 88% in speaking)
- b. 62% of third graders completing the A1 exam successfully passed. 83% passed reading, 69% passed writing, 94% passed listening and 86% passed speaking. Higher scores in all sections other than writing were noted in the 2022-23 scores.
- c. Sixth grade students complete the A2 assessment and 81% passed successfully. This is a 20% increase from the 2022 scores.
- d. 84% of 8th grade students completing the DSD1 exam achieved the required standard to pass.

SY2022-2023

1.10a Rating: 3.5

1.10b Rating: 3.0

1.10c Rating: 2.0

1.10d Rating: 2.0

Overall Rating: 2.625

Comments:

- a. On the Student Oral Proficiency Assessment, 90% of second graders passed the listening portion and 88% passed the speaking portion.
- b. 70% of third graders completing the A1 exam successfully passed. 76% passed reading, 89% passed writing, 72% passed listening and 71% passed speaking.
- c. Sixth grade students complete the A2 assessment and 61% passed successfully.
- d. 67% of 8th grade students completing the DSD1 exam achieved the required standard to pass.

Source: Annual report

1.11 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.

1.11a: Reading**1.11b: Math**

1 = Does not meet standard More than 10 percentage points below state EL performance.

2 = Approaching standard 6-10 percentage points below state EL performance.

3 = Meets standard Within 5 percentage points of state EL performance.

4 = Exceeds standard Exceeds state EL performance by more than 5 percentage points.

SY 2025-2026 (Results from 2025 MCA)**1.11a: Reading: _3_****1.11b: Math: _3_****Overall Rating: _3_****Comments:**

	TCGIS Average	State Average
Reading Proficiency	7.7%	9.9%
Math Proficiency	15.4%	12.6%

There was a 6% decrease in math proficiency from the previous year while reading had a slight increase of .6%.

SY2024-2025**1.11a: Reading: 3****1.11b: Math: _4_****Overall Rating: __3.5__****Comments:**

	TCGIS Average	State Average
--	---------------	---------------

Reading Proficiency	7.1%	10.2%	
Math Proficiency	21.4%	12.5%	
SY2023-2024 1.11a: Reading: ___ N/A ___ 1.11b: Math: ___ N/A ___ Overall Rating: ___ N/A ___ Comments: The number of EL students was too small to report.			
SY2022-2023 1.11a: Reading: ___ N/A ___ 1.11b: Math: ___ N/A ___ Overall Rating: ___ N/A ___ Comments: The number of EL students was too small to report. 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 proficiency? Note that for schools with greater than 70% of students qualifying for FRL, demographic categories will also be filtered by FRL status.		
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.	
SY2025-2026 (Based on 2025 MCA)		
1.12a: Reading: _4_		
1.12b: Math: _3_		
Overall Rating: _3.5_		
Comments:		
	TCGIS Average	State Average
Reading Proficiency	51.3%	25.1%
Math Proficiency	27.5%	24.3%

Reading proficiency increased for the second year in a row 4.8% and math proficiency increased by 6.6%.

SY2024-2025

1.12a: Reading: 4

1.12b: Math: 3

Overall Rating: 3.5

Comments:

	TCGIS Average	State Average
Reading Proficiency	46.5%	25.5%
Math Proficiency	20.9%	24.7%

Reading proficiency increased by 10.7%; however, math proficiency scores decreased by 8.7%.

SY2023-2024

1.12a: Reading: 4

1.12b: Math: 4

Overall Rating: 4

Comments: In reading 35.8% of students were proficient on the MCA and 29.6% in math. Both scores exceeded the state average (25.7% in reading and 24.6% in math). The math scores show an increase of 13.5% from the previous year.

SY2022-2023

1.12a: Reading: 4

1.12b: Math: 2

Overall Rating: 3

Comments:

In reading 33.9% of students were proficient on the MCA and 16.1% in math. The reading score exceeded the state average of 25.9% proficient while the math score was below the state average of 24.1%.

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?

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%).
Rating: __NA__ Comments: Not Applicable	
Source: School Selected Assessment Data	

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.
SY2025-2026 Rating: 4 Comments TCGIS is strongly aligned to its mission and vision through its consistent implementation of German immersion, whole-child supports, and a focus on intercultural understanding. The school delivers innovative instruction through immersive, data-informed practices and extended language opportunities, resulting in strong academic outcomes while also supporting students' social-emotional needs. Family feedback and school structures reflect a strong sense of community, belonging, and relationships, reinforcing the school's core values of kindness, community, and support. Overall, the report demonstrates that TCGIS effectively advances its mission of developing multilingual, open-minded global citizens, while continuing to refine areas such as math performance and equitable access to supports.	
SY2024-2025	

Rating: 4

Comments:

TCGIS's mission is "Innovative Education of the Whole Child through German Immersion". During the Fall and Spring Site visits, it was evident that TCGIS is holding true to its mission. TCGIS focused on offering a solid German Immersion program. The curriculum is scoped and sequenced to meet MN state standards while using the target language of German. It builds a solid foundation which begins in kindergarten. The observed kindergarten phonics lesson was based upon the science of reading research. It was systematic, including repetition of past sounds, newly introduced sounds, and blending of the sounds. Within each of the observed lessons, both teachers and students used German. Teachers offered additional support to students when they were having difficulty expressing themselves in German. All support and corrections were in German which is consistent with the philosophy of immersion education. Within each of the classes, students were engaged and there was often small group work and turn and talk activities. German culture events are highlighted throughout the school year, and students have an opportunity of going to Concordia's German Language Village. TCGIS has also developed a student exchange program with a partner school in Germany which all 8th grade students can participate as the school provides fund raising opportunities and scholarships for families facing financial hardships. Within the student focal group, students clearly understood the benefits of immersion education. Many of the students are planning to continue their study of German in high school and are contemplating the possibility of going to college in Germany.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 3

Comments: It is clear that decisions at TCGIS are made with the mission and vision of the school at the forefront. With the leadership changes, it takes a while for the dust to settle, but the school was back on track quickly and the reviews were very positive during the site visits.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 4

Comments: The three parts of the mission statement of Twin Cities German Immersion School drive all that happens at the school from the board, leadership, teachers, support staff and stakeholders. "Innovative education" includes evidence-driven instruction and best practices. TCGIS earned the MACS Innovation Award for the literacy assessments that were created in English and German.

The focus on "the whole child" includes all of the ways the school supports children as they grow and develop. In parent focus groups on site visits, it was mentioned that when talking with teachers at conferences, the teachers start with the happiness and social wellbeing of the child and then move to academic success. "Through German immersion" guides both the academic delivery of information as well as working toward the vision of helping students to "act with a mind open to the world".

The school is also guided by the values of curiosity, kindness, challenge and support, community and intercultural engagement.

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

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.
SY2025-2026 Rating: __4__ Comments: The finance committee meets on a monthly basis at least 9 months during the fiscal year. Membership consists of no less than 3 Board members, the Executive Director, Director of Operations, and Business Manager. The main objectives of the committee are overseeing the audit process & financial review, reviewing internal controls & financial policies, overseeing the preparation & maintenance of financial records, assisting in the development of annual budget, developing long-term budgeting forecasts, and reviewing investment objectives. The committee brings recommendations to the entire school board.	
SY2024-2025 Rating: __4__ Comments: TCGIS's finance committee meets at least 9 times per year, and the annual and long-term budget is continually updated so that the school can see potential problems that may pop-up in future years, giving itself enough time to be proactive instead of reactive. At each monthly board meeting, the finance committee reviews finances with the board. Additionally, TCGIS's finance committee, administration and campus planning committee have been working on a long-term strategic facilities improvement plan.	
SY2023-2024 Rating: __4__	

Comments: TCGIS has an active finance committee that meets regularly and is very aware of enrollment and all other aspects affecting the financial position of the school. The committee reports to the larger board at each monthly meeting.

SY2022-2023

Rating: __4__

Comments: The finance committee meets on a monthly basis. There are no less than 3 board members including the board chair who acts as an ex-officio member of the committee. School administrators, the Executive Director, Director of Operations and Facilities, all attend committee meetings as ex-officio members as well. The accounting management firm presents financial reports all the finance committee meetings.

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.

SY2025-2026

Rating: __3__

Comments:

TCGIS maintains a fund balance policy that sets a minimum ending fund balance at 20% of projected total school expenses and ensures compliance with all financial bond covenants.

SY2024-2025

Rating: __3__

Comments:

TCGIS has a fund balance policy (Policy 717) which has established an ending fund balance of at least 20% of the expected total school expenses and meets all TCGIS financial bond covenants.

SY2023-2024

Rating: __3__

Comments: TCGIS has a comprehensive fund balance policy.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The fund balance policy was revised in January 2022. The policy stipulates that the fund balance be at least 20% of expected total school expenses.

Source: Monthly board packets; Board policy manual

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

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

SY2025-2026

Rating: __4__

Comments:

TCGIS had a clean annual audit with no findings.

SY2024-2025

Rating: __4__

Comments:

TCGIS had a clean audit with no findings.

SY2023-2024

Rating: __4__

Comments: TCGIS had a clean audit with no findings.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 4

Comments: The FY21 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

SY2025-2026

Rating: 3

Comments:

The school demonstrates that it establishes and maintains a balanced budget. The budget is board-approved and monitored through a structured finance committee process, with ongoing oversight and adjustments made as needed to respond to staffing and operational changes. Financial practices include maintaining positive cash flow and strong financial indicators, including meeting bond covenants and sustaining a fund balance that exceeds established policy targets. Additionally, when adjustments were required, the school made strategic reductions to non-instructional areas such as supplies rather than implementing major program cuts, ensuring that core programming and the student experience were not negatively impacted

SY2024-2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

TCGIS Administration, Finance Committee and Creative Planning work together to manage school finances and set the budget. The school has a 5-year budget projection and is updated annually. Budgeting for the upcoming year begins in February and starts with projected enrollment. In March, the admin and finance committee discuss the upcoming fiscal year's budget. The budget is approved by the school board

before June 30. The school has a separate working budget to track changes throughout the year and is approved by the board as needed.

SY2023-2024

Rating: __3__

Comments: The TCGIS budget is approved before June 30 and includes a conservative enrollment projection. The budget is reviewed and adjusted as necessary.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The finance committee assists in developing the budget for the upcoming fiscal year. The committee also regularly monitors performance against the budget and develops recommendations. The budget is approved by the board prior to June 30 and is based on realistic enrollment.

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

SY2025-2026

Rating: __3__

Comments:

The original budget ADM was set at 550. Per Quarter 3 report the current working budget ADM is 535. The enrollment realization is 97.27%

SY2024-2025

Rating: __3__

Comments:

The original budget ADM was set at 585. Per Quarter 3 report the current working budget ADM is 558. The enrollment realization is 95.4%

SY2023-2024

Rating: __3__

Comments: The enrollment realization is 98%.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The budget was built on an ADM of 620. On October 31, the actual enrollment at the school was 612.88 ADM. This makes the enrollment realization 98%.

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

2.6 Does the school have sufficient cash on hand to meet its near-term obligations?

1 = Does not meet standard The school has fewer than 30 days cash on hand.

2 = Approaching standard The school maintains 30-59 days cash on hand.

3 = Meets standard The school maintains a minimum of 60 days cash on hand or is meeting the cash on hand requirements of its bond covenants, whichever is greater.

4 = Exceeds standard NOT APPLICABLE

SY2025-2026

Rating: _3__

Comments:

Per the annual report, the school had 66 days cash on hand, which is above the 60 days minimum to meet bond covenants.

SY2024-2025

Rating: _3__

Comments:

Per the annual report, the school had 73 days cash on hand, which is above the 60 days minimum bond covenants.

SY2023-2024

Rating: __3__

Comments: Per the audit, the school has 76 days cash on hand. This exceeds the requirement of bond covenants.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments: Per the FY21 financial audit, the school has 87 days of cash on hand.

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.

SY2025-2026

Rating: __ 4 __

Comments:

From the annual report, the school's fund balance was 28.6% and the overall academic outcomes fall within the "Meets Standard"

SY2024-2025

Rating: _4__

Comments:

The school's fund balance is 30.9% and the overall academic outcomes fall within the "Meets Standard" range.

SY2023-2024

Rating: __ 4 __

Comments: The school's fund balance is 30.1% and the overall academic outcomes fall within the "Meets Standard" range.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 4

Comments: In June 2022, the fund balance of TCGIS was \$2,345,313 or 30.1%.

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

SY2025-2026

Rating: 3

Comments:

Based on the annual report, the school met bond covenants: 66 days cash on hand and 1.1 DSCR (required 1.0). The school has met bond covenants for the past 4 years.

SY2024-2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

The school is currently meeting bond covenants: 71.8 days cash on hand (required 60 days) and 1.11 DSCR (required 1.0) The school did not meet bond covenants in SY22, but it did meet bond covenants in SY23 and SY24 as reported in an independent auditor report. Currently, the school is meeting bond covenants for SY25.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 2

Comments: The school is currently meeting bond covenants, but has been out of compliance within the past three years.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 2

Comments: The school is meeting all bond covenants but was out of compliance in SY22.

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.
SY2025-2026 Rating: 3 Comments: All board members meet statutory requirements for both initial and ongoing training. According to the annual report, the board utilizes Charter Source to support its annual training. In addition, all board members and administrative leadership participate in MACS Board trainings to strengthen their understanding of roles and responsibilities. The board also held three retreats during the year (October 24, October 25, and March 14) to support continued development and governance practices.	
SY2024-2025 Rating: __ 3 __ Comments: All members meet the statutory requirements for initial and ongoing training. According to the TCGIS annual report, the school board held two half-day retreats to continue ongoing training. Additionally, TCGIS board members have access to Charter Source which provides further board training on a variety of topics.	
SY2023-2024 Rating: __ 3 __ Comments: TCGIS does a good job of ensuring board members are meeting the board training requirements. All board members have fulfilled the initial board training and the whole board has undergone further trainings from both outside entities as well as from fellow board members.	
SY2022-2023 Rating: 3	

Comments: Board members complete MACS board trainings to enhance their understanding of roles and responsibilities. Board orientation for new members includes a comprehensive board member manual, MACS trainings as well as TCGIS-specific board training by the board chair and the governance chair. The annual training requirement is met by holding all day retreats in April which are focused on strategic plan milestones and clearly defined expectations.

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

SY2025-2026

Rating: 3

Comments:

Through board observations, interviews, and review of board documents, the board demonstrates a clear understanding of and compliance with the Open Meeting Law and maintains its records in an organized and accessible manner. Board meeting dates, times, locations, and a Zoom link for remote participation are publicly posted. Agendas and board packets are made available on the school's website in advance of meetings. Meetings are conducted with a quorum present and in alignment with the board's bylaws. Board minutes are digitally archived, with access provided through a Google Drive link on the school's website, and all votes are clearly documented within the minutes.

SY2024-2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

The board understands and meets the requirements of the Open Meeting Law and maintains its records in an orderly manner.

- Board meeting times and location are published along with a Zoom link to attend remotely
- Board agendas and packets are available on the school website.
- Meeting is conducted only with a board quorum
- Past board meeting minutes are digitally archived, and a link is provided on the school's website to Google Drive where they are stored. Votes are recorded and part of minutes
- Meetings are conducted in accordance with the board's bylaws.

SY2023-2024 Rating: __3__ Comments: Through observations and interviews, it is clear that the board has a good understanding of Open Meeting Law. Records are maintained through Google Docs as well as in a physical binder.
SY2022-2023 Rating: 3 Comments: Through interviews with board members as well as board meeting observations, it is clear that the board understands and complies with Open Meeting Law.
Source: Board minutes, ongoing correspondence, UST site visits

3.3 Are all the school's educational staff appropriately licensed?	
1 = Does not meet standard	At least one educational staff is not appropriately licensed or does not hold appropriate and current waivers or variances.
2 = Approaching standard	At least one educational staff has been on a waiver or variance for more than one year.
3 = Meets standard	All educational staff are appropriately licensed.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
SY2025-2026 Rating: 3 Comments: All teachers were appropriately licensed.	
SY2024-2025 Rating: __1__ Comments: The 7 th grade math teacher is licensed in the following areas: G7-12 ELA (6/2028) and an out-of-field Academic & Behavior Specialist (6/25); however, their out-of-field license for math expired on 6/2023. The 6 th & 8 th grade German/science teacher is licensed in the following area: German (6/2027); however, their out of field science license expired on 6/2023. The 5 th -8 th grade German/art teacher is licensed in the following area: German (6/2027); however, their out of field license for visual arts expired on 6/2024.	

The 5th, 7th, & 8th Grade German and Social Studies teacher has a license for G5-12 social studies but is not licensed in German.

The 4th-8th Grade PE teacher has the following license: G7-12 ELA (6/2029), G5-12 German (6/2029), G5-12 PE (6/2029); however, they are currently not licensed for 4th grade.

The 4th/8th Grade ELA teacher has a G1-6 Elementary Ed license (6/2030); however, they are not currently licensed to teacher 8th grade English.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 3

Comments: All staff are appropriately licensed. Due to the number of international teachers, there are some Tier 1 licenses and variances.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments: Per the MDE license look-up, all teachers 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

SY2025-2026

Rating: 3

Comments:

TCGIS conducts background checks for all individuals offered employment. In addition, the school requires background checks for volunteers, chaperones, independent contractors, and newly appointed board members.

SY2024-2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

TCGIS completes background checks for applicants who receive an offer or employment with the district. The school district also requires background checks on all volunteers, chaperones, independent contractors, and new board members.

SY2023-2024**Rating:** 3

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

SY2022-2023**Rating:** 3

Comments: The school certifies that criminal background checks are conducted for new school employees, volunteers who interact with the students and board members.

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

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

- Meeting admissions and enrollment practice/policy requirements
- Meeting governance model requirements

1 = Does not meet standard	The school is not in compliance with other applicable law.
2 = Approaching standard	NOT APPLICABLE
3 = Meets standard	The school is in compliance with other applicable law.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY2025-2026**Rating:** 3 **Comments:**

The school is in compliance with applicable laws. New legislative changes have been addressed and updated accordingly. TCGIS actively engages in ongoing policy review, with the board's governance committee meeting monthly for approximately 90 minutes to review standing policies. The school also maintains a policy review calendar that tracks the last review date, upcoming review dates, and policies requiring annual review.

TCGIS has created, passed, and implemented policies recently passed by the legislature in recent sessions, including the board approved LAP, Procurement Policy and the Student Journalism Policy in the 2024-2025 school year, the Cell Phone Policy in fall of 2025, and Nepotism policy is in committee.

Additionally, TCGIS Board Policy 522 outlines the Title IX Sex Nondiscrimination policy, including the grievance procedures and process. The policy designates the Director of Operations & HR as the Title IX Coordinator and the Executive Director as the Title IX investigator.

School Website was checked on January 21, 2026, and was found to be in compliance.

Governance Structure is outlined in the board's bylaws. The board shall consist of at least 5 members with the target configuration of 9 members but may have as many as 11 members with board approval. The board of directors shall consist of a majority of parent members. During SY26, there were 9 directors: 6 parent members, 2 teacher members, and one community member.

SY2024-2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

The school is in compliance with applicable laws. All new legislative changes have been accounted for and policies updated.

TCGIS Board Policy 509 states their admission and enrollment policy which follows MN Statute 124D.10. It was board reviewed and updated on 4/24/2025.

TCGIS Board Policy 522 outlines Title IX Sex Nondiscrimination policy, grievance procedure and process. It identifies the Director of Operations & HR as the Title IX coordinator; the Executive Director is TCGIS's Title IX investigator.

Governance Structure is outlined in the board's bylaws. The board shall consist of at least 5 members with the target configuration of 9 members, but may have as many as 11 members with board approval. The board of directors shall consist of a majority of parent members. During SY25, there were 9 directors: 6 parent members, 2 teacher members and one community member.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 3

Comments: The school is meeting all applicable laws and statutory policy requirements.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments: TCGIS is compliant in all applicable law. The enrollment policy has recently been updated and is compliant with MN statute.

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

SY2025-2026

Rating: 3

Comments:

The Executive Director and board demonstrate a clear understanding of their respective roles, with strong and consistent communication structures in place. The ED regularly attends board and committee meetings, and meets weekly with the board chair to discuss strategy and emerging issues. The Executive Committee

further supports this relationship through monthly meetings that provide ongoing feedback and a space for collaboration.

The board has established clear and thoughtful governance practices, including an annual self-review with well-developed questions aligned to key responsibilities, and a structured Executive Director evaluation conducted twice yearly based on board-approved goals.

The succession plan is well developed, with a focus on leadership continuity through internal capacity building, cross-training, and use of Q-Comp to support staff development. New board members receive comprehensive onboarding materials and complete required training prior to beginning service.

The board and school leadership also collaborated to develop and approve a new five-year strategic plan in SY25, supported by shorter-term operational plans to guide implementation and ongoing oversight.

SY2024-2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

The Director and the board have a clear understanding of their roles. The ED attends all board meetings, along with most board committee meetings (finance and facilities, fundraising, diversity and belonging, executive). The board chair and ED meet weekly for 30-60 minutes to discuss long term strategy for the school as well as legal and organizational “hot spots” that may end up in front of the board. The board asks the director for advice, and the ED carries the strategic vision through implementation with staff and systems at the school level. The Executive Committee supports board/ED collaboration and meets monthly. The Executive Committee provides the director with ongoing feedback and serves also to hear the director's concerns.

The Board conducts a self-evaluation each year in March. The board self-evaluation reviews, reflects, and discusses the evaluation, and the evaluation is shared in March board meeting.

The board evaluates the ED twice a year. Mid-year evaluation provides real-time feedback from the board and the annual performance reviews are at the end of year which includes a self-evaluation of progress and the board's evaluation. The board chair and administrative liaison meet with the ED to discuss the evaluation.

The current ED has a current license in MN as a K-12 Principal.

Newly elected board members are provided a comprehensive board member manual with information on board member roles and responsibilities, authorizer contract, financial operations, legal documents, important contacts, academic performance and other background information. New members receive training through Charter Source. The TCGIS Board Chair and Governance Chair also provide TCGIS-specific board training to new members as a group, and the Board Chair meets individually with each new member to discuss specific interests and to answer questions.

The Board is in the process of creating a new strategic plan. They have contracted with MSBA to guide them in developing their next strategic plan. The board intends the new plan to be in use for SY25-26. The strategic plans implementation and progress of existing milestones were tracked by the school's administration team.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 3

Comments: The TCGIS board completes annual self-evaluations which drive training for the next school year. Annual evaluations of the school leaders is also undertaken. Strategic planning is a regular practice and the plan is referenced on a regular basis at board meetings and in committee meetings.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The board completes a self-evaluation annually which highlights the following strategic areas: Innovative Teaching and Learning, Diversity and Belonging, Financial Sustainability, Culture and Engagement. The evaluation informs board development work for the board retreats of committees. An evaluation of the school director is also conducted annually. The board engages in regular strategic planning with is informed by the completed self-evaluations.

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

SY2025-2026

Rating: 3

Comment:

The board's governance committee meets monthly for approximately 90 minutes to review standing policies. TCGIS follows a policy review calendar to support ongoing compliance with state statute.

SY2024-2025

Rating: __3__
Comments:

The board's governance committee meets monthly for an hour and a half to review standing policies. TCGIS has adopted a policy review calendar to ensure they remain in compliance with statute.

SY2023-2024

Rating: __3__

Comments: The bylaws and policies are updated on a regular basis. Policies are reviewed on a three-year rotation which is spread evenly over the three years.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments: Policies are reviewed on a three-year rotation except for the policies that need annual review.

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

SY2025-2026

Rating: 3

Comments:

Board packets are provided to board members, school leadership, and UST at least three days in advance of all board meetings. All meeting minutes are publicly posted on the TCGIS website.

SY2024-2025

Rating: __3__

Comments:

The board provides board packets to board members, school leadership and UST at least 3 days prior to all board meetings. All minutes are posted on TCGIS's website.

SY2023-2024

Rating: __3__

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

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

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 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

SY2025-2026

Rating: 3

Comments:

The school has established processes to identify and serve students in need of EL services. New students complete the Minnesota Language Survey, and those identified are assessed using the WIDA screener, with an option for pre-year screening to support timely service delivery. EL services are provided through a

combination of push-in and pull-out models, coordinated with classroom teachers and aligned to the school's LIEP, with staffing currently at 0.4 FTE serving 18 students, 3.3% of TCGIS student population.

Academic data indicates that while English Learners perform below non-EL peers on MCAs, the school's outcomes exceed statewide EL performance, with noted gains in both achievement and growth in recent years. However, ACCESS results show variability, likely influenced by small cohort sizes. The board-approved Language Access Plan outlines clear procedures to ensure families receive accessible communication, including translation and interpretation services, staff training, and ongoing monitoring to support compliance and equitable access.

SY2024-2025

Rating: _3__

Comments:

TCGIS uses a home language questionnaire as well as the WIDA screener to identify students for EL services. After initial identification, a LIEP placement based on additional data will be used to determine what amount or type of service is needed. Services are a combination of a push-in model during English classes and pull-out services. Parents/Guardians are sent a letter offering EL services. English learners are assessed annually using the WIDA ACCESS assessment. Students exit the EL program when they reach the proficiency level determined by the Minnesota Department of Education. TCGIS's EL population consists of 21 students, which is 3.7% of the student population. They have one EL teacher at .4 FTE. TCGIS is an immersion school with annual immersion workshops. Additionally they had specific training for all staff focused on English Language Learner.

SY2023-2024

Rating: _3__

Comments: TCGIS has a small number of EL students (3.4%). One teacher is designated as serving EL students at 0.2 FTE. The programming is on a one-on-one basis and is tailored to the needs of each student. The services are provided in pull-out and are provided in collaboration with the classroom teacher.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments: All students complete a Family Intake Survey when enrolling. The information is used to determine if a student is eligible for EL services. TCGIS employs one 0.2 FTE ELD teacher for the 13 (2.1%) students who currently qualify for EL services. Given that most of the EL instruction is 1:1, the curriculum is tailored to each student's needs. The school has an ELL Instruction Educational Program Plan.

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

SY2025-2026

Rating: 3

Comments:

10.1% of students (55 students) at TCGIS qualify for special education services. TCGIS has a board approved TSES manual which is posted on their website. The school demonstrates systems and practices that support fulfillment of its legal obligations related to access and services for students with IEPs. A structured identification process is in place through a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and Child Study Team (CST), ensuring that students receive appropriate interventions and are referred for evaluation in alignment with Minnesota requirements.

The school maintains strong staffing and leadership capacity, including a Director and Assistant Director of Special Education, along with a team of licensed staff and contracted service providers to meet a wide range of student needs. Services are grounded in a student-centered, strengths-based philosophy, emphasizing least restrictive environment, inclusion, and data-driven decision-making. The school also effectively utilizes external partners to ensure access to specialized services when necessary.

SY2024-2025

Rating: __3__

Comments:

10.5% of students (59 students) at TCGIS qualify for special education services. TCGIS has a board approved TSES manual which is posted on their website. Identification of students follows a systematic, multi-tiered approach. TCGIS contracts out for a Director of Special Education and employs 4.5 FTE Special Education Teachers. The school contracts three licensed special education teachers as Due Process Specialists from EdSource to assist the TCGIS special education teachers with their due process paperwork. There are ten Education Assistants (paraprofessionals) that support Special Education needs in various

school settings. TCGIS contracts three EAs with Zen Educate as long-term substitutes. TCGIS has a 1.0 contracted Speech Language Pathologists from Word Play. TCGIS also employs a 1.0 Occupational Therapist from Strategic Staffing. Identification of students follows a systematic, multi-tiered approach. Specific professional development focused on Special Education was provided: Special Education 101, CPI Training, ADHD Training, Mental Health Module. TCGIS did not have any complaints found through MDE. The authorizer did not receive any complaints related to Special Education either.

SY2023-2024

Rating: __ 3 __

Comments: TCGIS uses teacher referrals, assessment data, PBIS behavioral referrals and parental referrals to determine interventions through the Student-Wide Support Team. Through this team and the results of the interventions, it is then determined if a student will be referred for a special education evaluation. 11.8% of TCGIS students receive special education services. The school employs 4.5 FTE Special Education Teachers with specializations in EBD, SLD, ASD and ABS. 13 Education Assistants are employed to help students where needed. A Director of Special Education serves on-site as well as a Due Process and Compliance Coordinator and a Special Education Coordinator. Contracted services include Speech Pathology, Occupational Therapy, DAPE and Audiology/DHH services.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments: Currently 73 students (11.9%) qualify for special education services. The school employs 4.5 FTE special education teachers in the licensure areas of EBD, SLD, ASD, ABS, 13 paraprofessionals, Special Education Director, Due Process and Compliance Coordinator, Lead Special Education Coordinator and a .5 FTE Coordinator to support the students with IEPs. Contracted services include Speech/language pathology, occupational therapy, DAPE, licensed school nurse, audiology consultation, Deaf/Hard of Hearing and school psychologist.

Teachers at Twin Cities German Immersion School can refer students who are struggling to the SWST (School-wide Support Team). Students are also automatically referred per achievement screener data, MCA scores and behavior referrals through PBIS. Parents may also consult SWST about concerns.

Tiered interventions through ADSIS programming are also utilized for students who are struggling. Literacy Tier II interventions are available in German and English, Math. Behavior interventions are also available.

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

3.11 Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to the delivery of a quality Prekindergarten instructional program. This includes ensuring Early Childhood Health and Developmental Screening is completed, securing appropriate staffing, supplying relevant professional development to all staff, implementing culturally responsive comprehensive child

assessment/s, utilizing the Early Childhood Indicators of Progress (ECIPs), supporting an effective transition to Kindergarten, and 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
Rating: __NA__ Comments: Not Applicable	
Source: Site Visits, Interviews, Quarterly Reports	

3.12 Does the school have a high attendance rate?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The attendance rate is less than 85 percent
2 = Approaching standard	The attendance rate is between 85 and 89.9 percent
3 = Meets standard	The attendance rate is 90-94.9 percent
4 = Exceeds standard	The attendance rate is more than 95 percent
SY2025-2026 Rating: 1 Comments: The consistent attendance rate reported on the MDE report card is 83.9%, which was an increase of 2.7% from the previous year. The state average was 75.5%.	
SY2024-2025 Rating: 1	

Comments:

The consistent attendance rate reported on the MDE report card is 81.2%, which has significantly increased from the previous year. The state average was 74.5%.

SY2023-2024**Rating: __1__**

Comments: The consistent attendance rate reported on the MDE report card is 66.9%. This percentage falls a bit short of the state average with is 69.8%.

SY2022-2023**Rating: 4**

Comments: The attendance rate for TCGIS is 95.3% compared to the state percentage of 85.3%.

Source: Annual reports, MDE website (data downloads)

3.13 Is the school able to maintain a high percentage of teacher retention (retention of probationary and non-probationary teachers eligible to continue to serve)?

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

SY2025-2026**Rating: 4****Comments:**

The teacher retention rate from SY24/25 to SY25/26 was 95.7%.

SY2024-2025**Rating: __2__****Comments:**

The teacher retention rate from SY23/24 to SY24/25 was 81.6%.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 2

Comments: The teacher retention rate for 2022-23 was 78%.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 2

Comments: 81% of teachers returned in SY22.

Source: Annual report

3.14 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 of 95%.
2 = Approaching standard	Student retention rates are 5-10% below the school's agreed-upon target rates of 95%
3 = Meets standard	The school is consistently fully enrolled. Student retention rates are within 5% or above the school's agreed-upon target rates of 95%
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY2025-2026

Rating: 3

Comments:

The school continues to have a high student retention rate of 96.99%. The beginning of the school year was 564 and the ending enrollment number was 547.

SY2024-2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

The school continues to have a high student retention rate of 96.08%.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 3

Comments: The school has a high student retention rate at 97%.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The student enrollment at the beginning of the year for SY22 was 594 and 585 students ended the school year (98% retention rate). Enrollment remains strong at TCGIS.

Source: Annual report, renewal application

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

3.15a The percentage of parents surveyed who “agree” or “strongly agree” that they would recommend TCGIS to a friend.

3.15b Survey response rate

1 = Does not meet standard

3.15a Less than 70% of parents surveyed indicate they would recommend the school to a friend.

3.15b The school’s survey response rate was less than 25%.

2 = Approaching standard

3.15a 70-79% of parents surveyed indicate they would recommend the school to a friend.

3.15b The school’s survey response rate was 25-30%.

3 = Meets standard

3.15a 80-89% of parents surveyed indicate they would recommend the school to a friend.

3.15b The school’s survey response rate was 31-35%.

4 = Exceeds standard

3.15a 90% or more of parents surveyed indicate they would recommend the school to a friend.

3.15b The school’s survey response rate was greater than 35%.

SY2025-2026

3.15a Rating: 3

3.15b Rating: 1

Overall Rating: 2

Comments:

83.6% of respondents to the family survey indicated that they would recommend TCGIS to a friend which increased by 4.2% from the previous year. The response rate to the survey was 16%

SY2024-2025 3.15a Rating: __3__ 3.15b Rating: __3__ Overall Rating: __3__ Comments: 79.4% of respondents to the family survey indicated that they would recommend TCGIS to a friend. The response rate to the survey was 33.4%	
SY2023-2024 3.15a Rating: __3__ 3.15b Rating: __3__ Overall Rating: __3__ Comments: 79.4% of respondents to the family survey indicated that they would recommend TCGIS to a friend. The response rate to the survey was 29%.	
SY2022-2023 3.15a Rating: __3__ 3.15b Rating: __4__ Overall Rating: __3.5__ Comments: The school reported that 238 parents responded to the SY22 parent survey (58%). 88.3% indicated overall satisfaction with the school.	
Source: Annual report, School parent satisfaction survey--overall satisfaction indicator	

3.16 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.
SY2025-2026 Rating: 3 Comments: TCGIS has systems in place that support a secure and welcoming environment for students. Entry to the building is controlled through locked exterior doors and a monitored buzzer/intercom system for visitors. The playground is fenced, staff actively monitor students during outdoor time, and the equipment has been updated within the past three years to ensure it is developmentally appropriate for the grades served. The separation of middle school and elementary spaces allows for a more developmentally appropriate setting for each group. Classrooms are consistently set up and well-resourced, and the facility is accessible for all students.	
SY2024-2025 Rating: __3__ Comments: TCGIS provides a safe environment for its student population. The external doors are locked, and there is a buzzer/intercom system to admit visitors to the school. During the fall site visits, students reported feeling safe at school both physically and emotionally. The middle school classes are located in a separate wing from the elementary classes. This division helps to support their specific developmental needs. The rooms have uniformity in furnishing, and all needed resources are provided for students and teachers. The building is accessible to all students.	

SY2023-2024
Rating: __3__ Comments: The school facility provides a safe environment and is well-suited to meet the needs of students. Parking, pick-up and drop-off were brought up as issues in various focus groups, but they do not have easy solutions and the school has worked hard to put the best solutions in place. All health and safety code requirements are being met and the facility are well-maintained.
SY2022-2023
Rating:3 Comments: All health code requirements are being met and the facility is conducive to learning. Based on some of the comments during focus groups, there were some complaints about temperature regulation and conditions of the older building. The equipment and furniture is well maintained and accessible to all students.
Source: Authorizer observation

3.17 Do the school's disciplinary practices eliminate disparities as they relate to students of color?
1 = Does not meet standard The percentage of BIPOC students with a DIRS reportable incident was more than 15% higher than their white peers.
2 = Approaching standard The percentage of BIPOC students with a DIRS reportable incident was more than 5-10% higher than their white peers.
3 = Meets standard The percentage of BIPOC students with a DIRS reportable incident was approximately the same than their white peers.
4 = Exceeds standard Not applicable
Rating: _NA__ Comments: Information not available.

Source: MDE DIRS Data, School reported data

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

3.18a Processes to communicate academic performance and other pertinent school Information that are accessible to families including the consider language needs.

3.18b 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.

3.18c Opportunities for parents to support their child's education and/or the school (e.g. volunteer, parent organization, family events, conferences).

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.

SY2025-2026

Rating a: 3

Rating b: 4

Rating c: 4

Overall Rating: 3.67

Comments:

The school has a clear and comprehensive plan for communicating academic performance and key information to families, and it is implemented consistently. Parent and student surveys are conducted annually, and the school uses this feedback as an opportunity for growth. Survey data and family interviews indicate a strong sense of belonging, with 96.6% of responding families agreeing or strongly agreeing that they feel welcomed in the school community.

TCGIS families have a variety of opportunities to engage, including parent-teacher conferences, afterschool activities, field trip chaperoning, participation on the school board and committees, affinity groups, and regular communication from teachers and the Executive Director. The board has approved a Language Access Plan to support communication with all families. The school utilizes TransACT Parent Notices, professional document translation and interpretation services, and multilingual staff to reduce language barriers. Training on the Language Access Plan is provided to all teachers annually.

SY2024-2025

Rating a: 3

Rating b: 4

Rating c: 4

Overall Rating: 3.67

Comments:

The school has many avenues for parent involvement. TCGIS has formed family/affinity groups for students, parents/caregivers, and staff which aim to bring individuals together. The current affinity groups listed on the school's website are BIPOC, Parent/Caregiver Support Group, Modern Family, Gun

Safety, LGBTQ+. Parents also are encouraged to volunteer at the school, at school events, and on field trips. At each board meeting, volunteers are recognized for their service to the TCGIS community. TCGIS also has an active PTO organization which has a variety of committees to serve on. TCGIS keeps family well informed through the Klassenbrief, Rundbrief, Infinite Campus, and Fall and Spring Parent Teacher Conferences. For new families, TCGIS hosts a Fall Welcome Night, and in the spring, they host a Welcome event for new kindergarten families.

The school annually conducts a parent survey to elicit feedback. On the school survey, 91% felt appreciated and well informed, 82.7% were satisfied with their child's German skills, and 80.7% were satisfied with the academic program. The school reflects upon the results and identifies key takeaways and key areas of opportunity.

SY2023-2024

Rating a: 3

Rating b: 4

Rating c: 3

Overall Rating: 3.33

Comments: TCGIS has numerous opportunities for families to be involved including the school board, Parent Council, Fundraising Committee, PTO. Various family education sessions are offered throughout the school year which have included age appropriate technology, PBIS and how it is being applied at school and how families can support fifth graders at school and at home. On the parent survey, 84.9% of respondents felt that TCGIS welcomed family engagement and 91.3% felt a sense of satisfaction with school communication. A lower percentage of 75.6% felt that they were well-informed about school expectations and their child's progress.

SY2022-2023

Rating a: 3

Rating b: 3

Rating c: 3

Overall Rating: 3

Comment:

TCGIS demonstrates a thoughtful and comprehensive approach to family engagement, offering multiple avenues for involvement such as affinity groups, volunteer opportunities, PTO and Parent Council participation, and board service. The school fosters strong communication through newsletters, Infinite Campus, conferences, and onboarding events for new families, helping to build connection and transparency across the community. TCGIS also gathers annual feedback from families and uses the results to reflect on strengths and areas for growth. Overall, responses indicate that families feel connected to the school and value both communication and programming, while also pointing to an opportunity to further strengthen clarity around school expectations and student progress.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews

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

3.19a Marketing/outreach targets socioeconomically and racially diverse populations, which includes having materials available in multiple languages.

3.19b. Enrollment policies and practices are accessible and transparent. Supports are available to families as needed to navigate the application and enrollment process.

3.19c. The school demonstrates a commitment to cultivating a board and staff that is reflective of the student population and knowledgeable about equity practices.

3.19d. Cultural relevancy/representative is a key factor in curriculum selection.

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. Minimal training is offered to board or staff to grow knowledge about equity practices and/or cultural competency.
- d. Cultural relevancy/representation is not a factor in curriculum selection.

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. Some training is offered to the board and/or staff to grow knowledge about equity practices and/or cultural competency.
- d. Cultural relevancy/representation is a factor in curriculum selection.

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. Board members and

staff participate in trainings to grow knowledge about equity practices and/or cultural competency. Equity is a part of the school's strategic plan. d. 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
SY2025-2026 Rating a: 3 Rating b: 3 Rating c: 3 Rating d: 3 Overall Rating: 3 Comments: The Recruitment and Enrollment Team works collaboratively to attract and welcome new families through intentional, coordinated outreach. Their efforts focus on expanding access and increasing diversity through community events, open houses, school tours, and partnerships with local organizations and preschools. They have strengthened communication through multilingual materials and targeted marketing, including billboards and digital campaigns, to reach a broader audience. Using data to refine their approach, the team balances strategic outreach with relationship-building to ensure recruitment efforts align with the school's mission and foster a strong sense of belonging for new families. TCGIS provides clear and accessible enrollment information on its website, making it easy for families to navigate the process. Families can readily find the application, details about the lottery, options to schedule tours, and contact information for additional support. The application is available in English, Somali, and Spanish to better meet family needs. TCGIS embeds equity into its systems and practices, beginning at the policy level, where governance committee reviews intentionally consider equitable outcomes for students and staff. Curriculum adoption follows a structured review process that includes a rubric addressing equity and representation. At the same time, recent Belonging Survey results indicate that some students, particularly students of color and those with disabilities, do not consistently see themselves reflected in the curriculum and increasing that sense of belonging remains a strategic priority for the school. The school promotes an inclusive environment through daily morning circles that build community and explicitly teach social-emotional skills. Classrooms reflect equitable practices such as mixed-ability grouping, intentional participation strategies, and clearly established norms. TCGIS also elevates student voice through structures like student council and by actively seeking student input on larger school decisions.	
SY2024-2025 Rating a: 3 Rating b: 3 Rating c: 3	

Rating d: 3

Overall Rating: 3

Comments:

The school's marketing plan is focused on having a presence at community events around the Twin Cities. TCGIS has developed an outreach activities calendar which included events in the Como neighborhood such as spring garage sale, ice cream social, Como Pride event, and sponsorship at Como ballpark. Postcards were sent to nearby neighborhoods in an attempt to reach a more diverse population. Their marketing material represents the TCGIS student population. The school has also contracted with Charter Connect to increase enrollment through an online presence.

TCGIS website enrollment policies and practices are easy to follow. There are links to the application, information about the lottery, setting up tours, and an email to get additional support. The enrollment application is in English, Somali and Spanish. The enrollment application is connected to a software called Packed Class which allows the school to follow up with parents/guardians who have clicked on the application but have not finished it.

The board reads each policy carefully to ensure equitable practices for students and staff. The most recently added policy was the Gender Inclusion Policy. The Principal meets with the GSA group quarterly to get feedback from this student group to help enhance the experience of queer or gender-queer students. TCGIS curriculum review uses a rubric that addresses equity and diversity in new materials. TCGIS's Student Support Team annually conducts a student survey which gathers feedback on student belonging and inclusivity. The school continues to have affinity groups.

SY2023-2024

Rating a: 3

Rating b: 3

Rating c: 3

Rating d: 3

Overall Rating: 3

Comments: The school employed a new initiative of connecting with the surrounding pre-schools and day care programs in the hopes of increasing Kindergarten enrollment. It is too early to determine if this will yield results in the long term, but it seems to be a positive step. The school enrollment policy was recently updated and is statutorily compliant.

SY2022-2023

Rating a: 2.5

Rating b: 2.5

Rating c: 3

Rating d: 2.5

Overall Rating: 2.63

Comments: On the parent survey, 87% of respondents said that they felt TCGIS was a welcoming environment. In the Strategic Plan, one goal centers around Diversity and Belonging. The goal is to increase the diversity of students and staff to be more reflective of the multifaceted diversity of the Twin Cities. An environment of teaching and learning will be developed where everyone feels they belong. The board and leadership of the school is constantly moving toward these goals.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews