



Performance Framework

2025-26

What's New in 2025-26

This document gives an overview of changes in the framework and OEI accountability for the 2025-26 school year, which will be reflected in reports drafted in the winter/spring of 2027. We update the OEI Performance Framework to make improvements to existing metrics, add new metrics, or address questions and concerns from school leaders.

We also make updates to ensure alignment, where needed, with state and federal expectations. This means that some indicator specifications in this handbook will necessarily change. We will communicate changes to calculations, data collection, and plans for rating in future reports throughout the year as information is confirmed.

The full performance framework, along with expanded criteria and additional information about how indicators are calculated and what data is needed, follows later in this section. We encourage you to reach out with any questions or concerns as they arise.

All Core Questions

OEI will no longer use numbers to label Core Question indicators. As changes have been made over the years, the numbers increasingly caused confusion and lack meaning. Instead, each indicator will have a label that corresponds to what it measures. Core Question numbers (1, 2, 3, 4,) will remain, and sub-indicators will still be labeled with letters (a, b, c, etc.). We hope this provides clearer communications and understanding going forward.

Core Question 1

Growth metrics

The Indiana Department of Education updated how they present ILEARN growth data as part of the new EdFi and EdData portals. Because of this change, we updated our growth indicator last year to better reflect the available data and its corresponding language. The Annual Growth indicator for K-8 students is calculated using Federal Report Card data. The percentage of students making adequate growth is determined by the number of students meeting their growth target in both ELA and math and/or being proficient in both ELA and math divided by the total number of tested students in grades 4-8. It is important to note that growth targets are calculated by the state based on the state's goal of Indiana students reaching proficiency by 2028 (previously 2026).

We will track student growth for high schools from the fall PSAT administered in 10th grade to the SAT given in 11th grade. Academic analysts will continue to collaborate with stakeholders to identify the best methods for reporting student growth using the College Board Suite of Assessments.

Comparative Performance: Is the school outperforming students' assigned schools?

For reports based 2023-24 results (released in spring 2025), there is no change for how this indicator is calculated compared to prior years. Beginning for reports based on 2024-25 results (released in spring 2026), because of changes related to how students are assigned to schools under Indianapolis Public Schools' Rebuilding Stronger plan, comparison schools will likely be selected based on similar demographics and other data points. We will provide additional updates as we finalize that process.

Special Education Subgroup Reporting

We are in the process of researching and revising how we measure the performance of students included in the ILEARN special education subgroup. For annual accountability reports based on the 2023-24 and 2024-25 school years (released in spring 2025 and spring 2026, respectively), we will **not** use special education subgroup results to

drive ratings for Indicators 1.3 or 1.4. Those results will still be reported in the narrative sections for those indicators, but the ratings will be determined by differences in proficiency for other listed subgroups.

We will communicate any future indicator revisions or additions, as well as requests for feedback, as they are developed.

High School Indicators

As high school accountability metrics shift at the state level, OEI will also continue to revise its Core Question 1 framework to better align with these changes and OEI's standards for academic success. Specifically, OEI wants to give a comprehensive understanding of high school quality, including where schools are demonstrating achievement and growth and where challenges remain. We also anticipate adjusting the FAFSA indicator in the future given changes in state law. For now, we will measure it as explained in the current framework, but we will communicate any updates as we receive them.

New WIDA Indicator

The Office of Education Innovation is committed to continually updating and enhancing its accountability measures to align with the evolving educational landscape. In response to the growing population of Multilingual Learners (MLLs) in Marion County, OEI's academic team has conducted research and developed a new indicator for Core Question 1. This indicator assesses MLL student growth utilizing the WIDA ACCESS assessment.

State Accountability Grades

In 2025 the Indiana General Assembly revived state A-F letter grades for accountability purposes with the passage of House Bill 1498. While these grades will not be issued based on 2024-25 results (reports released in spring 2026), future years may include them. As the state releases information about the grades and their calculations, we will communicate about any corresponding accountability changes to the performance framework.

Core Question 2

No substantive changes were made to the Core Question 2 framework for school year 2025-26.

Core Question 3

This year the CQ3 Governance framework has been updated to better identify how indicators are being measured and what artifacts satisfy requirements. Each indicator has been renamed to better reflect the overall accountability measure of the board and school leadership; Governance Oversight, Board Composition and Vision, Compliance, and Academic Strength and Organizational Leadership. The goal is that these changes will provide additional clarification for school leaders and its board of directors to better understand our expectations and how Core Question 3 is measured overall.

Core Question 4

No substantive changes were made to the Core Question 4 framework for school year 2025-26.

Language Acquisition Indicator

Overview

In response to the growing population of Multilingual Learners (MLLs) in Marion County, OEI has developed a new indicator for Core Question 1 that assesses MLL student growth and language acquisition using the WIDA ACCESS assessment. What follows is the rationale for the indicator and its implementation timeline.

Rationale

Through our research with school leaders, educators, and experts from across the state, we understand the best way to calculate MLL accountability is through growth. Therefore, OEI will begin by utilizing the data of grades 1-12 MLL students enrolled at a school for 162+ days for two consecutive years.

Kindergarten students will be excluded from analysis because the Kindergarten WIDA ACCESS assessment follows a different model compared to the WIDA ACCESS exams administered in upper grade levels. Furthermore, Kindergarten WIDA ACCESS is administered one-on-one with a teacher instead of independently, introducing an additional variable that could affect consistency in the data.

When analyzing the WIDA ACCESS assessment data of 1,594 MLL students enrolled 162+ days at OEI schools between the 2022-23 and 2023-24 school years, OEI found the average level increase on WIDA ACCESS from year to year was 0.3. However, OEI acknowledges adequate growth for an MLL student on WIDA ACCESS is generally considered to be 1 level per year, according to feedback from MLL experts. Based on this context, OEI has determined that a benchmark of 0.4 level growth is achievable for the first and third year¹ of implementing the indicator. To ensure continued progress, OEI proposes a gradual growth model, increasing the benchmark by 0.2 annually after the initial three years. This phased approach would set 1.0 level growth as the final expectation for meeting standard in year six of implementation. Furthermore, this timeline considers the planned transition between test changes occurring during the 2025-2026 school year that will result in incomparable data prohibiting our ability to produce results for 2026 CQ1 reports.

Ratings for the indicator will not be segmented by grade level bands. For instance, schools serving grades 1-12 will receive a single rating, rather than separate ratings for 1-8 and 9-12. Our review of the impact of grade-level division on ratings revealed no significant difference that would justify providing two separate ratings for a single school.

Implementation Timeline

Year 1 (*Tracking Only* – 2024-2025)

Language Acquisition: Are students demonstrating growth as determined by the WIDA ACCESS assessment the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does Not Meet Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.29 or less on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
Approaching Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.30-0.39 on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.

¹ Starting the 2025-2026 school year, the WIDA ACCESS assessment will undergo changes resulting in incomparable data for 2026 CQ1 reports. Due to these changes, schools will receive a tracking only rating for the proposed indicator in 2025 CQ1 reports, and no rating for year two of implementation (2026). As a result, the proposed slow growth model will not begin until the 2027-2028 school year (year four of implementation).

Meets Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.40-0.49 on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
Exceeds Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.50+ on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.

Year 2 (2025-2026) – No Rating due to WIDA ACCESS test changes and incomparable data.

Year 3 (2026-2027)

Language Acquisition: Are students demonstrating growth as determined by the WIDA ACCESS assessment the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does Not Meet Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.29 or less on the WIDA assessment from 25-26 to 26-27.
Approaching Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.30-0.39 on the WIDA assessment from 25-26 to 26-27.
Meets Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.40-0.49 on the WIDA assessment from 25-26 to 26-27.
Exceeds Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.50+ on the WIDA assessment from 25-26 to 26-27.

Year 4 (2027-2028)

Language Acquisition: Are students demonstrating growth as determined by the WIDA ACCESS assessment the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does Not Meet Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.49 or less on the WIDA assessment from 26-27 to 27-28.
Approaching Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.50-0.59 on the WIDA assessment from 26-27 to 27-28.
Meets Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.60-0.69 on the WIDA assessment from 26-27 to 27-28.
Exceeds Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.70+ on the WIDA assessment from 26-27 to 27-28.

Year 5 (2028-2029)

Language Acquisition: Are students demonstrating growth as determined by the WIDA ACCESS assessment the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does Not Meet Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.69 or less on the WIDA assessment from 26-27 to 27-28.
Approaching Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.70-0.79 on the WIDA assessment from 26-27 to 27-28.
Meets Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.80-0.89 on the WIDA assessment from 26-27 to 27-28.
Exceeds Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.90+ on the WIDA assessment from 26-27 to 27-28.

Year 6 (2029-2030)

Language Acquisition: Are students demonstrating growth as determined by the WIDA ACCESS assessment the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does Not Meet Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.89 or less on the WIDA assessment from 27-28 to 28-29.
Approaching Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.90-0.99 on the WIDA assessment from 27-28 to 28-29.
Meets Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 1.0-1.09 on the WIDA assessment from 27-28 to 28-29.
Exceeds Standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 1.10+ on the WIDA assessment from 27-28 to 28-29.

2025-26 Performance Framework Overview

Core Question 1: Is the educational program a success?
<i>Elementary/Middle School</i>
Annual Growth: Are students making adequate growth as measured by Indiana’s accountability system?
Growth Over Time: Are students improving the longer they are enrolled at the school?
School Subgroups: Is the school providing an equitable education to all students within its building?
State Subgroups: Is the school providing an equitable education to all students compared to the state?
Attendance: Is the school’s attendance rate strong?
Comparative Performance: Is the school outperforming students’ assigned schools?
Reading Proficiency: Are students mastering foundational reading standards as determined by IREAD-3?
Language Acquisition: Are students demonstrating growth as determined by WIDA ACCESS the longer they are enrolled at the school?
<i>High School</i>
Annual Growth: Are students making adequate growth as measured by the SAT Suite of Assessments?
Graduation Rate: Is the school preparing students to graduate on time as measured by Indiana’s cohort graduation rate or course completion?
School Subgroups: Is the school providing an equitable education to all students within its building?
State Subgroups: Is the school providing an equitable education to all students compared to the state?
Attendance: Is the school’s attendance rate strong?
FAFSA: Is the school preparing students for postsecondary success through FAFSA completion?
On Track: Is the school preparing students to graduate on time as measured by Ninth Grade On-Track?
Language Acquisition: Are students demonstrating growth as determined by WIDA ACCESS the longer they are enrolled at the school?
Core Question 2: Is the organization in sound fiscal health?
Short-Term Health: Does the school demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?
Network Short-Term Health: Does the network demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?
Long-Term Health: Does the organization demonstrate long-term financial health?
Fiscal Oversight: Does the organization demonstrate it has adequate financial management and systems?
Core Question 3: Is the organization effective and well-run?
Governance Oversight: Does the board demonstrate strong governance oversight?
Board Composition and Vision: Is the board active, knowledgeable, diverse, and does it work toward a strategic vision?
Compliance: Does the school satisfactorily comply with all its governance obligations?
Leadership: Is the school leader strong in their academic and organizational leadership?
Core Question 4: Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success?
Curriculum: Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?
Pedagogy: Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school’s mission?
Post-secondary Support: Does the school provide sufficient support and preparation for post-secondary options? (9-12)
Instruction: Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?
Staffing: Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?
Mission: Is the school’s mission clearly understood by all stakeholders?
Climate: Is the school climate responsive to the needs of students, staff, and families?
Family Communication: Is ongoing communication with students and families clear and helpful?
SPED Compliance: Do special education files demonstrate legal compliance and implementation of best practice?
MLL Compliance: Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to multilingual students?

Core Question 1: Is the educational program a success?

Elementary and Middle School Indicators

Annual Growth: Are students making adequate growth as measured by Indiana's accountability system?	
<i>Only applicable to schools serving students in any one or combination of grades 4-8.</i>	
Does not meet standard	Results indicate that less than 60.0% of students are making adequate growth.
Approaching standard	Results indicate that 60.0-69.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Meets standard	Results indicate that 70.0-79.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Exceeds standard	Results indicate that at least 80.0% of students are making adequate growth.
Growth Over Time: Are students improving the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does not meet standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show a decrease in combined proficiency rate of 5 or more percentage points OR no students are proficient.
Approaching standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show a change in combined proficiency rate of less than 5 percentage points but greater than -5 percentage points.
Meets standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show an increase in combined proficiency rate of 5 or more percentage points. OR the charter school has a combined proficiency of 70% or more.
Exceeds standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show an increase in combined proficiency rate of 15 or more percentage points. OR the charter school has a combined proficiency of 80% or more.
School Subgroups: Is the school providing an equitable education to all students within its building?	
<i>Schools are evaluated for subgroup proficiency in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	School has more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Approaching standard	School has no more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Meets standard	School has no more than 10 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Exceeds standard	School has no more than 5 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
State Subgroups: Is the school providing an equitable education to all students compared to the state?	
<i>Schools are evaluated separately for subgroup proficiency and growth in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance less than 25 (bottom quartile)
Approaching standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 25 and 49
Meets standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 50 and 74
Exceeds standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance is 75 or higher (top quartile)
Attendance: Is the school's attendance rate strong?	
Does not meet standard	School's attendance rate is less than 90.0%
Approaching standard	School's attendance rate is between 90.0-94.9%
Meets standard	School's attendance rate is greater than or equal to 95.0%
Comparative Performance: Is the school outperforming students' assigned schools?	

Does not meet standard	School's performance in terms of proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpace that of schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 0-1 out of 4 categories. Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpace that of schools serving similar student populations in 0-1 out of 4 categories.
Approaching standard	School's performance in terms of both proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpace that of the schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 2 out of 4 categories. Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpace that of schools serving similar student populations in 2 out of 4 categories.
Meets standard	School's performance in terms of both proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpace that of the schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 3 out of 4 categories. Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpace that of schools serving similar student populations in 3 out of 4 categories.
Exceeds standard	School's performance in terms of both proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpace that of the schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 4 out of 4 categories. Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpace that of schools serving similar student populations in 4 out of 4 categories.
Reading Proficiency: Are students mastering foundational reading standards as determined by IREAD-3?	
Does not meet standard	IREAD-3 results indicate fewer than 69.9% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Approaching standard	IREAD-3 results indicate 70.0-79.9% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Meets standard	IREAD-3 results indicate 80.0-89.9% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Exceeds standard	IREAD-3 results indicate more than 90.0% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Language Acquisition: Are students demonstrating growth as determined by WIDA ACCESS the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does not meet standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.29 or less on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
Approaching standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.30-0.39 on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
Meets standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.40-0.49 on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
Exceeds standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.50+ on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.

High School Indicators

Annual Growth: Are students making adequate growth as measured by the SAT Suite of Assessments?	
Does not meet standard	Fewer than 60.0% of students are making adequate growth.
Approaching standard	60.0%-69.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Meets standard	70.0%-79.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Exceeds standard	More than 80.0% of students are making adequate growth.

Graduation Rate: Is the school preparing students to graduate on time as measured by Indiana's cohort graduation rate?	
Does not meet standard	School's 4-year graduation rate is below 70.0%
Approaching standard	School's 4-year graduation rate is 70.0 - 79.9%
Meets standard	School's 4-year graduation rate is at 80.0 – 89.9%
Exceeds standard	School's 4-year graduation rate is at least 90.0%
School Subgroups: Is the school providing an equitable education to all students within its building?	
<i>Schools are evaluated for subgroup proficiency in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	School has more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Approaching standard	School has no more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Meets standard	School has no more than 10 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Exceeds standard	School has no more than 5 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
State Subgroups: Is the school providing an equitable education to all students compared to the state?	
<i>Schools are evaluated separately for subgroup proficiency and growth in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance less than 25 (bottom quartile)
Approaching standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 25 and 49
Meets standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 50 and 74
Exceeds standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance is 75 or higher (to quartile)
Attendance: Is the school's attendance rate strong?	
Does not meet standard	School's attendance rate is less than 90.0%
Approaching standard	School's attendance rate is between 90.0-94.9%
Meets standard	School's attendance rate is greater than or equal to 95.0%
FAFSA: Is the school preparing students for postsecondary success through FAFSA completion?	
Does not meet standard	Fewer than 75% of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA
Approaching standard	75-84.9% of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA
Meets standard	85-89.9% of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA

Exceeds standard	90% or more of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA
On Track: Is the school preparing students to graduate on-time as measured by ninth grade on-track?	
Does not meet standard	School earns 2-3 out of 8 points for percent of students earning at least 10 credits and percent of students receiving 1 or more Fs in core classes.
Approaching standard	School earns 4 out of 8 points for percent of students earning at least 10 credits and percent of students receiving 1 or more Fs in core classes.
Meets standard	School earns 5-6 out of 8 points for percent of students earning at least 10 credits and percent of students receiving 1 or more Fs in core classes.
Exceeds standard	School earns 7-8 out of 8 points for percent of students earning at least 10 credits and percent of students receiving 1 or more Fs in core classes.
Language Acquisition: Are students demonstrating growth as determine by the WIDA ACCESS assessment the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does not meet standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.29 or less on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24- 25.
Approaching standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.30-0.39 on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
Meets standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.40-0.49 on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
Exceeds standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.50+ on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.

Core Question 2: Is the organization in sound fiscal health?

Short-Term Health: Does the school demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?	
<i>Applicable for all Mayor-sponsored charter schools</i>	
Does not meet standard	The school does not meet standard for two or more sub-indicators: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default
Approaching standard	The school approaches standard for all sub-indicators: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default OR The school meets standard for three of the sub-indicators and does not meet standard on the remaining sub-indicator OR the school approaches standard for two of the sub-indicators and meets standard for the remaining two sub-indicators.
Meets standard	The school meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default
Exceeds Standard	The school meets standard for all sub-indicators: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand and d) Debt Default
Network Short-Term Health: Does the network demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?	
<i>Not Applicable for standalone Mayor-sponsored charter schools</i>	
Does not meet standard	The network does not meet standard for two or more sub-indicators: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio and c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default
Approaching standard	The network approaches standard for all sub-indicators: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default OR The school meets standard for two of the sub-indicators and does not meet standard on the remaining sub-indicator OR the school approaches standard for two of the sub-indicators and meets standard for the remaining sub-indicator.

Meets standard	The network meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default
Exceeds Standard	The network meets standard for all network-level sub-indicators: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default
Long-Term Health: Does the organization demonstrate long term financial health?	
<i>For schools within networks, OEI will use network consolidated financials to determine long-term financial sustainability. OEI will provide narrative in accountability reports related to school-specific metrics in this area.</i>	
Does not meet standard	The school meets standard for one sub-indicator, but does not meet standard for the remaining two sub-indicators: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio OR The school does not meet standard for any of the sub-indicators
Approaching standard	The school meets standard for two sub-indicators: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio OR The school approaches standard for all three sub-indicators
Meets standard	The school meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio, and c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio
Exceeds standard	The school meets standard for all sub-indicators: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio, and c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio
Fiscal Oversight: Does the organization demonstrate it has adequate financial management and systems?	
Does not meet standard	The school does not meet standard for one sub-indicator: a) Financial audit b) Financial Reporting Requirements
Approaching standard	The school meets standard for one sub-indicator but approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: a) Financial audit b) Financial Reporting Requirements
Meets standard	The school meets standard for both sub-indicators: a) Financial Audit and b) Financial Reporting Requirements

Core Question 3: Is the organization effective and well-run?

Governance Oversight: Does the board demonstrate strong governance oversight?	
<i>Sub-indicators: a) Board has relentless focus on academic outcomes; b) Active committees with clear goals; and c) Evaluation systems in place to monitor itself and school leadership</i>	
Does Not Meet Standard	The board does not meet standard on one or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The board either 1) approaches standard for all three sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 3) approaches standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds or meets standard for one sub-indicator, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The board either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 2) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, and approaches or does not meet for one, 3) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, or 5) meets standard for all sub-indicators.
Exceeds Standard	The board exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and meets standard for one.
Board Composition and Vision: Is the board active, knowledgeable, diverse, and does it work toward a strategic vision?	
<i>Sub-indicators: a) Board has diverse, active members with essential skillsets; b) Board uses clear and accurate data as part of a formal tracking system to monitor school health</i>	

Does Not Meet Standard	The board does not meet standard on one or both sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The board either 1) approaches standard for one or both sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for one sub-indicator and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The board either 1) meets standard for both sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for one sub-indicator and exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, or 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator and approaches standard for one sub-indicator.
Exceeds Standard	The board exceeds standard for both sub-indicators.
Compliance: Does the school satisfactorily comply with all its governance obligations?	
<i>Sub-indicators: a) Compliance document submission; b) Charter Compliance; c) Compliance with Incident Communication Policy; d) Compliance with IODL</i>	
Does Not Meet Standard	The organization does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The organization either 1) approaches standard for all four sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 3) approaches standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The organization either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators, or 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, or 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, and approaches for two sub-indicators or 4) meets standard for all sub-indicators
Exceeds Standard	The organization exceeds standard for one sub-indicator and meets standard for the rest.
Leadership: Is the school leader strong in their academic and organizational leadership?	
<i>Sub-indicators: a) School leaders show clear track record of success; b) Are fully present and give data-driven updates; c) Collaborate with board to handle concerns; d) Maintains leadership stability with clear succession plan</i>	
Does Not Meet Standard	The organization does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The organization either 1) approaches standard for all four sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 3) approaches standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The organization either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators, or 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators 5) meets standard for all sub-indicators.
Exceeds Standard	The organization exceeds standard for at least two sub-indicators and meets standard for the rest.

Core Question 4: Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success?

Core Question 4 is measured using a rubric for each sub-indicator. Each level of the rubric has an assigned point value such that each indicator has a maximum number of points possible. This maximum number is used to determine an overall rating on each indicator. Point values of sub-indicators and an indicator ratings summary can be found below.

Indicator Ratings Summary	
Does Not Meet Standard	The average rating across all sub-indicators is 65% or less of the total points possible.
Approaching Standard	The average rating across all sub-indicators is between 65-79% of the total points possible.
Meets Standard	The average rating across all sub-indicators is between 79-89% of the total points possible.
Exceeds Standard	The average rating across all sub-indicators is more than 89% of the total points possible.
Sub-Indicator Point Values	
Planning	1 point
Emerging	2 points
Implementing	3 points
Sustaining	4 points

Curriculum: Does the school have a high-quality curriculum and supporting materials for each grade?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) The curriculum used across all academic areas is rigorous, evidenced-based and aligned with state standards.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is in place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
b) Systematic reviews of curricula are conducted by administrators and school staff to identify gaps based on student performance across and within subgroups.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
c) The school regularly reviews instructional curriculum maps to ensure presentation of content is aligned with learning objectives.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
d) The school has a well-defined horizontal and vertical alignment within and across grade levels and content areas that is prioritized and focuses on core learning objectives.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
e) Instructional staff have access to provided materials to deliver the curriculum effectively.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of instructional staff.
f) Instructional staff understand and uniformly use curriculum documents and related program materials to effectively deliver instruction.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of instructional staff.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: List of school-wide curricula, Curriculum Maps, Pacing Guides, Professional Development materials, Classroom Observations, Instructional Calendars, Staff handbook, Master Calendar, Staff Interviews, Survey Data, Focus Group Data

Pedagogy: Are the teaching processes (pedagogies) consistent with the school's mission?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) The curriculum is implemented in all classrooms with fidelity.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of instructional staff.
b) A clearly documented lesson internalization process is used to explicitly target core learning objectives across all academic areas.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
c) A clearly documented lesson internalization process is used to explicitly identify a wide range of instructional strategies that target core learning objectives across all academic areas.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
d) Instruction is differentiated based on ongoing formative assessment of student learning needs, identified student interests, and preferred learning styles.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
e) Instructional strategies used are designed to promote authentic learning to impact levels of student engagement.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
f) Instructional practices are intentionally designed to validate and affirm the cultures of students.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems

			used by all instructional staff.	are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
g) Staff receive explicit feedback on instructional practices on an ongoing basis.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: List of school-wide curricula, Curriculum Maps, Pacing Guides, Professional Development materials, Classroom Observations, Instructional Calendars, Staff handbook, Master Calendar, Staff Interviews, Survey Data, Focus Group Data

Postsecondary Support: For secondary students, does the school provide sufficient guidance on and support preparation for postsecondary options?				
Only applies to schools serving students in grades 9-12				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) The school provides access to rigorous coursework and career planning experiences (e.g., Advanced Placement courses, internships, independent study) to prepare students for post-secondary opportunities aligned to their interests.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
b) A system is in place to ensure school staff provide students with the supports they need to be effectively prepared for post-secondary opportunities.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
c) The school provides opportunities for extracurricular engagement and activities, connected to student interests, (e.g., athletics, academic clubs, vocational) to increase post-secondary options.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems

			used by all instructional staff.	are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
d) The school offers a range of pathways that allow all students to meet or exceed Indiana Core 40 graduation requirements.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: School Handbook, List of School Curricula, Course of Study (including Pathway, AP, IB, and dual credit options), Disaggregated Reports on Course Enrollment, Counseling Department Policies and Procedures, Advising Procedures and Protocols, Student Handbook, Survey Data, Focus Group Data, Staff, Student, Family interviews

Instruction: Does the school effectively use learning standards and assessments to inform and improve instruction?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) Assessments utilized are well aligned to learning standards.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
b) Assessments utilized are varied in order to support a wide range of student learning styles and abilities.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
c) Assessments utilized provide student level data focused on growth and proficiency.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
d) Assessments are administrated with sufficient frequency and results are provided in a timely manner.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
e) A system is in place to ensure that assessment data is analyzed across and within subgroups and used to guide decision-making related to instruction and curriculum.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: Data Reports, Assessment Calendar, Assessment Materials, Professional Development Agendas, Master Calendar, Data Meeting Agendas/Notes, Instructional Calendars, Survey Data, Focus Group Data, Staff Interviews, Staff Policy and Procedure Handbook

Staffing: Has the school developed adequate human resource systems and deployed its staff effectively?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) A standard recruitment/ hiring policy and procedure process is in place and is designed to ensure human resources are leveraged to reflect the needs of the school population.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
b) Hiring processes are well organized and used to support the success of new staff members.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
c) Staffing levels adequately allow staff to maximize instructional time and capacity.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of staff.
d) Faculty and staff are appropriately certified/sufficiently trained in areas to which they are assigned and possess the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of staff.
e) Professional learning opportunities are offered regularly in order to support the staff in delivering culturally relevant and differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
f) Professional learning opportunities are determined through analyses of student outcome data and clearly linked to strategic objectives and school improvement goals.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.
g) The teacher evaluation process is explicit and regularly implemented with a clear process and criteria.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place in some areas.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented in most but not all areas.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented across all areas.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: Hiring Policy and Procedure manual, Staff Deployment Plan, Organizational Chart, List of school staff and credentials, PD calendar, School Improvement Plan, Teacher evaluation summary data, Survey Data, Focus Group Data, Staff Interviews

Mission: Is the school's mission clearly understood by all stakeholders?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) Procedures are in place for assessing all stakeholder's perceptions, knowledge, and commitment to the intentions of the school's mission.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place for some stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented for most but not all stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all key stakeholders.
b) Procedures are in place for establishing meaningful partnerships with all families and community stakeholders to support the school's mission.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place for some families and stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented for most but not all families and stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all key families and stakeholders.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: School Improvement Plan, Student handbook, Staff Handbook, Family Engagement Plan, Survey Data, Focus Group Data

Climate: Is the school climate responsive to the needs of students, staff, and families?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) A multi-tiered framework designed to support the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of students is implemented with fidelity.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice in some areas.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most areas and/or evidence indicates that data obtained is not used by all instructional staff.	Evidence indicates shared systems to support the practice are embedded into the culture of the school, implemented with fidelity, and the impact of systems are monitored by school leaders at defined intervals.
b) Culturally responsive and evidenced based interventions are explicitly identified and implemented throughout the school to support the needs of students.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of staff.
c) Explicit procedures for facilitating the development of strong, positive relationships between adults and students are clearly communicated to and implemented by all staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of staff.
d) Procedures are in place for assessing staff, student, and family perspectives to ensure a sense of connectedness and engagement with the school.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place for some stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented for most but not all stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all key stakeholders.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: MTSS Handbook, Discipline Handbook, List of available interventions, Discipline Data, Classroom Management Plans, Classroom Observations, Family Engagement Plan, Survey Data, Focus Group Data, Staff, Student, Family Interviews.

Family Communication: Is ongoing communication with students and families clear and helpful?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) An active and ongoing system of communication between the school and family members in place.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of staff.
b) Procedures for responding to concerns of families are clearly defined and implemented by all school staff and validated by families.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place for some stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented for most but not all stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all stakeholders.
c) Families are regularly informed in their native or home language of their students' academic and behavioral strengths and areas of need.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place for some stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented for most but not all families.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all families.
d) The school's communication methods are designed to promote family- school partnerships in ways that meet the needs of a diverse set of families.	No evidence that practice is in place.	Evidence indicates practice is place for some stakeholders.	Evidence indicates practice is implemented for most but not all families.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all families.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: School Improvement Plan, Student and Staff Handbooks, Family Engagement Plan, Family Interviews, Welcome Packet, School Newsletters, Meeting notices, Parent Correspondence, Student progress reports, Survey and Focus Group Data

SPED Compliance: Do special education files demonstrate legal compliance and implementation of best practice?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) Services outlined in Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) adequately match the exceptional needs in present level of performance of the student and are being delivered as outlined.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 0-25% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 26-49% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 50-89% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 90-100% of students with IEPs.
b) IEP plans include student specific goals and plan for progress monitoring of student goals. Evidence of ongoing assessment is present.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 0-25% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 26-49% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 50-89% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 90-100% of students with IEPs.
c) IEP goals are rigorous, based on state and national learning standards, and related to present levels of performance.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 0-25% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 26-49% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 50-89% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 90-100% of students with IEPs.

d) IEP goals are reviewed and revised annually as determined by present levels of student level of performance.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 0-25% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 26-49% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 50-89% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 90-100% of students with IEPs.
e) IEP plans explicitly identify requirements for specifically designed curriculum and instruction, as well as accommodations that align with student needs. Evidence of specifically designed curriculum, instruction, and accommodations is present.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 0-25% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 26-49% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 50-89% of students with IEPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 90-100% of students with IEPs.

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: Reviews of IEPs, Case Conference Meeting notes, and Confidential Student Files; Parent Correspondence, Conference Notifications, Survey and Focus Group Data, RDA Accountability Workbook

MLL Compliance: Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to multilingual students?				
	Planning	Emerging	Implementing	Sustaining
a) Staff have a clear understanding of legal obligations, current legislation, research, and effective practices relating to the provision of services for ELL students.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of instructional staff.
b) Staff have a knowledge of the process of language acquisition and the skillsets needed to differentiate instructional strategies per the modifications and accommodations listed in the ILP to meet the needs of ELL students. Lesson plans and/or lesson internalizations and observations include evidence that these differentiated strategies are implemented in classroom instruction.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 0-25% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 26-49% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 50-89% of instructional staff.	Evidence indicates practice occurs among 90-100% of instructional staff.
c) Procedures are in place to ensure relationships with ELL students, parents, and external providers are well-managed and in compliance with Indiana law and regulations.	No evidence to indicate practice is backed up by systems.	Evidence indicates individuals are starting to create systems to support this practice for some ELL students.	Evidence indicates some shared systems exist to support the implementation of the practice in most ELL students.	Evidence indicates practice is fully implemented for all ELL students.
d) ILP plans include "strategies, instructional and assessment accommodations, modifications, goals for the student, the student's English language proficiency levels, state and local assessment data,	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 0-25% of students with ILPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 26-49% of students with ILPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 50-89% of students with ILPs.	Evidence indicates practice occurs for 90-100% of students with ILPs.

and details on their EL services (i.e. program model, frequency)” (<u>IDOE EL Guidebook</u> , 2023-2024). Evidence of academic progress is evident through student subgroup analysis.				
--	--	--	--	--

Supporting Artifacts for assessing area: Reviews of ILPs, Confidential Student File reviews, Survey Data, Focus Group Data, RDA Accountability Workbook, Reviews of ILPs, Review of ILP Conference Meeting notes, Confidential Student File reviews, Parent Correspondence, Survey Data, Focus Group Data, RDA Accountability Workbook

Core Question 1: Is the educational program a success?

Expanded Criteria

Overview

The Academic Performance Framework gauges the academic success of schools in serving their target populations and closing the achievement gap in Indianapolis.

The framework consists of indicators designed to measure schools on how well their students perform and grow on standardized testing measures, attendance, and measures that capture academic progress.

Collecting Evidence

To use the framework throughout the school year, OEI will need the following:

- ILEARN assessment data
- PSAT and SAT assessment data
- FAFSA Completion Information
- Student credit/course completion data
- ILEARN Results
- IREAD-3 Results
- DOE-ME Reports
- DOE-STN Reports
- Quarterly Attendance Reports
- Benchmark & Formative Assessment Data
- Student Level Demographic Data
- Student Residence Data

Unless noted otherwise, indicators are informed by data for students who have been enrolled for at least 162 days, or 90 percent of the school year, which is in line with other reporting practices related to academic accountability. Also, n-size is 10 unless stated differently. OEI relies as much as possible on state-level academic data reported by the Indiana Department of Education. In certain circumstances where data is not available, school-submitted information is requested. Questions about academic data may be directed to Deputy Director Holly Morgan at Holly.Morgan@indy.gov.

Evaluation

OEI will continue to evaluate and rate schools' performance on an annual basis against the academic performance framework. We will have meetings three times a year where we focus on the benchmark data in order to predict performance and make mid-course corrections as necessary. Schools determined to be in academic distress will be subject to additional monitoring and/or corrective action at the discretion of OEI staff.

Elementary and Middle School Expanded Criteria

Annual Growth: Are students making adequate growth as measured by Indiana's accountability system?	
<i>Only applicable to schools serving students in any one or combination of grades 4-8.</i>	
Does not meet standard	Results indicate that fewer than 60.0% of students are making adequate growth.

Approaching standard	Results indicate that 60.0-69.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Meets standard	Results indicate that 70.0-79.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Exceeds standard	Results indicate that at least 80.0% of students are making adequate growth.

Formative Indicator Calculations

Does not meet standard	Fewer than 60% of students are on track to make adequate growth.
Approaching standard	Between 60.0%-69.9% of students are on track to make adequate growth.
Meets standard	Between 70.0%-79.9% of students are on track to make adequate growth.
Exceeds standard	At least 80% of students are on track to make adequate growth.

Students must make adequate growth under requirements of the federal Every Student Succeeds Act. This metric was used beginning in 2021 to determine growth based on state ILEARN results. This rate uses student growth percentiles (SGP) as the basis of the growth measure. SGP metrics are formulated based on how a student's assessment performance compares with Indiana students who had similar achievement the prior year. Growth is calculated for all students based on their relative position compared to academic peers. The resulting student growth percentile is then compared to a growth target set by the state that translates into the amount of growth necessary for the student to reach proficiency by 2028, previously 2026.

The school receives credit for each student demonstrating adequate growth by meeting or exceeding the annual growth target or attaining proficiency in both ELA and math. The adequate growth rate is calculated based on those students enrolled at the school for at least 162 days, or 90 percent of the school year, with two consecutive years of valid test results.

Data Sources

Summative: State test data published by IDOE

Formative: Benchmark data shared by school (e.g., NWEA, Airways, DIBELS)

Growth Over Time: Are students improving the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does not meet standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show a decrease in combined proficiency rate of 5 or more percentage points OR no students are proficient.
Approaching standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show a change in combined proficiency rate of less than 5 percentage points but greater than -5 percentage points.
Meets standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show an increase in combined proficiency rate of 5 or more percentage points OR the charter school has a combined proficiency of 70% or more.
Exceeds standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two or more consecutive years show an increase in combined proficiency rate of 15 or more percentage points OR the charter school has a combined proficiency of 80% or more.

Calculation: Schools are evaluated based on students who are enrolled at the school for at least 162 days for two or more consecutive years.

Data Sources

Summative: ILEARN data provided by IDOE (for current year and previous year)

School Subgroups: Is the school providing an equitable education to all students within its building?
<i>Schools are evaluated for subgroup proficiency in Math and ELA.</i>

Does not meet standard	School has more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Approaching standard	School has no more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Meets standard	School has no more than 10 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Exceeds standard	School has no more than 5 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.

Calculation: Schools are evaluated on each subgroup with 10 or more tested students who have been enrolled for at least 162 days. Each subgroup is evaluated based on a combined ELA and Math proficiency. The rating for this indicator is based on the subgroup with the largest gap.

Data Sources

Summative: ILEARN data provided by IDOE

State Subgroups: Is the school providing an equitable education to all students compared to the state?	
<i>Schools are evaluated separately for subgroup proficiency and growth in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance less than 25 (bottom quartile)
Approaching standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 25 and 49
Meets standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 50 and 74
Exceeds standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance is 75 or higher (to quartile)

Calculation: Schools are evaluated separately for each subgroup with 10 or more tested students who have been enrolled for at least 162 days. Each subgroup is evaluated for ELA proficiency, Math proficiency, ELA growth, and Math growth and ranked based on statewide performance in the same grades served by the charter school. Schools receive an overall rating for the indicator that represents the average rank across all reported subgroups. Subgroups include all race and ethnicity categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Data Sources

Summative: ILEARN data provided by IDOE

Attendance: Is the school's attendance rate strong?	
Does not meet standard	School's attendance rate is less than 90.0%
Approaching standard	School's attendance rate is between 90.0 – 94.9%
Meets standard	School's attendance rate is greater than or equal to 95.0%

Data Sources

Summative: DOE-AT report

Formative: SIS attendance average (Average Daily Attendance/Average Daily Membership)

Comparative Performance: Is the school outperforming students' assigned schools?	
Does not meet standard	School's performance in terms of proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpace that of schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 0-1 out of 4 categories.

	Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpace that of schools serving similar student populations in 0-1 out of 4 categories.
Approaching standard	School's performance in terms of both proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpace that of the schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 2 out of 4 categories. Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpace that of schools serving similar student populations in 2 out of 4 categories.
Meets standard	School's performance in terms of both proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpace that of the schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 3 out of 4 categories. Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpace that of schools serving similar student populations in 3 out of 4 categories.
Exceeds standard	School's performance in terms of both proficiency and growth in both Math and ELA outpace that of the schools the students would have been assigned to attend in 4 out of 4 categories. Innovation Network Schools: Proficiency and growth of enrolled students within the school neighborhood boundary in both Math and ELA outpace that of schools serving similar student populations in 4 out of 4 categories.

Calculation: Schools are evaluated based on ILEARN test results that compare performance to that of those schools that students would be assigned to attend based on their residence. Evaluations for Innovation Network Schools also include results from student performance at similar schools. Comparison schools serving similar student populations will be selected based on demographic enrollment, location, and grades served.

Data Sources

Summative: GIS Maps, school-level SGPs, IDOE test data, Student Residence Report for OEI compliance

Reading Proficiency: Are students mastering foundational reading standards as determined by IREAD-3?	
Does not meet standard	IREAD-3 results indicate fewer than 69.9% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Approaching standard	IREAD-3 results indicate 70.0-79.9% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Meets standard	IREAD-3 results indicate 80.0-89.9% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.
Exceeds standard	IREAD-3 results indicate more than 90.0% of students are meeting grade level reading standards.

Calculation: Schools will be assessed on IREAD-3 pass rates for all third-grade students enrolled 162+ days, including those who retested and those who passed as second graders.

Data Sources

Summative: IREAD-3 pass rates provided by IDOE

Language Acquisition: Are students demonstrating growth as determined by WIDA ACCESS the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does not meet standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.29 or less on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
Approaching standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.30-0.39 on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
Meets standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.40-0.49 on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.

Exceeds standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.50+ on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
-------------------------	---

Calculation: Schools are evaluated based on WIDA growth of multi-lingual learners who are enrolled at the school for at least 162 days for two consecutive years.

Data Sources

Summative: WIDA rates provided by IDOE

Formative: Check-ins with academic analyst

High School Expanded Criteria

Annual Growth: Are students making adequate growth as measured by the SAT Suite of Assessments?	
Does not meet standard	Fewer than 60.0% of students are making adequate growth.
Approaching standard	60.0%-69.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Meets standard	70.0%-79.9% of students are making adequate growth.
Exceeds standard	More than 80.0% of students are making adequate growth.

Calculation: Adequate growth, per College Board benchmarks, are a score increase of at least 60 points between exams, but OEI is still working to determine a final benchmark for this indicator. The analysis would be based on *combined* Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (ERW) and Math proficiency scores for 162-day students. OEI will continue to monitor and align this indicator with new metrics at the state level. We will communicate new information with schools as we receive it.

Data Sources

Summative: College Board assessment data including PSAT and SAT

Graduation Rate: Is the school preparing students to graduate on time as measured by Indiana's cohort graduation rate?	
<i>Only applicable to schools with a graduating class</i>	
Does not meet standard	School's 4-year graduation rate is below 70.0%
Approaching standard	School's 4-year graduation rate is 70.0 - 79.9%
Meets standard	School's 4-year graduation rate is at 80.0 – 89.9%
Exceeds standard	School's 4-year graduation rate is at least 90.0%

Calculation: Ratings are based on the state graduation rate calculated in the IDOE Graduation Rate Report.

Data Sources

Summative: IDOE Graduation Rate

Formative: Quarterly count of students in the cohort on track to graduate with a waiver/certificate/diploma

School Subgroups: Is the school providing an equitable education to all students within its building?	
<i>Schools are evaluated for subgroup proficiency in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	School has more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Approaching standard	School has no more than 15 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Meets standard	School has no more than 10 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
Exceeds standard	School has no more than 5 percentage point difference in the percentage of students passing standardized assessments amongst subgroups, which include all race categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free/reduced lunch.

Calculation: Schools are evaluated on each subgroup with 10 or more tested students who have been enrolled for at least 162 days. Each subgroup is evaluated based on a combined ELA and Math proficiency. The rating for this indicator is based on the subgroup with the largest gap.

Data Sources

Summative: State assessment data provided by IDOE from SAT.

State Subgroups: Is the school providing an equitable education to all students compared to the state?	
<i>Schools are evaluated separately for subgroup proficiency and subgroup growth in Math and ELA.</i>	
Does not meet standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance less than 25 (bottom quartile)
Approaching standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 25 and 49
Meets standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance between 50 and 74
Exceeds standard	Statewide ranking for subgroup performance is 75 or higher (to quartile)

Calculation: Schools are evaluated separately for each subgroup with 10 or more tested students who have been enrolled for at least 162 days. Each subgroup is evaluated for ELA proficiency, Math proficiency, ELA growth, and Math growth and ranked based on statewide performance in the same grades served by the charter school. Schools receive an overall rating for the indicator that represents the average rank across all reported subgroups. Subgroups include all race and ethnicity categories, English Language Learners, and students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Data Sources

Summative: Data provided by IDOE from SAT.

Attendance: Is the school's attendance rate strong?	
Does not meet standard	School's attendance rate is less than 90.0%
Approaching standard	School's attendance rate is between 90.0 – 94.9%
Meets standard	School's attendance rate is greater than or equal to 95.0%

Data Sources

Summative: DOE-AT report

Formative: SIS attendance average (Average Daily Attendance/Average Daily Membership)

FAFSA: Is the school preparing students for postsecondary success through FAFSA completion?	
Does not meet standard	Fewer than 75% of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA
Approaching standard	75-84.9% of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA
Meets standard	85-89.9% of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA
Exceeds standard	90% or more of eligible students in the graduating cohort completed the FAFSA

Calculation: number of students who completed FAFSA / number of students within the cohort eligible for FAFSA

The only students who would be removed from the cohort would be those who are undocumented and do not have DACA status.

Data Sources

Summative: School-reported FAFSA completion information, Scholar Track reports, Indiana Commission for Higher Education FAFSA completion report

Formative: Check-ins with academic analyst

On Track: Is the school preparing students to graduate on-time as measured by ninth grade on-track?			
Ninth grade students with at least 10 credits		Percent of students receiving 1 or more F in core classes	
Fewer than 70% (1 pt)		30.1% or more (1 pt)	
70-79.9% (2 pts)		20.1-30% (2 pts)	
80-89.9% (3 pts)		10.1-20% (3 pts)	
90%+ (4 pts)		10% or fewer (4 pts)	
2-3 out of 8 pts DNMS	4 out of 8 pts AS	5-6 out of 8 pts MS	7-8 out of 8 pts ES

Calculation: The final rating is calculated by adding up the points from the sub-indicators. Credits earned will include all credits earned by the student from eighth grade through the summer after ninth grade.

The second sub-indicator will be calculated by totaling the number of Fs students receive in a core class during the academic year. A core class is defined as an English/Language Arts, Math, Science, or Social Studies class that fulfills a core requirement (English/Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies) for an Indiana diploma. A full list of these class descriptions can be found [here](#). Students who make up a failed course during summer school will not count toward this metric. An F is defined as a final rating for a class in which no credit is earned by the student, relative to the school's individual grading system.

Data Sources

Summative: School-reported summer school credits and state course completion reports for students enrolled at least 162 days

Formative: Check-ins with academic analyst.

Language Acquisition: Are students demonstrating growth as determined by WIDA ACCESS the longer they are enrolled at the school?	
Does not meet standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.29 or less on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
Approaching standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.30-0.39 on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
Meets standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.40-0.49 on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.
Exceeds standard	Students who have been enrolled at the school for two consecutive years show an average level increase of 0.50+ on the WIDA assessment from 23-24 to 24-25.

Calculation: Schools are evaluated based on WIDA growth of multi-lingual learners who are enrolled at the school for at least 162 days for two consecutive years.

Data Sources

Summative: WIDA rates provided by IDOE

Formative: Check-ins with academic analyst

Core Question 2: Is the organization in sound fiscal health?

Expanded Criteria

Overview

The Financial Performance Framework gauges the financial health of schools in the short and long term through quarterly check-ins and the results of annual audits with independent auditors. The framework consists of indicators designed to measure schools on enrollment consistency, liquidity, long-term financial planning, and the school's ability to meet short- and long-term debt obligations.

Data Collection

In order to use the framework throughout the school year, OEI will need the following:

- Unaudited quarterly financial statements, including balance sheets, statements of activity and/or profit and loss statements for schools and networks as needed.
- Annual budgets, including budget vs. actual analyses.
- Annual Audit of Financial Statements submitted to the Indiana State Board of Accounts
- Enrollment reported through semi-annual Count Days in October and February

Evaluation

OEI will continue to evaluate and rate schools' and networks' performance on an annual basis against the financial performance framework using the audited financial statements required of all charter schools and submitted each year to the Indiana State Board of Accounts.

We will also have quarterly meetings and/or correspondence where we focus on the prior quarter's unaudited financial statements and a budget vs. actuals comparison to understand financial trajectory and make mid-course corrections as necessary. Schools determined to be in financial distress will be subject to additional monitoring and/or corrective action at the discretion of OEI staff.

Short-Term Health: Does the school demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?	
<i>Applicable for all Mayor-sponsored charter schools</i>	
Does not meet standard	The school does not meet standard for two or more sub-indicators: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default.
Approaching standard	The school approaches standard for all sub-indicators: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default OR The school meets standard for three of the sub-indicators and does not meet standard on the remaining sub-indicator OR the school approaches standard for two of the sub-indicators and meets standard for the remaining two sub-indicators.
Meets standard	The school meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default.
Exceeds Standard	The school meets standard for all sub-indicators: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand and d) Debt Default.

The Short-Term Health indicator is calculated for all mayor-sponsored charter schools using school-specific data on enrollment, cash-flow, expenses, debt obligations, etc. For schools within networks, the Network Short-Term Health indicator will be calculated alongside the school-specific calculations.

a) School-level Enrollment Variance Ratio

The Enrollment Variance Ratio sub-indicator tells authorizers whether the school is meeting its enrollment targets as specified on the board-approved budget, thereby generating enough revenue to fund operations for the current school year. It also examines attrition between fall and spring counts.

Enrollment is typically the largest source of revenue for a school. If a school is consistently hitting the enrollment targets used to build the annual budget, then it is bringing in the amount of necessary to ensure the school is in a healthy financial position. If the school consistently does not meet its enrollment targets, then the school will need to adjust its spending to reflect the reduced amount of revenue.

Data Source: Estimated enrollment from the board-approved budget submitted to OEI on July 1 and actual enrollment from the Department of Education's October and February Count Days (Average Daily Membership, ADM).

Calculation: Average of the fall and spring enrollment variances.

$$[(\text{Fall ADM}/\text{July 1 board-approved budgeted enrollment}) \times 100] + [(\text{Spring ADM}/\text{Fall ADM}) \times 100] / 2$$

Does not meet standard	Enrollment Variance is less than or equal to 89%.
Approaching standard	Enrollment Variance is between 90% - 94%.
Meets standard	Enrollment Variance equals or exceeds 95%.

b) School-level Current Ratio

The Current Ratio sub-indicator depicts the relationship between a school's current assets (what they own) and current liabilities (what they owe).

Current is defined as within the next twelve months. If the current ratio is 1.1 or greater, then a school owns more than it owes in the short term. If the school owns more than it owes, then it has a good chance of meeting its obligations. If a school owes more than it owns, then it may not be able to meet its financial obligations over the next twelve months.

Data Source: Audited Statement of Financial Position/Balance Sheet

Calculation: Current Assets/Current Liabilities

Does not meet standard	Current Ratio is less than 1.0
Approaching standard	Current Ratio is between 1.0 - 1.09
Meets standard	Current Ratio equals or exceeds 1.1

c) School-level Days Cash on Hand

The Days Cash on Hand sub-indicator indicates how many days a school can pay its expenses without another inflow of cash.

Best practice indicates a school should have between 30-60 days cash on hand to cover unexpected expenses. This is particularly important given the cyclical nature of cash inflows and the restricted nature of many of the funds

school use throughout the year. For this indicator, Unrestricted Cash includes cash and cash equivalents and excludes escrow accounts and board-restricted funds. Short-term investments that can be converted into cash quickly, such as treasury bills with a maturity of up to 90 days, will also be considered cash equivalents.

Data Source: Audited Statement of Financial Position/Balance Sheet (checking or savings account balance, other unrestricted cash) and audited Statement of Activities/Income Statement (Total Expenses, Depreciation and Amortization), Statement of Functional Expenses (Depreciation)

Calculation: Unrestricted Cash / ((Total Expenses – Depreciation)/365)

Does not meet standard	Days Cash on Hand is less than 30 days.
Approaching standard	Days Cash on Hand is between 30-44 days.
Meets standard	Days Cash on Hand equals or exceeds 45 days.

d) School-level Debt Default

The Debt Default sub-indicator indicates if a school is not meeting its debt obligations or covenants. Schools must meet all requirements when servicing debt and complying with other covenants in their agreements.

Data Source: Notes to the audited financial statements

Calculation: Reviewal of notes to the financial statements in the accrual-based audit

Does not meet standard	Default or delinquent payments identified and/or is in violation of covenants.
Approaching standard	The school is in violation of covenants, but audit indicates that a waiver was granted.
Meets standard	Not in default or delinquent.

Network Short-Term Health: Does the network demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?	
<i>Not Applicable for standalone Mayor-sponsored charter schools</i>	
Does not meet standard	The network does not meet standard for two or more sub-indicators: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, d) Debt Default
Approaching standard	The network approaches standard for all sub-indicators: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default OR The school meets standard for 2 of the sub-indicators and does not meet standard on the remaining sub-indicator OR the school approaches standard for two of the sub-indicators and meets standard for the remaining sub-indicator.
Meets standard	The network meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default.
Exceeds Standard	The network meets standard for all network-level sub-indicators: a) Enrollment Variance, b) Current Ratio, c) Days Cash on Hand, and d) Debt Default.

The Network Short-Term Health indicator is calculated only for mayor-sponsored charter school networks using the organization's consolidated financial statements. "Network" in OEI's framework refers to the entire organization (campuses + administration). The analysis includes data on enrollment, cash-flow, expenses, debt obligations, etc., from the consolidated financial statements.

a) Network-level Enrollment Variance Ratio

The Enrollment Variance Ratio sub-indicator tells authorizers whether the network is meeting its enrollment targets in the board-approved budget, thereby generating enough revenue to fund operations for the current school year. It also examines attrition between fall and spring counts.

Enrollment is typically the largest source of revenue for a network. If a network is consistently hitting the enrollment targets at each school that are used to build the annual budget, then it is bringing in the amount of necessary to ensure it is in a healthy financial position. If the network consistently does not meet its enrollment targets, then it will need to adjust its spending to reflect the reduced amount of revenue.

Data Source: Estimated enrollment from the board-approved budget submitted to OEI on July 1 and actual enrollment from the Department of Education's October and February Count Day.

Calculation: Average of the fall and spring enrollment variances.

$$[(\text{Fall ADM}/\text{July 1 board-approved budgeted enrollment}) \times 100] + [(\text{Spring ADM}/\text{Fall ADM}) \times 100] / 2$$

Does not meet standard	Enrollment Variance is less than 90%.
Approaching standard	Enrollment Variance is between 90% - 94%.
Meets standard	Enrollment Variance equals or exceeds 95%.

b) Network-level Current Ratio

The Current Ratio sub-indicator depicts the relationship between a network's current assets (what they own) and current liabilities (what they owe).

Current is defined as within the next twelve months. If the current ratio is 1.1 or greater, then a network owns more than it owes in the short term. If the network owns more than it owes, then it has a good chance of meeting its obligations. If a network owes more than it owns, then it may not be able to meet its obligations.

Data Source: Audited Statement of Financial Position

Calculation: Current Assets/Current Liabilities

Does not meet standard	Current Ratio is less than 1.0
Approaching standard	Current Ratio is between 1.0 - 1.09
Meets standard	Current Ratio equals or exceeds 1.1

c) Network-level Days Cash on Hand

The Days Cash on Hand sub-indicator shows how long a network can pay its expenses without another inflow of cash.

Best practice indicates a network should have between 30-60 days cash on hand to cover unexpected expenses. This is particularly important given the cyclical nature of cash inflows and the restricted nature of many of the fund's networks use throughout the year. For this indicator, Unrestricted Cash includes cash and cash equivalents and excludes escrow accounts and board-restricted funds. Short-term investments that can be converted into cash quickly, such as treasury bills with a maturity of up to 90 days, will also be considered cash equivalents.

Data Source: Audited Statement of Financial Position/Balance Sheet (checking/savings account balance, other unrestricted cash) and audited Statement of Activities/Income Statement (Total Expenses, Depreciation and Amortization), Statement of Functional Expenses (Depreciation)

Calculation: Unrestricted Cash / ((Total Expenses – Depreciation)/365)

Does not meet standard	Days Cash on Hand is less than 30 days.
Approaching standard	Days Cash on Hand is between 30-44 days.
Meets standard	Days Cash on Hand equals or exceeds 45 days.

d) Network-level Debt Default

The Debt Default sub-indicator indicates if a network is not meeting its debt obligations or covenants. Networks must meet all requirements when servicing debt and complying with other covenants in their agreements.

Data Source: Notes to the audited financial statements

Calculation: Reviewal of notes to the financial statements in the accrual-based audit

Does not meet standard	Default or delinquent payments identified and/or is in violation of covenants.
Approaching standard	The network is in violation of covenants, but audit indicates that a waiver was granted.
Meets standard	Not in default or delinquent.

Long-Term Health: Does the organization demonstrate long term financial health?	
<i>For schools within networks, OEI will use the organization's consolidated financials to determine long-term financial sustainability. OEI will provide narrative in accountability reports related to school-specific metrics in this area as needed.</i>	
Does not meet standard	The organization meets standard for one sub-indicator but does not meet standard for the remaining two sub-indicators: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio OR The school does not meet standard for any of the sub-indicators.
Approaching standard	The organization meets standard for two sub-indicators: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio OR The school approaches standard for all 3 sub-indicators.
Meets standard	The organization meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio, and c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio.
Exceeds standard	The organization meets standard for all sub-indicators: a) Three-year Aggregate Net Income, b) Debt to Asset Ratio, and c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio.

The Long-Term Health indicator is calculated for all mayor-sponsored charter schools. Sub-indicators for standalone schools will be calculated using audited financial statements, and those for networks will be calculated using the organization's consolidated financial statements. "Network" refers to all campuses plus administration.

a) Three-Year Aggregate Net Income

Net income measures the difference between a school or network's revenues and expenses (including non-cash expenditures such as depreciation and amortization)

Net income indicates whether a school or network operates with a surplus or a deficit in a given time period. Net income is important because schools cannot operate at a deficit for sustained periods of time without risk of

closure. The Three-Year Aggregate Net Income is simply the sum of the net incomes for the most recent three years to understand if the school or network is generating a surplus in the long run.

Data Source: Three Years of Audited Statements of Activity

Calculation: Sum of Net Incomes for the past three years

Note: For schools in year one and year two of operation, we are looking for positive net incomes each year. Aggregate metrics will not be calculated until year three.

Does not meet standard	Aggregate three-year Net Income is negative OR Aggregate three-year net income is not available and most recent year net income is negative.
Approaching standard	Aggregate three-year Net Income is positive and most recent year is negative OR Aggregate Three-year Net Income is negative and most recent year Net Income is positive.
Meets standard	Aggregate three-year Net Income is positive and most recent year Net Income is positive.

b) Debt-to-Asset Ratio

The Debt-to-Asset Ratio sub-indicator measures the amount of liabilities a school/network owes versus the assets they own; it measures the extent to which the school/network relies on borrowed funds to finance its operations. The debt-to-asset ratio is the long-term version of the current ratio. It compares school's/networks total assets to their total liabilities. This is a snapshot of how much a school/network owns vs. how much they owe in total. A lower debt-to-asset ratio generally indicates stronger health.

Data Source: Audited Statement of Financial Position

Calculation: Total Liabilities/Total Assets

Does not meet standard	Debt-to-Asset Ratio exceeds 0.95
Approaching standard	Debt-to-Asset Ratio is between 0.91 – 0.95
Meets standard	Debt-to-Asset Ratio is less than or equal to 0.90

c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio

The Debt Service Coverage Ratio sub-indicator indicates a school/network's ability to cover its debt obligations in the next year based on its current net income. This measure depicts a school/network's ability to pay obligations once you add back the non-cash expenditure (depreciation) and the interest expense. This is then divided by the total principal and interest payments due in the coming year to understand if the income generated is enough to meet those obligations.

Data Sources: Audited Statement of Activity or Income Statement (change in net assets or net income, interest expense, depreciation expense) and the notes to the audited Financial Statements (annual principal, principal maturities of the note payable)

Calculation: (Net Income + Depreciation+ Amortization + Interest Expense) / (Principal + Amortization + Interest Payment for the next year)

Does not meet standard	Debt Service Coverage ratio is less than 1.05
Approaching standard	Debt Service Coverage ratio is between 1.05 – 1.1

Meets standard	Debt Service Coverage ratio equals or exceeds 1.2
-----------------------	---

Fiscal Oversight: Does the organization demonstrate it has adequate financial management and systems?	
Does not meet standard	The organization does not meet standard for one sub-indicator: a) Financial Audit OR b) Financial Reporting Requirements.
Approaching standard	The organization meets standard for the b) Financial Reporting Requirements sub-indicator but approaches standard for the a) Financial Audit sub-indicator.
Meets standard	The organization meets standard for both sub-indicators: a) Financial Audit b) Financial Reporting Requirements.

The Fiscal Oversight indicator is calculated for all mayor-sponsored charter schools. Sub-indicators for standalone schools will be calculated using audited financial statements, and those for networks will be calculated using the organization's consolidated financial statements. "Network" refers to all campuses plus administration.

a) Financial Audit

The annual accrual-based audit provides an opinion on the validity of the information being shared in the financial statements and provides insight into a school's financial health.

Data Sources: Annual accrual-based audit

Does not meet standard	The organization receives an audit with multiple significant deficiencies, a material weakness, or has a noted going concern assessment.
Approaching standard	Receives a clean audit opinion with one or more significant deficiencies noted but no material weaknesses or a noted going concern assessment.
Meets standard	Receives a clean audit opinion with no findings related to its internal controls over financial reporting.

b) Financial Reporting Requirements

Schools are required to submit all financial documentation in a timely manner. Adhering to the reporting requirements are critical in ensuring strong ongoing monitoring of a school or network's financial health.

Data Sources: Compliance items submitted to OEI, independent auditor, accountant, bookkeeper, and other relevant vendors

Calculation: OEI reserves the right to consider the following when determining that a school does not meet standard for this sub-indicator: Compliance with charter requirements; Late submission or failure to submit quarterly financial documents; Late submission or failure to submit the annual accrual-based audit per OEI, SBOA, or Federal OMB deadlines; Cancellation of compliance meetings with OEI for non-emergency reasons and/or failure to reschedule meetings.

Does not meet standard	Fails to satisfy financial reporting requirements by submitting less than 80% of documents on-time or is out of compliance with charter requirements.
Meets standard	Satisfies all financial reporting requirements by submitting at least 80% of documents on-time and is in compliance with charter requirements.

Core Question 3: Is the organization effective and well-run?

Expanded Criteria

Overview

The Governance Performance Framework gauges the strength, capacity, and effectiveness of school and board leadership, as well as ability to remain in compliance with the terms of the charter and all other applicable laws and policies. The framework consists of indicators designed to measure schools and networks on governance oversight, board capacity and focus, compliance, and organizational leadership and collaboration.

Data Collection

In order to use the framework throughout the school year, OEI will need the following:

- Board-approved minutes from every meeting and/or in-person observations of those meetings
- Assurance (through compliance submissions) that boards are meeting requirements of Indiana Open Door Law
- On-time compliance submissions through the Charter Achievement Portal
- Results from evaluations of the board, school leadership, and EMO/CMO (if applicable)
- Notes and information from semi-annual board chair check-ins between board chairs and Governance Analysts
- Any relevant complaints from students, parents, or staff

Evaluation

OEI will continue to evaluate and rate schools' and networks' performance on an annual basis against the governance performance framework using the minutes, reports, and observations of board meetings and results of regular check-ins with board and school leadership throughout the year. Schools determined to be out of compliance will be subject to additional monitoring and/or corrective action at the discretion of OEI staff.

Governance Oversight: Does the board demonstrate strong governance oversight?	
Does Not Meet Standard	The board does not meet standard on one or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The board either 1) approaches standard for all three sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 3) approaches standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds or meets standard for one sub-indicator, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The board either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 2) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, and approaches or does not meet for one, 3) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, or 5) meets standard for all sub-indicators.
Exceeds Standard	The board exceeds standard for at least two sub-indicators and meets standard for one.

Governance Oversight centers the board's prioritization of academic outcomes, financial viability of the school, and governance accountability. A board that is focused on data is just as important as a data-driven school leader.

a) The board exercises relentless focus on student academic outcomes

Boards are expected to regularly discuss student data, in aggregate and disaggregated by subgroup. This should occur at least three times per year to correspond with beginning-, middle-, and end-of-year assessments and checkpoints. Governance analysts will consult with academic analysts on this indicator.

Data Sources:

- Board discussions of academic data
- Board meeting minutes
- Academic and or/or progress report-outs on board goals
- Evidence of an academic committee and/or individual(s) on the board who collaborate with the school leader to closely monitor progress.

Does not meet standard	• The board is unable to gauge whether students are on track; or • The board does not have an active academic committee.
Approaching standard	• The board was engaged during academic performance discussions. • The board did not regularly discuss disaggregated data.
Meets standard	The board did three of the following: • Centered student academic outcomes in discussions. • Discussed disaggregated academic data regularly. • Worked with school leadership to adjust course when needed. • Has an academic committee that regularly meets with school leadership to review academic data and reports to the full board.
Exceeds Standard	The board did all the following: • Centered student academic outcomes in discussions. • Discussed disaggregated academic data regularly. • Worked with school leadership to adjust course when necessary. • Has an academic committee that regularly meets with school leadership review academic data and reports to the full board.

b) The board has active committees with clear goals

Boards bylaws should include provisions for committees that regularly meet for their intended purpose. OEI suggests, at the least, that a board has an academic, finance, and governance committee. Committees should set goals and consistently report to the full board. Board members and non-members who are part of the school community may serve on committees.

Data Sources:

- Evidence of committees that operate against a clear charge
- Evidence that committees are able to articulate their progress on goals
- Board bylaws
- Board meeting minutes
- Committee report-outs

Does not meet standard	• There is no evidence of active committees; or • Committee goals do not align to school-specific goals; or • The board has committees, but there is minimal to no evidence progress to goals was shared.
Approaching standard	The board has two of the following:

	- Active committees rooted in student/school-level success. - Each committee has goals aligned to student/school-level success. - Committees share progress to goals with recommendations to full board when necessary. - At a minimum, committees in academics and finance.
Meets standard	The board has three of the following: - Active committees rooted in student/school-level success. - Each committee has goals aligned to student/school-level success. - Committees share progress to goals with recommendations to full board when necessary. - At a minimum, committees in academics and finance.
Exceeds Standard	The board has all the following: - Active committees rooted in student/school-level success. - Each committee has goals aligned to student/school-level success. - Committees share progress to goals with recommendations to full board when necessary. - At a minimum, committees in academics and finance.

c) The board has evaluation systems in place to monitor itself and school leadership

It is important that boards have strong systems that allow them to hold school leadership accountable to the promises in the charter contract and set high expectations for student performance. Similarly, the board should also take time to reflect on its own performance and progress toward helping the school achieve its mission and vision. Evaluations should drive plans for improvement and avoid punitive measures. If evaluations are not satisfactory and require leadership changes, the board should also have a strong succession plan on file to allow for seamless transition and limited, if any, disruption for students, staff, and families.

Data Sources:

- Board self-evaluations
- Board evaluation of executive director or CEO
- Board of evaluation of the CMO/EMO
- School leader self-evaluation
- School leader succession plan

Does not meet standard	- The organization is missing all evaluations; or - The board did not submit a school leader succession plan.
Approaching standard	- The organization is missing two or more required evaluations; or - The board has an outdated school leader succession plan on file.
Meets standard	The organization did all the following: - The organization completed all but one of the required evaluations. - The board has an updated school leader succession plan on file.
Exceeds Standard	The organization did all the following: - The board evaluated the school leader. - The school leader conducted a self-assessment. - The board conducted a self-assessment. - The board evaluated its education service provider, if applicable. - The board has an updated school leader succession plan on file.

Board Composition and Vision: Is the board active, knowledgeable, diverse, and does it work toward a strategic vision?

Does not meet standard	The board does not meet standard on one or both sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
-------------------------------	---

Approaching standard	The board either 1) approaches standard for one or both sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for one sub-indicator and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets standard	The board either 1) meets standard for both sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for one sub-indicator and exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, or 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator and approaches standard for one sub-indicator.
Exceeds standard	The board exceeds standard for both sub-indicators.

Board Composition and Vision centers on the board's ability to craft a diverse team to lead the school as well as the ability to accurately monitor and keep a pulse on the overall health of the school.

a) The board has diverse members with essential skillsets where all members are contributing

Historically, OEI has looked to evaluate board diversity by the presence of academic, legal, finance, HR, and operations skills on the Board, as well as the expectation that board members backgrounds are also diverse in terms of race, ethnicity, and other markers of identity, particularly those relevant to the school's student population.

Data Sources:

- Board roster and board member resumes
- Board member attendance (individual and committee)
- Board meeting schedule, agendas, packets, reports, minutes, meeting discussions, and notes
- Gender and racial/ethnic diversity of the board relative to the students served at the school
- State-audited school-level demographics
- Board-submitted goals for recruiting diverse members (if not captured in board-submitted formal tracking system, policies, and/or bylaws)

Does not meet standard	The board did most of the following: • Board experiences lack diverse and strategic skills. • The board met quorum at less than 80% of meetings. • Board committees were rarely represented in meetings.
Approaching standard	The board did most of the following: • Board experiences include one of the following skillsets: law, finance, or academics. • The board met quorum at 80% of meetings. • Committees were represented at 80% of meetings.
Meets standard	The board did most of the following: • Board members mostly reflect the student population or measurable goals were set for recruitment. • Board experiences include two of the following skillsets: law, finance, or academics. • The board met quorum at 90% of meetings. • Committees were represented at 90% of meetings.
Exceeds Standard	The board did all the following: • Board members reflect the student population or measurable goals were set for recruitment. • Board experiences include law, finance, and academics. • The board met quorum at 100% of meetings. • Committees and members were represented and contributing at every meeting.

b) The board uses clear and accurate data as part of a formal tracking system to monitor school health

One of the primary roles of a charter school board is working with the school leader to set, monitor, and evaluate performance against annual goals that are aligned with the school's long-term strategic vision. A school's annual goals reflect the unique approach and strategies it uses to ensure delivery on the promises articulated in its charter. Goals vary from year to year and depend upon student performance, school leadership, operations, and overall functioning of the board.

Data Sources:

- Progress monitoring and ongoing mechanisms to formally track performance on school-level goals
- Board meeting minutes
- Committee/board reports
- Formal tracking system with board's annual goals

Does not meet standard	• The board does not have goals and/or a way to monitor their progress.
Approaching standard	The board did most of the following: • There is no evidence of a formal tracking system in place. • Targets include a combination of academic, finance, and operational indicators. • The board has general goals, but only assesses progress once per year.
Meets standard	The board did most of the following: • The board exercises oversight of the financial and operational health of the school using clear and accurate data and a consistent set of metrics. • At minimum, targets include academic, finance, and operational indicators. • The board sets annual goals and discusses progress towards goals at least quarterly.
Exceeds Standard	The board did all the following: • Exercised tight oversight of the health of the school using clear and accurate data and a consistent set of metrics. • At minimum, targets included academic, finance, and operational indicators. • Set annual goals and discusses progress towards goals at all board meetings.

Compliance: Does the school satisfactorily comply with all its governance obligations?	
Does Not Meet Standard	The organization does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The organization either 1) approaches standard for all four sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 3) approaches standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The organization either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators, or 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator or 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, and approaches for two sub-indicators or 4) meets standard for all sub-indicators
Exceeds Standard	The organization exceeds standard for at one sub-indicator and meets standard for the rest.

The Compliance indicator determines adherence to the reporting requirements calendar and the sufficiency of information submitted by boards to OEI. It also reviews school-level compliance with applicable laws. Most of these items are outlined in the board's charter agreement. The spirit of this indicator encourages boards and schools to be timely and proactive in their compliance items while remaining in good standing with laws specific to the state of Indiana.

a) Compliance Document Submission

OEI maintains a document submission platform, where schools are given access to upload required items each month. These requirements are details in the Calendar of Reporting Requirements found later in this handbook.

Data Sources:

- Compliance items submitted in the Charter Achievement Portal (CAP)

Calculation: Documents submitted on-time / Documents required

Does not meet standard	• The organization submitted fewer than 75% of compliance documents on-time.
Approaching standard	• The organization submitted 75-85% of compliance documents on-time.
Meets standard	• The organization submitted 86-94% of compliance documents on-time.
Exceeds Standard	• The organization submitted at least 95% of compliance documents on-time.

b) Charter Compliance

The organizer is expected to remain in compliance, at all times, with the terms of the charter contract and its associated amendments. Failure to do so may result in a formal Notice of Noncompliance or Notice of Deficiency and engagement in OEI's performance improvement process.

Data Sources:

- Complaints or charges from individuals or institutions pertaining to compliance
- Notifications of deficiencies (from OEI or other sources)

Does not meet standard	• The organization was out of compliance with multiple sections of its charter and/or applicable law or was unable to resolve several violations during the school year.
Approaching standard	• The organization was out of compliance with one or more sections of its charter and/or applicable law but worked to resolve the issue(s) during the school year.
Meets standard	• The organization remained in compliance with all sections of its charter and applicable laws.

c) Compliance with OEI's Incident Communication Policy

Boards are required to craft plans to notify OEI when issues arise at the school level. To meet OEI's standards of communication, the board must notify the authorizer of any school-level incident within 24 hours of occurrence. Additionally, school leadership should engage in regular, responsive communication with OEI. This includes in regard to scheduling meetings, providing feedback, and addressing other concerns as needed. This policy is detailed further in a later section of this handbook.

Data Sources:

- Charter agreement
- Communications with school and/or board leadership
- Board-submitted plan to notify OEI of incidents
- Cancellation of compliance meetings with OEI for non-emergency reasons and/or failure to schedule or reschedule meetings

Does not meet standard	• In the event of a material incident, the organization did not comply with OEI's Incident Communication Policy.
-------------------------------	--

Meets standard	In the event of a material incident, the organization complied with OEI's Incident Communication Policy.
-----------------------	--

d) Compliance with Indiana Open Door Law

As public schools, charter school boards must ensure board meetings are held in accordance with Indiana Open Door Law. A reference guide is included later in this handbook, as well as a link to the full requirements.

Data Sources:

- Signed IODL Assurance Form
- Board meeting notices, agendas, and minutes
- Evidence of board meeting transparency via communication outlets (calendar, meeting notices, minutes, social media, etc.)

Does not meet standard	The board failed to comply with IODL on multiple occasions and/or did not resolve issues at subsequent meetings.
Approaching standard	The board failed to comply with IODL at one meeting but resolved issues at subsequent meetings.
Meets standard	The board complied with IODL at all meetings.

Leadership: Is the school leader strong in their academic and organizational leadership?	
Does Not Meet Standard	The organization does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.
Approaching Standard	The organization either 1) approaches standard for all four sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 3) approaches standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.
Meets Standard	The organization either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators, or 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators 5) meets standard for all sub-indicators.
Exceeds Standard	The organization exceeds standard for at least two sub-indicators and meets standard for the rest.

Academic Strength and Organizational Leadership centers on the performance of the school leader as well as the relationship between the school leader and the board. The spirit of this indicator aims to encourage collaboration between the school leader and the board. This indicator also reinforces that the board is expected to hold the school leader accountable for strong school outcomes.

a) School and/or network leaders show a clear track record of success

This sub-indicator is based on results for the prior year's academic accountability (Core Question 1) report. Results are reviewed and used to determine a rating. For networks with multiple schools, school-level ratings are averaged to determine an overall rating.

Data Sources:

- State-audited summative data
- Academic team performance analysis
- Formative assessment data
- Additional academic data, including, but not limited to graduation, rate, IREAD-3 data, PSAT, attendance

Does not meet standard	• The organization has an average of Does Not Meet Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Approaching standard	• The organization has an average of Approaches Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Meets standard	• The organization has an average of Meets Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Exceeds Standard	• The organization has an average of Exceeds Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.

b) School and/or network leaders are fully present and give data-driven updates to the board

OEI expects school leadership to consistently attend board meetings in order to both provide the board with updates and transparently represent to the community the health of the school. This sub-indicator relies on observations from governance analysts and interpretation of meeting minutes.

Data Sources:

- Board meeting minutes
- School leadership reports to the board
- School leadership attendance and reporting structure
- School leadership ability to report on progress indicators across multiple campuses (if network)

Does not meet standard	• Attended fewer than 60% of board meetings. • Did not present on academic or financial outcomes or presentations were not accurate. • Did not present on school trends and/or there were no plans to address concerns.
Approaching standard	• Attended 60% of board meetings. • Did not present on academic or financial outcomes or presentations were not accurate. • Informed the board when trends declined but did not adjust course accordingly.
Meets standard	• Attended 80% of board meetings. • Presented transparent and accurate academic and financial information. • Made mid-course adjustments to improve results when trends declined.
Exceeds Standard	• Attended 100% of board meetings. • Presented transparent and accurate academic and financial information. • Made mid-course adjustments to improve results when trends declined.

c) School and/or network leadership collaborates with the board to handle school-level complaints and concerns

This sub-indicator relies on observations during meetings as well as any complaints or issues that occur over the course of the year. This could be in the form of specific complaints to OEI, or issues that OEI is made aware of. We expect that the school and board leaders can effectively work together to ensure students, families, and staff have their concerns or problems addressed, and that the problem-solving process includes collaboration and effective communication.

Data Sources:

- Board meeting minutes
- School leadership reports
- Parent/stakeholder complaints

Does not meet standard	• The board was unaware of several issues or concerns at the school level. • There is little to no evidence of collaboration to resolve issues.
Approaching standard	• The board was not always aware of or brought on in a timely manner regarding school concerns or issues. • There is evidence of some collaboration between board and school leadership to resolve issues.
Meets standard	Leadership did at least two the following when concerns arose: • Presented thorough data to the board. • Collaborated with the board to develop solutions that centered the best interests of students. • Resolved most school-level issues or complaints.
Exceeds Standard	Leadership did all of the following when concerns arose: • Presented thorough data to the board. • Collaborated with the board to develop solutions that centered the best interests of students. • Resolved all school-level issues or complaints.

d) The school and/or network maintains leadership stability in key administrative positions with a clear plan for succession

A successful school requires stable, consistent leadership. Schools are expected to ensure leadership stability at the administrative level (deans, directors, principal, executive director, CEO, etc.) to allow the school to meet its mission and vision and effectively carry out instruction and implement building culture. This sub-indicator will also consider the extent to which any transitions resulted in disruption for the school community.

Data Sources:

- Academic meetings
- Quarterly finance meetings
- Board chair check-ins
- Other communications as indicated

Does not meet standard	• School leadership was unstable with significant administrative turnover. • School leadership changes disrupted school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
Approaching standard	• School leadership was unstable with minimal administrative turnover. • School leadership changes disrupted school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
Meets standard	• School leadership was stable with minimal administrative turnover. • School leadership changes had minimal disruption on school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
Exceeds Standard	• School leadership was stable with minimal administrative turnover. • School leadership changes did not disrupt school operations, student success, or charter compliance.

Core Question 4: Is the school providing the appropriate conditions for success?

Site Visit Schedule and Vendor Information

Overview

The site visit framework assesses the processes and systems that impact a school's academic, financial, and governance outcomes in Core Questions 1, 2 and 3.

During the term of its initial charter, a school receives a site visit and evaluation against Core Question 4 in the second, fourth and sixth years. The fourth-year comprehensive review culminates in a school's mid-charter review, while the sixth-year visit serves to inform charter renewal decisions. In subsequent standard charter terms (seven years), a school receives a site visit and evaluation against Core Question 4 in the third and sixth years. In subsequent 15-year charter terms, a school receives a site visit and evaluation in the fifth, 10th, and 14th years. The third-, fifth- or 10th-year review culminate in a school's mid- or interim charter review, while the sixth- or 14th-year visit serves to inform renewal decisions.

Evaluations are completed by external consultants who contract with each school or network. The Office of Education Innovation will publish completed evaluations alongside annual accountability reports on its website.

Schools that are required to schedule site visits for 2025-26 are listed below, as well as in the calendar on the following page:

Third Year (Mid-Charter for schools after first term)

- Global Preparatory Academy

Third Year (Renewal for schools on a shortened term)

- Irvington Community Elementary School
- Irvington Community Middle School
- Irvington Preparatory Academy

Fourth Year (Mid-Charter for schools in first term)

- Monarca Academy
- Liberty Grove School

Sixth Year (Renewal)

- Avondale Meadows Academy
- Enlace Academy
- Emma Donnan Elementary and Middle School
- Believe Circle City High School
- The PATH School
- Rooted High School
- Hope Academy

Required Review and External Evaluation by Charter Year																																		
Network	School	Opening Year	SY 25-26	SY 26-27	SY 27-28	SY 28-29	SY 29-30	SY 30-31	SY 31-32	SY 32-33	SY 33-34	SY 34-35	SY 35-36	SY 36-37	SY 37-38	SY 38-39	SY 39-40	SY 40-41																
			Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit	Yr	Visit		
GEI	Excel Center - Marion County (12+)	2010-2011	2		3		4		5	5YCR	6		7		8		9		10	10YCR	11		12		13		14	14YR	15		1		2	
	Excel Center - Lafayette Square (12+)	2013-2014	2		3		4		5	5YCR	6		7		8		9		10	10YCR	11		12		13		14	14YR	15		1		2	
	Excel Center - University Heights (12+)	2015-2016	2		3		4		5	5YCR	6		7		8		9		10	10YCR	11		12		13		14	14YR	15		1		2	
	Excel Center - Southeast	2023-2024	2		3		4		5	5YCR	6		7		8		9		10	10YCR	11		12		13		14	14YR	15		1		2	
HCS	Herron High School (9-12)	2006-2007	2		3		4		5	5YCR	6		7		8		9		10	10YCR	11		12		13		14	14YR	15		1		2	
	Herron-Riverside High School (9-12)	2017-2018	2		3		4		5	5YCR	6		7		8		9		10	10YCR	11		12		13		14	14YR	15		1		2	
	Herron Preparatory Academy (K-8)	2021-2022	2		3		4		5	5YCR	6		7		8		9		10	10YCR	11		12		13		14	14YR	15		1		2	
PSOE	Paramount Brookside (K-8)	2010-2011	2		3		4		5	5YCR	6		7		8		9		10	10YCR	11		12		13		14	14YR	15		1		2	
	Paramount Cottage Home (K-6)	2018-2019	2		3		4		5	5YCR	6		7		8		9		10	10YCR	11		12		13		14	14YR	15		1		2	
	Paramount Englewood (5-8)	2019-2020	2		3		4		5	5YCR	6		7		8		9		10	10YCR	11		12		13		14	14YR	15		1		2	
PPHS	Purdue Polytechnic High School Englewood (9-12)	2017-2018	2		3		4		5	5YCR	6		7		8		9		10	10YCR	11		12		13		14	14YR	15		1		2	
	Purdue Polytechnic High School Broad Ripple (K-12)	2019-2020	2		3		4		5	5YCR	6		7		8		9		10	10YCR	11		12		13		14	14YR	15		1		2	
	Andrew J. Brown Academy (K-8)	2003-2004	2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV
USI	Avondale Meadows Middle School (6-8)	2017-2018	2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV
IMSA	Indiana Math & Science Academy North (K-12)	2010-2011	2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV
VCP	Victory College Prep High (9-12)	2025-2026	1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2	
VCP	Victory College Prep Middle (6-8)	2025-2026	1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2	
TAS	Charles A Tindley Accelerated School (7-12)	2004-2005	1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2	
KIPP	KIPP Indpls College Prep (6-8)	2004-2005	1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2	
	SENSE Charter School (K-8)	2004-2005	1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2	
	Damar Charter Academy (K-12)	2011-2012	1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2	
	Matchbook Learning (K-8)	2018-2019	1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2	
KIPP	KIPP Indy Legacy High School (9-12)	2019-2020	1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2	
VCP	Victory College Prep Elementary (K-5)	2005-2006	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1	
USI	Avondale Meadows Academy (K-5)	2006-2007	6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7	
NCN	Enlace Academy (K-8)	2013-2014	6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7	
	Emma Donnan Elementary and Middle (K-8)	2020-2021	6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7	
	Believe Circle City High School (9-12)	2020-2021	6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7	
	The PATH School (K-8)	2020-2021	6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7	
	Rooted High School (9-12)	2020-2021	6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7	
	Hope Academy (9-12)	2020-2021	6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7	
TAS	Tindley Summit Academy (K-6)	2014-2015	5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR
GEI	Indianapolis Metropolitan High School (9-12)	2004-2005	5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR
KIPP	KIPP Unite Elementary (K-5)	2014-2015	1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2	
USI	Vision Academy (K-8)	2014-2015	5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR
IMSA	Indiana Math & Science Academy West (K-8)	2014-2015	5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR
TAS	Tindley Genesis Academy (K-5)	2015-2016	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5	
	Monarca Academy (6-8)	2022-2023	4	4YCR	5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5	
	Liberty Grove School (K-6)	2022-2023	4	4YCR	5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5	
ICS	Irvington Community Elementary School (K-5)	2009-2010	3	3YSV	4		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7	
	Irvington Community Middle School (6-8)	2009-2010	3	3YSV	4		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7	
	Irvington Preparatory Academy (9-12)	2009-2010	3	3YSV	4		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7	
	Global Prep Academy (K-8)	2016-2017	3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4		5		6	6YR	7		1		2		3	3YSV	4	

Key	
2YSV	2nd Yr - Site Visit
4YCR	4th Yr - Charter Review
6YR	6th Yr - Renewal
3YSV	3rd Yr - Site Visit
	Renewal starts in Fall of 7th/15th year.
	MCR starts in Spring of 4th/5th/10th year.
INT	Interim Site Visit scheduled as needed

OEI Site Visit Participation

OEI team members will attend select site visits to observe, ensure the site visit protocol is implemented with fidelity, and gain better understanding of the school's day-to-day operations. OEI may participate in some or all of the visit. This could include classroom observations, focus groups, or building walkthroughs. To protect authorizer objectivity and school autonomy, OEI team members will not provide feedback from the site visit or draft any areas of the Core Question 4 accountability reports. School leaders will be notified of OEI's participation in the site visit prior to the scheduled visit.

Site Visit Debrief

For site visits that OEI elects not to participate in, the evaluation team should find time to debrief the highlights of the site visit with a member of OEI staff.

Report Drafts

External evaluators will include OEI on all Core Question 4 report draft correspondence with school leaders. OEI will not provide feedback on report drafts or address areas of concern within the correspondence.

Evaluator Selection

OEI will provide schools with a list of approved evaluators that they may contract with at their own cost to complete the site visit. Mayor-sponsored charter schools may not contract with the same external evaluator more than twice sequentially. This is not limited to the current charter term. The only exception to this policy is circumstances in which a school is required to contract with a specific evaluator at OEI's discretion. These circumstances may include, but are not limited to, a school's placement on a Notice of Noncompliance or Notice of Deficiency, the initiation of a special education investigation by the Indiana Department of Education in the current or preceding school year, or direct constituent complaints to OEI.

Example of Acceptable Evaluator Contract Timeline



To improve the diversity of the pool of external evaluators, OEI will continue to engage in a Request for Information process on an ongoing basis.

Conflicts of Interest Policy

Schools may not use an individual as an external evaluator to complete their Core Question 4 site visit evaluation if the school has worked or is currently working with the individual in a consultant capacity **in the past three years**. This prohibition only applies to the individual evaluator, not the organization that employs the individual. A school may use an organization that they have used or are currently using in a consulting capacity to complete the evaluation so long as the individual completing the evaluation has never worked with the school in a consulting capacity. It is the responsibility of the evaluation team to make OEI aware of the most recent work the team has engaged in with the school ahead of the site visit.

Important Note: Once a school has selected an evaluator, under no circumstances may the evaluator engage in any kind of preliminary evaluation with the school outside of collecting publicly available data or information that might be necessary for the context of planning or conducting the site visit. Pre-visits or advance evaluations of any kind that compromise the independence and integrity of the site visit process could result in additional consequences that include OEI rejecting the report, requesting the school engage a different evaluator to repeat the process, or removing the evaluator in question from the approved list. Questions on this may be directed to Shaina Cavazos, Director of Charter Schools.

Presentations to mayor-sponsored charter school boards

In the event a charter school received more than two ratings of “Does Not Meet Standard,” OEI may ask the evaluation team to complete a presentation to the school’s board detailing the findings of the site visit. The school would be required to contract with the evaluation team at market rate. Evaluators will include this caveat in their proposed scope of work.

Cost

External evaluators have the autonomy to set their own pricing. Costs will depend on various factors including, but not limited to, the model, size, and grade band of the school and could range from \$10,000 to \$20,000. We encourage schools to reach out to the evaluators for more information on their pricing and procedures.

Collecting Evidence

Consultants will inform schools of required evidence to evaluate against Core Question 4. Below is a sample list of supporting artifacts school leaders may produce to provide evidence in support of indicators in the Core Question 4 framework.

Supporting Evidence	CQ4 Indicator
Assessment calendar and samples	Instruction, MLL Compliance
Classroom Observations	Curriculum, Pedagogy, Instruction, Climate, Compliance
College and career readiness data	Postsecondary Support
Conference notifications	Compliance
Confidential student file reviews (including PHLS)	Compliance, MLL Compliance
Counseling Department Policies and Procedures, Advising Procedures and Protocols	Postsecondary Support
Curriculum documents (pacing guides, maps, example lesson plans)	Curriculum, Pedagogy
Data protocol documents	Pedagogy, Instruction
Data reports	Instruction, MLL Compliance
Demographic information	Family Communication
Disaggregated Reports on Course Enrollment	Postsecondary Support
Discipline policy materials	Climate
Family/Community engagement plan	Mission, Climate, Family Communication
Focus Groups	Curriculum, Pedagogy, Postsecondary Support, Instruction, Staffing, Mission, Climate, Family Communication, Compliance, 4.10
Graduation Data	Postsecondary Support
Hiring policy and procedure manual	Staffing
Instructional Calendars	Curriculum, Pedagogy, Instruction

ILP conference meeting notes	MLL Compliance
Lesson Plans, Lesson Plan Internalization Protocol/System	Pedagogy, MLL Compliance
List of school curricula, Course of Study (including Pathway, AP, IB, and dual credit options)	Postsecondary Support
List of school staff and credentials	Staffing
Master Calendar	Pedagogy, Instruction
MOUs with college and community partners	Postsecondary Support
Supporting Evidence	CQ4 Indicator
MTSS data	Instruction, Climate
Organizational chart	Staffing
Parent correspondence (including, but not limited to, ILP input, ELL notification of services, WIDA results/notification of WIDA test, etc.)	Family Communication, Compliance, MLL Compliance
PLC agendas/materials	Pedagogy, Instruction
Professional development agendas, schedule, materials, etc.	Curriculum, Pedagogy, Postsecondary Support, Instruction, Climate, MLL Compliance
Public meeting notices	Family Communication
RDA accountability workbook	Compliance, MLL Compliance
Review of case conferences meeting notes	Compliance
Review of IEPs (at least 20% of them)	Compliance
Review of ILPs (at least 20%)	MLL Compliance
School discipline data	Climate
School Handbook	Postsecondary Support
School Improvement Plan	Family Communication
School newsletters	Family Communication
Secondary Completion Data	Postsecondary Support
Staff deployment plan	Staffing
Staff Handbook	Curriculum, Pedagogy, Instruction, Mission, Family Communication
Student Handbook	Postsecondary Support, Mission, Climate, Family Communication
State standards	Compliance
Student and teacher data trackers (or similar items i.e. dashboards, etc.)	Curriculum, Instruction, MLL Compliance
Student progress report cards/forms	Family Communication, MLL Compliance
Survey Data	Curriculum, Postsecondary Support, Mission, Family Communication, Compliance, MLL Compliance
Teacher evaluation rubric	Pedagogy, Staffing
Welcome packet	Family Communication

OEI-Approved External Evaluators

Chisley Consulting Group, LLC.	
Primary Contact	Dr. Porsche Chisley 614-531-8573 Porsche@chisleyconsulting.com 502 N. Tremont Street Suite 233 Indianapolis, IN 46222
Brief Description of Company	At Chisley Consulting Group, LLC. we specialize in driving transformative success for organizations and system leaders. We help organizations move from chaos to clarity- aligning strategy, streamlining systems, and building leadership capacity so they can lead boldly, deliver on their mission, and create sustainable change. We offer strategic advising, leadership development solutions, and technical assistance to enhance your team's capacity to effectively implement your mission, vision and values. We've been deeply invested in school improvement work since 2015 and support a variety of clients, including charter authorizers, districts, charter school networks, and nonprofit organizations. Our services are rooted in three core pillars: Strategy, Systems, and Leadership
Team Members	Dr. Porsche Chisley, an Indianapolis native, is the Founder & CEO of Chisley Consulting Group and a nationally respected education strategist and leadership coach. A former Teach for America corps member and award-nominated teacher, she has led dramatic school improvements initiatives-helping schools significantly improve their accountability ratings. Prior to launching CCG, Dr. Chisley led as the Vice President of Expanded Impact for The Mind Trust and the Vice President of School Improvement for the largest charter authorizer in Ohio, leading the organization to achieving "exemplary" authorizer status. Today, she partners with schools and organizations across the country to bring their missions to life through strategy, system design, and leadership development. Dr. Linda Gibson-Fletcher is an Academic Performance and Accountability Specialist. Dr. Fletcher is committed to improving outcomes for underserved students. She holds degrees from Cleveland State, Ashland University, and a Ph.D. from the University of Dayton. A former principal, superintendent, and school founder, she supports school leaders, teaches at Capella University, mentors principals, and leads Inspire2Teach1, Inc., advocating for education and mentorship. Dr. Dee Morgan is committed to the work of raising student performance and closing the achievement gap. Dr. Morgan has served in a variety of roles in urban and suburban districts including a superintendent, deputy superintendent, curriculum and instruction director, early childhood coordinator, principal, and special education teacher. She worked as a regional specialist for Race to the Top and, since 2015, a consultant for the Ohio Department of Education, Office of Improvement and Innovation, serving as a team lead for district reviews. Diana R. Williams is a seasoned special educator who has worked with charter schools throughout the country to improve their special education departments and increase inclusivity through coaching and professional development. Diana leverages her experience co-founding a charter elementary school and overseeing multiple schools within a charter network to assist with the training and development of other educators. In addition to her passion for special education and small group instruction, she loves working with schools to increase their knowledge and skillset when responding to tricky student behavior. Diana has a master's degree in teaching with a concentration in Special Education.

Clarity Education	
Primary Contact	Catherine Pangan, Ed.D 917-951-5490 cpangan@butler.edu 4600 Sunset Avenue Indianapolis, IN 46208
Brief Description of Company	Clarity Education exists to support school communities in leading creatively, thinking strategically, and living into their fullest potential by keeping students and educators at the center of decision-making. As part of our evaluation, we provide a wide variety of resources and ideas to support school communities. Our consulting team includes education professionals with over 75 years of collective education experience, working with K-12 students, educators, and administrators in the following areas: • STEM and Incorporating AI into Curriculum and Educator Support • Special Education, RTI, and Inclusive Practices • ENL, Immigrant Advocacy, and Bilingual Education • Teacher Leadership and Development • Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging • High Ability/Gifted and Talented Programs • Accreditation and Data-Driven Research • Global Education • Social-Emotional Learning through an Education Neuroscience Lens • Goal Setting and Attainment through Data-Driven Analysis • Computer Science Education • Educational Leadership (both teacher leadership and administrative leadership)
Team Members	Dr. Kelli Esteves is a Professor of Special Education and the Associate Dean for the College of Education at Butler University. She holds a B.A. in Learning Disabilities, an M.A. in Teaching Children with Visual Impairments, and an Ed.D. in Special Education. Her research focuses on inclusive practices within K-12 educational settings and multi-tiered systems of support for students. She has consulted with numerous schools and is a frequent presenter for professional organizations such as the Council for Exceptional Children and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). In her role as a global coordinator for the College of Education, she works with school partners around the world to develop intercultural connections among educators and students. Under her leadership, Butler's College of Education received the AACTE Best Practice Award in Support of Global and International Perspectives for its Global Network for Teacher Preparation program. Prior to her time at Butler, Dr. Esteves was the director of the Learning Disabilities program at Aquinas College in Grand Rapids, Michigan. She was also a special education teacher and literacy specialist in the All children in every neighborhood deserves access to education that enables them to define their own life paths. K-12 public school system. Dr. Esteves is the coauthor of <i>RTI Success: Proven Tools and Strategies for Schools and Classrooms</i> and <i>RTI in Middle School Classrooms</i>. Dr. Brooke Kandel serves as Dean and Professor in the College of Education at Butler University, where she collaborates with colleagues and community partners to expand and diversify the Indiana educator pipeline, to prepare excellent educators and advocates to serve youth and communities, and to ensure every student can thrive. Previously, Brooke has worked as an immigrant advocate in the court system, an ESL and bilingual K-12 and adult educator, and a Senior Research Associate at the State of Texas Education Research Center. She earned her Ph.D. in Educational Psychology from Texas A&M University, and her scholarly

	interests include culturally and linguistically sustaining practices, school-family-community engagement, ESL teacher professional development, and teacher leadership. Brooke's scholarship has been published in books and journals including <i>Multicultural Education</i>, <i>Theory into Practice</i>, <i>Educational Forum</i>, and <i>The Oxford Encyclopedia of Global Perspectives on Teacher Education</i>. She is a Fellow of the Desmond Tutu Center for Peace, Reconciliation, and Global Justice. Brooke is most energized when she is collaborating with and learning from children, youth, and educators. Dr. Catherine Hagerman Pangan is a Professor in the College of Education at Butler University, Director of the state's STEM New Educator Academy, and Director of the Butler Lifelong Learning Collaborative. She is honored to work with learners of all ages and many community partners around the city. Her work focuses on science and social studies methods, teacher leadership and innovation, and pre-service teaching. She is also an Innovation Fellow for Butler's Transformation Lab focusing on large-scale special projects for the university. As an author, Dr. Pangan contributed for over ten years as a columnist in <i>The Teacher Advocate</i> magazine as "Dr. P." and has written curriculum for the Children's Museum of Indianapolis and the Benjamin Harrison House. She penned a children's book titled "No Peanuts for Me!" about her son's peanut allergy. Further contributions include chapters for "The Power of Teacher Leaders," "Connecting Children to Nature," "The Gifts of Indiana," and "Add a Page or Two." She also served for over 12 years as a member of the Board of Trustees for Sycamore School. Formerly, Dr. Pangan was an elementary teacher in St. Louis, MO and Indiana. She traded in her "Golden Apple" teaching award for the Big Apple and helped start the New Teacher Academy at Columbia University and worked with teachers in Harlem and Brooklyn. She received her B.S. in Elementary Education at ISU, a master's in educational administration at Butler University, an endorsement in Gifted Education, and a doctorate in Curriculum and Teaching with an emphasis on policy and education law from Columbia University. Dr. Pangan has been working in education for over 25 years.
--	--

EduLove Consulting LLC	
Primary Contact	Monique D. Love 574-208-7264 eduloveconsulting@gmail.com Serving South Bend, IN. & Indianapolis, IN.
Brief Description of Company	EduLove Consulting LLC is an established consulting company that is keen on advocating for standards and expectations in education. Our reports have served schools to identify challenges as well as successes in public charter schools. We strive for transparency and practical solutions that increase productivity and engagement. EduLove Consulting has been a staple for administrators, parents, and students as they strive for adequate and justifiable education by providing knowledge and communication from school to home. In addition, EduLove provides over 45 years of education expertise that suits the inner-city goal for success for all students.
Team Members	Monique Love - CEO, Master of Arts in Teaching, Master of Education with Building Administration Licensure, Bachelors in English with concentration in writing, and Associate Degree in General Studies. Professional Licensed Secondary Educator with 15+ years. Competencies include Secondary English Language Arts, Building Administration, At-risk Youth and Trauma Responsiveness, Community Stakeholder Buy-In, Teacher Evaluator for Effectiveness, Differentiated Instruction, Data-Driven Instruction, Student Engagement, Marginalized Communities, Restorative Justice Practitioner, Social-Emotional Wellness, and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Currently an Education Consultant, Literacy Director at MLK & Affiliated Professor. Licenses: State of Illinois Professional Educator's License (#2487909) Building Level Administration PreK-12, State of South Carolina Professional Educator's License (#294396) Building Level Administration PreK-12, and

	formerly State of Indiana Professional Educator's License (#10226836) Building Level Administration PreK-12. Mary Preston- Master of Education Leadership Administration, Master of Arts in Library Sciences, Bachelor of Science in General Studies, and Professional Licensed Administrator with 15+ years in school administration. Competencies include MTSS, Action-Minded Achievement, Adaptable to Systematic Change, Effective Communication Abilities, High Emotional Intelligence, Restorative Justice Practitioner, Social - Emotional Learning & Wellness, Transformational Professional Development, and Trauma-Informed Practitioner. Currently School Administrator with specialization in turnaround campuses with expertise in cultural and management strategies and formerly a Texas Fort Worth Administrator. Licenses: Texas Principal Certification PK-12, Texas School Library Science Certification PK-12, Texas Elementary Self-Contained Grades 1-6, Indiana Building Administrator Certification. Maxie Bolden - General Studies B.A. (Major), Minor English (Indiana University South Bend); Transition to Teaching Program - Bethel College. Competencies include the following: Finding Words (Indiana Department of Child Services); Foundations Reading Instruction; Restorative Justice Education (Peacekeeper and Conflict Resolution), The Writing Revolution, Conflict Resolution; Building Positive Relationships with families, Montessori and Student Engagement and Lesson creation with Measurable Goal Setting; Mr. Bolden has 20 years of experience with the South Bend Community School Corporation in the following positions: Teacher, Special Education Paraprofessional, Teacher's Aide, Tutoring. Mr. Bolden thrives in classroom management (social emotional lesson creation, curriculum design and pacing for the district. Mr. Bolden advocates for at-risk-children within the community by connecting students with resources. He is an expert in creating and instituting Behavior Intervention Plans and Behavior Management Solutions; Mr. Bolden has served as a Montessori instructor for lower elementary (1st- 3rd grade); Currently, he is a 6th - 8th grade instructor at Dickinson Fine Arts Academy. Teacher License (10001475) Dawn M. Jones - is a committed community advocate who has served in the South Bend, IN area for 30 years. Dawn Jones's commitment and competencies to public education is as follows: dedicated almost five terms, amounting to a total of 19 years, as a school board trustee for South Bend Community School Corporation. During her tenure, she served as president for two years, vice-president for two years, and secretary for three years. Mrs. Jones is an advocate for the establishment of a virtual professional academy, which enabled students to obtain certificates and dual credits from nearby colleges along with being a staunch proponent of Magnet Academies. As the Executive Director of YMCA Urban Youth Services, she has provided assistance to disadvantaged students, creating initiatives that expose them to the construction sector and higher education, achieving a graduation rate of 99%. Dawn initiated a collaboration between Manchester College, the Urban League of St. Joseph County, the Urban League of Fort Wayne, and LaCasa de Amistad. This collaboration offered scholarships to middle school students, enabling them to attend Manchester College. She is dedicated to championing the needs of the underprivileged population and enhancing public policy to adhere to their needs more effectively. Currently, Dawn is currently in pursuit of her Doctorate in Business Administration. Kirk Preston - is a committed Special Education Teacher with a decade of experience growing students in and out of the classroom as a teacher and a coach from Fort Worth, Texas, and currently Indianapolis. He holds a master's in project management, Keller Graduate School of Management, Irving, TX, 2005 and a Bachelor of Science, Telecommunications Management, DeVry University, Irving, TX, 2004. Mr. Preston's competencies include the development of Individual Education Plans (IEPs), building websites, classroom management and strategic advising via CHAMPS, Career and College Exploration, data tracking and trend analysis, co-
--	---

	teaching/parallel and small group, student relationship development, curriculum, and instruction development. Mr. Preston has served in the classroom in multiple facets and currently is employed in Special Education for Indianapolis Public Schools.
--	--

VanDeWalle Consulting	
Primary Contact	Luke VanDeWalle (317) 605-2571 luke@lukevandewalle.com Indianapolis, IN
Brief Description of Company	We believe all leaders have two fundamental responsibilities: results and relationships. If a leader only has relationships, he or she is not fulfilling the school's mission of educating students. If a leader only has results, the results will not endure as staff and/or families do not stay with the school. We believe charter leaders must build sustained and enduring results and relationships by growing leadership's effectiveness in four key areas: • Knowing the staff, students, and families as people, building exceptionally strong relationships so that communication can be direct and frequent. • Knowing what staff members do well and what they can do better by constantly talking about performance. • Setting short- and long-term growth goals that encourage staff to grow and improve. • Empowering staff to own the school's success by delegating and keeping decision-making close to the classroom.
Team Member Expertise	Luke VanDeWalle works with schools, principals, and executive directors to increase their academic results and build better relationships with staff, students, and families. Luke was the founding Chief Academic Officer of KIPP Delta Public Schools from 2011 to 2016 where the first six graduating classes had a college persistence rate of 76 percent. He was the Founding School Leader of KIPP Delta Collegiate High School which had 100% college-acceptance for its graduates and was ranked the No. 2 high school in Arkansas by U.S. News and World Report. The inaugural graduating class of KIPP Delta Collegiate had an average ACT score of a 24.7. Luke's AP Calculus class, which he taught as School Leader, had more African American students pass the exam than any other school in Arkansas. He and his wife have six children, ages 9-18. Cristina Urena is a passionate and dedicated educator who started her career as a teacher in Fifth Ward, Houston, TX, as a Teach for America (TFA) corps member in HISD. As a first-generation Dominican American and an English language learner, she has used her experience in education to help create transformational change in the lives of thousands of students. Cristina was exposed to a rigorous education once she became an Albert G. Oliver scholar, where she was prepped to gain acceptance into one of New York City's prestigious private high schools. She attended Columbia University as a Psychology major and earned her MEd from the University of St. Thomas. Cristina was named Teacher of the Year and held several leadership positions, including instructional coach, while in HISD. As an instructional coach through Career Pathways, her teachers earned Texas Education Agency distinctions due to the number of students exceeding state standards. She later joined Building Excellent Schools (BES) as a fellow to help found Étoile Academy Charter School (EACS), a K-8 district in Houston, on the premise that ALL students can learn regardless of their language gaps or financial status. She currently manages all EACS principals as the Chief Schools Officers to ensure we can give all students an excellent education. Kimbire McWhorter is a Speech-Language Pathologist with a deep dedication to enhancing the communication skills of children. With a diverse background spanning various educational and clinical settings, including school-based therapy, rehabilitative care, and early intervention programs, Kimbire brings extensive experience in evaluation, treatment, and collaboration in

	both special education and multi-language learners. Her commitment to ongoing learning, evidenced by her ASHA certification and proficiency in standardized measures, is matched only by her compassion, evident in her therapeutic approach emphasizing understanding and love. Outside of her profession, Kimbre finds joy in family, art, outdoor activities, and continual personal growth.
--	---

Will Street Education Services	
Primary Contact	Dr. Carlotta Coopridier 317-319-0994 drcoopridier@gmail.com Switchboard Office Space 735 Shelby Street Indianapolis, IN 46203
Brief Description of Company	Will Street Education Services is committed to drive meaningful changes in teaching and learning. All members of our team are currently active in educational settings, bringing real-time experience and relevance to their work. We're in schools every day – our team is made up of educators with real experience in real classrooms and school systems. We are rooted in evidence-informed, practice-based approaches that bridge theory into actional results. Our team is composed of seasoned education professionals with deep experience and proven results in classrooms and schools across urban, rural, and suburban communities. We offer a full suite of specialized services designed to build educator capacity, ignite student engagement, and turn vision into measurable impact. Drawing on our collective expertise in adult learning and school improvement, our team supports districts and schools in creating lasting change. Will Street Education Services is your partner in progress.
Team Members	Dr. Carlotta Coopridier is the founder of Will Street Education Services. She has led evaluation teams for the Tindley Network of Schools, Goodwill Education Initiatives, Herron Classical Schools network, Neighborhood Charter Network (Enlace), Adelante Schools, Hope Academy, The PATH School, and multiple IPS innovation schools. She is an accomplished educational leader with over 25 years of experience across K–12, higher education, and adult learning. She has held leadership roles at the national, state, and local levels, including as Founding Dean at Relay Graduate School of Education and Executive Director at Teach Plus. Carlotta specializes in strategic planning, instructional leadership, program innovation, and evaluation. She has successfully led charter school evaluations, launched alternative teacher certification programs, and developed career-focused mentorships for high school students. Her work has directly contributed to increases in student proficiency, teacher effectiveness, and school improvement outcomes. As a consultant, she partners with school districts to create action plans aligned to student achievement and organizational growth. Carlotta holds a doctorate in Adult, Higher, and Community Education from Ball State University and has served as faculty and advisor in teacher training programs. A recognized thought leader and advocate, she is deeply committed to equity, community partnerships, and transforming learning experiences for all students. Lidia M. Vidal is a bilingual educator and instructional leader with over a decade of experience serving students in grades K–8. She currently serves as an Assistant Principal in Residence at Global Preparatory Academy, where she has also worked as a Spanish teacher and instructional coach. Lidia began her teaching career in 2012 and has developed a reputation for building innovative, student-centered learning environments. She holds a bachelor's degree in Elementary Education from Universidad Pedagógica Nacional and is currently pursuing principal licensure through Butler University's Experiential Program for Preparing School Principals. A recipient of multiple teaching awards, including Latinx Teacher of the Year (2021) and GPA

	Teacher of the Year (2019), Lidia has been recognized for her dedication and impact. She is certified in Structured English Immersion and trained in Literacy Squared®, and she brings a strong focus on data-driven instruction and student culture. Her professional learning includes leadership development through Relay Graduate School of Education. Lidia is passionate about equitable education and empowering multilingual learners to thrive. Tina Seymour is a veteran principal and leadership coach with over 25 years of experience in urban education. She is the Founder and Executive Director of Strategic Learning Solutions, LLC, a consulting group that supports K–16 schools through professional development and leadership coaching. Tina served as principal of Northview Middle School in Indianapolis for seven years, where she led the school to become both an International Baccalaureate World School and a nationally recognized “School to Watch.” She also held administrative roles at Ben Davis High School, Indiana’s largest 10–12 high school. Tina began her education career in 1998 as a middle school language arts teacher and was part of the team that helped Speedway Junior High become an Indiana Four Star School. She has served as an adjunct professor and interim director for the EPPSP program at Butler University, mentoring future school leaders. Tina is also a leadership coach and facilitator for the Indiana New Administrator Leadership Institute (INALI). In 2020, she co-authored <i>Lead From the Start</i>, a practical guide for new principals, published by Solution Tree Press. Edgar Saucedo-Davila is a bilingual educator and instructional leader with over a decade of experience supporting multilingual learners and advancing equity in public education. He currently serves as a Spanish teacher and World Language Department Chair at Goshen Junior High School, where he leads curriculum development, professional learning, and department-wide assessments. Edgar also teaches in the English Language Learners Endorsement Program at Goshen College, preparing future educators to collaborate effectively and understand the impact of culture on language acquisition. He has previously served as ELL Department Chair at Goshen Middle School and has mentored teachers to improve instructional practices using student data and targeted strategies. Edgar’s leadership extends beyond the classroom through his participation in the Teach Plus Fellowship, where he contributed to state-level education policy and advocacy. He holds a Master of Arts in Intercultural Leadership and a BA in TESOL Education from Goshen College. His work is grounded in a strong commitment to inclusive education, academic excellence, and student advocacy. Edgar is also actively involved in the Latino Advisory Committee at Goshen College and is known for building collaborative learning communities that support student and teacher growth. Dr. Clete Ladd is a seasoned educator, community leader, and published author with over 30 years of experience serving diverse student populations from K–12 through adult education. He has held leadership roles across public, charter, and higher education institutions, including principal, director, dean, and professor. Dr. Ladd currently serves as a practicum supervisor and adjunct professor at the University of Phoenix and has taught at Martin University and Indiana University. His work emphasizes culturally responsive teaching, leadership development, and community engagement. He is the author of several books on African American male rites of passage and Black history and frequently presents at national and local conferences. Dr. Ladd has received numerous honors, including Congressional Recognition and Faculty of the Year from the University of Phoenix. He holds multiple degrees, including a Ph.D. in Comparative Religion and an Ed.S. in Higher Education Administration. A veteran of the Indiana Army National Guard and a passionate advocate for youth and equity, Dr. Ladd continues to empower educators and communities through scholarship and service. Kristi Mann is an experienced educator and workforce development leader with a strong background in both classroom instruction and strategic program design. She currently serves as
--	--

	Director of Education and Workforce Programs at Conexus Indiana, where she leads statewide improvement initiatives in dual credit and credential attainment. Kristi has over a decade of experience in high school instruction, curriculum development, and teacher coaching in both traditional public and charter schools. She served in leadership roles at Indianapolis Metropolitan High School, where she was a master teacher, school director, and instructional leader for a turnaround school. Kristi has taught business, social studies, and career preparation courses, and is passionate about increasing college and career readiness through real-world learning. She holds a master's in special education and a Transition to Teaching Certification from IUPUI, as well as a bachelor's degree in business from Indiana University. Her certifications span multiple content areas including CTE, mild intervention, and social studies. Kristi brings a unique combination of classroom expertise, business insight, and program leadership to every role she takes on. Gretchen Stullken is an experienced educator and instructional leader with over two decades of service supporting students from early childhood through adult education. She currently serves as the Tutoring Program Coordinator for the Fishers Youth Assistance Program, where she develops and manages community-based tutoring partnerships. Gretchen has held roles as a 1st and 2nd grade teacher, teacher leader, and academic tutor, always centering student growth and individualized learning. At Fishers High School, she supported students and families in the Guidance Office, managing enrollment and graduation tasks with empathy and professionalism. She has also served as a Teacher Leadership Coach with Teach Plus, where she coached educators on school improvement strategies and led professional development. Gretchen's work with adult learners' spans roles at The Excel Center and MSD Washington Township, where she supported GED preparation and humanities instruction. She holds a Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education and a professional educator's license with multiple certifications. With a deep understanding of curriculum alignment, relationship-building, and student-centered practices, Gretchen is passionate about ensuring all learners thrive across stages of life. D'Angelo McDade is a dynamic educator and strategic leader with a strong background in student support, school culture, and community engagement. He currently serves as the Associate Regional Director of Student Support at KIPP Indy Public Schools, where he leads region-wide initiatives in school climate, culture, and data-driven improvement. As a founding teacher and Grade Level Chair, he has helped shape inclusive learning environments through culturally responsive instruction in African American Literature. D'Angelo brings a unique blend of operational and instructional leadership, drawing on his prior experience as Director of the Chicago Peace Warriors, where he managed youth programming and community partnerships. He has also served as Assistant Director of Civic Engagement and Culture for North Lawndale College Prep, advancing restorative practices and student voice. Passionate about racial equity and holistic student success, he is a certified Mental Health First Aid responder and an accredited trainer in Kingian Nonviolence. He is completing a master's degree in Secondary Education through Relay Graduate School of Education. D'Angelo continues to lead with a focus on justice, instructional excellence, and sustainable school transformation. Ashley Swanson is a passionate educator and instructional leader with over a decade of experience in K–8 academic programming and literacy development. She currently serves as a Reading Interventionist at Enlace Academy, where she leads small group instruction grounded in the Science of Reading and is completing Orton-Gillingham training. Previously, she served as Director of Academics at an IPS Innovation School, overseeing curriculum design, assessments, and professional learning communities. Ashley began her career as a classroom teacher and instructional coach, earning recognition such as the Superintendent's Above & Beyond Award and Teacher of the Year. She holds a master's in educational leadership from Indiana University
--	--

	and is pursuing her ENL license from Marian University. Ashley is also the co-founder of Grain of Rice Project, a nonprofit organization supporting education and sustainability efforts in Kenya. Joli Williams is a dedicated instructional leader with over two decades of experience in K–12 education, specializing in student growth, culturally responsive practices, and teacher development. She currently serves as a Senior Instructional Fellow at Relay Graduate School of Education, where she supports graduate students across multiple states. Joli previously taught for 18 years in Washington Township and has served in leadership roles supporting student behavior, curriculum design, and equity-centered instruction. She is a certified Developmental Designs I Facilitator and has led professional development sessions across Indiana, including for AVID, PBS, and culturally responsive teaching. Joli has a strong track record of mentoring new teachers, building inclusive school cultures, and collaborating with community organizations. Her educational background includes degrees in history and education from Indiana University and Indiana Wesleyan University.
--	---