



Charter Renewal Report

School: Near West Intergenerational School

Contract Term: July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2024

Date: December 5, 2023

Final Score: 143.57/150

96%

Recommendation: Renew

Purpose of a Renewal Application and Process

Charter schools (also called community schools in Ohio) play a critical role in offering families quality school choice. In order to ensure that the school choices are indeed of high quality, charter schools must be held accountable for performance by their sponsors. A strong charter renewal process is critical to protect students and the public interest, and to protect charter school autonomy, by ensuring that schools are held to high standards of academic, financial, and organizational performance. The renewal process also provides the school an opportunity to present clear and compelling evidence demonstrating how it is serving its students and meeting contractual expectations in order to determine whether the school has earned renewal based on its performance record. While a school's past and current record of performance will be the primary focus of Cleveland Metropolitan School District's (CMSD's) renewal decision, the renewal process also provides an opportunity for each school to outline its future plans, priorities, and potential modifications to its charter if renewed.

Performance Framework as the Basis for Renewal

CMSD uses a Performance Framework that sets out expectations for each charter school as the basis for its renewal decisions. Charter schools must meet standards in that performance framework in order to have their charter renewed. The Performance Framework is included in the school's charter contract and includes academic, organizational, and financial standards. The contract renewal process examines a multitude of criteria to develop a comprehensive portrait of the school and considers the school's past, present, and future. The most important component of the process is reviewing the school's past performance on the frameworks. The academic performance of the school is considered most heavily, but each school also must meet financial and organizational performance standards in order to earn renewal.

Board of Education Policy Alignment with State and National Standards

CMSD's renewal process is guided by the CMSD Board of Education's Policy on Renewal, Nonrenewal, and Termination of Community School Sponsorship Contracts. Under the policy, the Board bases the contract renewal process and renewal decisions on a thorough analysis of a comprehensive body of objective evidence defined by the Performance Framework.

The Board's policy and the process it outlines are aligned with state and national standards for quality charter school sponsorship or authorizing. The process is designed to meet the Ohio Department of Education's (ODE) standards for Sponsor Quality Practices concerning the renewal process and renewal decision making,¹ including the following:

- The sponsor has an application process and requires all schools seeking renewal to apply through a written renewal application.
- The criteria for renewal are publicly available and include written guidance regarding the renewal application, as well as a timeline and specific criteria used to evaluate the application that considers multiple sources of evidence, both academic and non-academic, in a high-stakes review of the school's performance results over the term of its current contract.
- The sponsor only grants renewal to schools that are fiscally and organizationally viable, have achieved contractual academic targets, and are faithful to the non-academic terms of their contract.

Likewise, CMSD's Board policy and process are designed to meet national professional standards for the renewal process and renewal decision making set forth in the National Association of Charter School Authorizers' (NACSA)

¹ Ohio Department of Education Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric, Section E. Available [here](#).

Principles & Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing², including:

- *A quality authorizer:*
 - *Designs and implements a transparent and rigorous process that uses comprehensive academic, financial, and operational performance data to make merit-based renewal decisions*
 - *Requires any school seeking renewal to apply for it through a renewal application, which provides the school a meaningful opportunity and reasonable time to respond to the cumulative report; to correct the record, if needed; and to present additional evidence regarding its performance*

Overview of the Renewal Process

CMSD's renewal process is a multi-stage review of each school's performance, with the following stages:

Stage 1: Renewal Performance Report

During the first stage of the renewal process, CMSD prepares a renewal performance report for each school eligible for renewal. The renewal performance report constitutes CMSD's record of the charter school's academic, financial, and organizational performance over the contract term in relation to the criteria for renewal and the school's obligations as outlined in its charter contract. The report states the authorizer's summative findings concerning the school's performance and its prospects for renewal. Schools will have an opportunity in the next stage to comment on the renewal performance report and to propose corrections or submit additional contextual information to supplement the record.

Stage 2: Charter Renewal Application

The second stage of the process requires the school to prepare and submit this Renewal Application. The application is aligned with the performance expectations set forth in the charter contract and provides schools with the opportunity to augment, or if needed correct, their performance record as reflected in the Renewal Performance Report. The Renewal Application also provides an opportunity to outline the school's future plans, priorities, and potential modifications to its charter if renewed. However, the school's past and current record of performance, and not its future plans or promises, will be the primary focus of CMSD's renewal decision.

Stage 3: Site Visit, Collecting of Additional Information, and Renewal Application Analysis

In the third stage of the process, CMSD will conduct a renewal site visit to each school applying for renewal. The site visit will include meetings with key school personnel and governing authority members, and CMSD will produce a report based on the site visit. CMSD will analyze the school's application using renewal criteria.

Stage 4: Renewal Recommendations Presented to CMSD Board, and Decisions Made in Public Meeting

Once all information has been collected, analyzed, and synthesized, CMSD staff will prepare a renewal recommendation for each school and present it to the CMSD Board of Education. Staff will only recommend schools for renewal that earn at least 66 percent of possible points on the application, which is at least 99 out of 150. Each school will receive its renewal recommendation prior to its being made public. The renewal recommendation may include comments from the school or information supplemental to CMSD's findings, if the school offers any. CMSD's Charter Schools Office will present each renewal recommendation to the CMSD Board, and the Board's decision to renew or not renew a charter will be made in a public meeting.

² National Association of Charter School Authorizers' (NACSA) Principles & Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing. Available [here](#).

Stage 5: Renewal or Non-Renewal Next Steps

If the renewal is approved, the school will begin negotiating its next charter contract with CMSD, and the Renewal Application will help guide discussions regarding adjustments to be made in the new contract. If the renewal is denied, CMSD will proceed consistent with state law and ODE standards that govern sponsors on charter school appeal of a non-renewal decision and on non-renewal or termination. (See Ohio Revised Code section 3314.07).

Please note that Ohio law prohibits a charter school whose contract is terminated or non-renewed for failure to meet generally accepted standards of fiscal management, or for failure to meet student performance requirements, from entering into a contract with any other sponsor. (See Ohio Revised Code section 3314.07 (B) (5)).

Overview of Scoring

The Renewal Application is divided into four sections, each of which is assigned weighting and a methodology for scoring. To be considered for approval, applicants must earn at least 66%. **Please note, however, that earning the minimum percentage of required points is not automatically sufficient to guarantee a recommendation for renewal.**

The sections and their assigned point values are:

- Section A, the Performance Review, is worth 140 points total. Up to 50 points may be earned for section A1 (Academic Performance), and up to 45 points each for sections A2 (Financial Performance) and A3 (Organizational Performance). CMSD will provide this section of the application in the form of the final renewal performance report by September 29, 2023.
- Section B, Renewal Site Visit, is worth up to 10 points.
- Section C is not scored but affords the applicant an opportunity to reflect on the data that were included in the renewal performance report and address any challenges the school faced and how it overcame them as well as address financial performance and any applicable corrective actions.
- Section D, Future Plans, is not scored. The section gives the applicant an opportunity to provide important information that is relevant to the school's next contract term, if any.

A. Performance Review (140 points)

Section A is an assessment of the school's performance on the Performance Framework (Attachment 4 of the charter contract) during the school's current contract term. CMSD provided the data for this section in the form of the renewal performance report.

A1. Academic Performance (50 points)

CMSD has assessed the school's performance based on the Academic Performance Framework and has provided an analysis of the school's academic performance over the term of the charter contract in the school's renewal performance report.

| Year | Standards Met | Standards |
|----------|---------------|-----------|
| 2019-20* | 1 | 1 |
| 2020-21* | 1 | 1 |
| 2021-22 | 5 | 5 |
| 2022-23 | 7 | 7 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 12 |
| POINTS | 50 | |

*Attendance indicator only. Not included in calculations due to accountability changes during the pandemic.

A2. Financial Performance (45 points)

CMSD has been assessing the school's financial performance monthly, quarterly, and annually in accordance with the Financial Performance Framework and has provided the school with monthly reviews and feedback on the school's latest enrollment and financial records. CMSD also has provided an analysis of the school's financial performance over the term of the charter in the school's renewal performance report.

| Year | Standards Met | Standards |
|---------|---------------|-----------|
| 2019-20 | 7 | 7 |
| 2020-21 | 7 | 7 |
| 2021-22 | 6 | 7 |
| 2022-23 | 6 | 7 |
| TOTAL | 26 | 28 |
| POINTS | 41.79 | |

A3. Organizational Performance (45 points)

CMSD has been assessing the school's performance on the Organizational Performance Framework. CMSD also has provided an analysis of the school's organizational performance over the term of the charter contract in the school's renewal performance report.

| Year | Standards Met | Standards |
|---------|---------------|-----------|
| 2019-20 | 4.95 | 5 |
| 2020-21 | 5 | 5 |
| 2021-22 | 5 | 5 |
| 2022-23 | 4.95 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 19.9 | 20 |
| POINTS | 44.78 | |

Scoring for this section:

CMSD will add the number of performance indicators met over the contract term, and the resulting number will be divided by the number of possible points for that area over the contract term. The resulting fraction will be multiplied by the number of points available for that section (e.g., academics is worth 50 points).

The overall score for Section A would be based on the combined points earned from the three categories (Academic, Financial, and Organization).

B. Renewal Site Visit (10 points)

As part of the charter renewal process, CMSD conducts renewal site visits aligned to the standards to augment evidence collected through the Performance Framework. The renewal site visit is designed to help evaluate objectively the success of the school, whether it is meeting its mission to provide a high-quality public education to its students, and what the outlook for the school’s performance may be if it is granted a new contract. The site visits are conducted to ensure a thorough review of each school and to provide an opportunity to see the school in action. For this reason, site visits will be planned with reference to each school’s renewal performance report and may differ in length, scope, and depth based on the school’s past performance and current standing with CMSD. Areas explored may include, but need not be limited to, school and school community culture, leadership, instruction, support for all learners, professional development, and organizational reflection and planning.

Scoring for this Section:

Site visits will utilize a rubric, to be shared with the schools prior to the visit, and schools will receive ratings across different components, as well as an overall numerical rating, based on how much the site visit inspires confidence that the school currently is engaging in, and/or is likely to engage in, a range of effective practices that are likely to accomplish the school’s mission and fulfill the terms of a future charter contract, including the Performance Framework. The points awarded for this section will range from 0 to 10, based on the renewal site visit rubric.

Rated Quality Standards

Quality Standard 1: The Quality of Instructional Practices (Classroom Climate) – meets expectations (1.5)

Quality Standard 2: The Quality of Instructional (Purposeful Teaching) – meets expectations (1.5)

Quality Standard 3: The Quality of Students’ Supports – approaches expectations (1.0)

Quality Standard 4: The Quality of Educators’ Supports – meets expectations (1.5)

Quality Standard 5: The Quality of School Leadership and Management – meets expectations (1.5)

Overall Renewal Site Visit Score: 7/10

C. Closer Look (Unscored)

Section C comprises three components: Reflection on Current Term, the Status Update on Financial Performance, and the Status Update on Remedial Action Plans.

Section C is unscored but affords the applicant an opportunity to correct what it believes to be any errors in the renewal performance report and/or to provide additional contextual information that the applicant believes will help CMSD better understand the data from the Performance Review and evaluate the application.

C1. Reflection on Current Term

The applicant should use the renewal performance report as a guide for its responses and submit only a) proposed corrections to what it believes is erroneous information in the report, or b) evidence of performance related to the Performance Framework that is not already included in the renewal performance report and/or that CMSD may not have and that the applicant believes will assist CMSD in better understanding, or placing into context, the data contained in the Performance Review. Responses should reference the specific criteria and benchmarks in the Performance Framework to which the supplemental information applies.

Such responses may include, but need not be limited to, information about interim assessments or progress reports; evidence of performance on school- or mission-specific goals; and improvements undertaken at the school, along with evidence of progress for any areas in which the school has not previously met or is not currently meeting the performance standard.

Responses should not include anecdotal information or evidence that is not relevant to the school's academic, financial, or organizational performance and the school's performance expectations as defined by CMSD's Performance Framework and the school's charter contract.

Although this section of the application is not assigned points, it still could prove very significant for the applicant. Again, achieving the minimum threshold of points does not guarantee a recommendation for renewal. In addition, the fullest amount of information on the school may factor into determinations about what length of contract term a renewed school will receive, as well as about what the other terms of the subsequent charter contract may include.

Scoring for this Section:

This section is not worth any points and will not be scored.

Notes/Questions from Renewal Team:

- The school noted a thoughtful approach to using their internal data to identify areas for improvement and acting upon them.
- The school noted changes over the years in commitment to its multiage model, and discussed efforts to recommit to this by supporting educators.
- The school reviewed their efforts post-pandemic to rebuild the intergenerational communities that are a key part of their model.

C2. Status Update on Financial Performance (Unscored)

This section will be based on CMSD's review of the school's most recent financial reports and records as are available from the current school year. CMSD will seek assurance that the school is on solid financial footing and that it is current in meeting its liabilities, including but not limited to payroll taxes, debt service payments, and employee benefits. In order to make this determination, CMSD may request additional information from the school to supplement the records it already possesses.

Scoring for this Section:

Under the Performance Framework, in order for the school to be considered for contract renewal, any area of

concern must be addressed with sufficient documentation, as determined by CMSD, demonstrating short- and long-term financial viability.

If the school enters into a new remedial action plan during the renewal process, CMSD will factor this into the renewal decision.

C3. Status Update on Remedial Action Plans (Unscored)

In this section, the school submits an update on its implementation of any still incomplete remedial action plan that was required of the school by CMSD under the Intervention Protocol in the school's contract. If you are unsure whether your school is, or should be, on a remedial action plan, please contact CMSD Executive Director of Charter Schools Matthew Rado at Matthew.Rado@clevelandmetroschools.org.

Please explain:

1. The circumstances that gave rise to the notice of breach and the remedial action plan;
2. The school's progress so far in implementing the remedial action plan;
3. The outlook and timeline for completion of the plan; and
4. What measures the school has taken to prevent the circumstances that gave rise to the remedial action plan, including specifically any actions or measures taken by the governing authority board.

Scoring for this Section:

Under the Performance Framework, in order for the school to be considered for contract renewal, any area of concern must be resolved or the school must be making acceptable progress on completing any current remedial action plan. In addition, in order for the school to be considered for contract renewal, it is expected to have no outstanding notice of breach or concern for which it has failed to submit a remedial action plan that has been approved by CMSD.

If the school enters into a new remedial action plan during the renewal process, CMSD will factor this into the renewal decision.

Notes/Questions from Renewal Team: The school has no remedial action plans.

D. Future Plans (Unscored)

Section D provides the school an opportunity to discuss its proposed plans for the term of the next charter contract. In particular, this section gives the applicant an opportunity to identify any significant changes it envisions for the school during the new contract term, as well as its plans for addressing any significant performance and operational challenges it has faced during the current contract term.

Schools should identify any anticipated changes to the school's educational program, governance model, and financial outlook and should include any other proposed changes that would require modification of a material provision in the school's charter contract and/or that are likely to impact the school's academic or organizational success or its financial sustainability. As a general rule, the school should identify any changes that are relevant or significant with respect to the performance outcomes that the school has agreed to meet or are otherwise relevant to the school's renewal and continued authorization and operation as a public charter school.

Examples of significant changes could include changes in the ages and grades of students the school proposes to serve or the characteristics of the students the school expects to attract; a shift in the focus of the curriculum; changes to delivery by in-person, virtual, or blended instruction; anticipated changes to the school's financial position or the financial impact of any significant proposed modifications to school's education program and operations; changes to the school governance, leadership, or staffing model, or any proposed changes to the

management of the school, including the school’s relationship with a third-party charter management organization or other education service provider; or changes to the school’s facility needs, status, or location.

CMSD may request additional information to sufficiently assess the impact of, and plan for, such proposed changes. Even if the school’s proposed changes would not occur until several years into the next charter contract term, the applicant should outline them here.

Contractual provisions are subject to approval by CMSD consistent with CMSD policy and state law. Failure to provide requested or otherwise relevant information, or failure to identify a material modification that is likely to raise contractual issues and/or to impact the school’s academic or organizational success or its financial sustainability, may be grounds for non-renewal and termination of the school’s charter. If the school has any questions about whether particular information or a proposed change should be included, please contact CMSD’s Charter Schools Office prior to submitting this application.

Regardless of whether a school anticipates or proposes any changes significant enough to potentially impact the school’s performance success and/or to warrant consideration of contract terms, the applicant should use this section to reflect upon its current contract term and identify any significant performance and operational challenges the school has faced and continues to face. Looking forward, the applicant should identify any new challenges it anticipates in the coming contract term. For each challenge identified, the applicant should indicate what strategies it proposes to employ during the next contract term to address the challenge and what degree of success it anticipates in overcoming the challenge.

If the school’s application for renewal is approved, the plans presented in this response will inform the drafting of relevant sections of the charter contract for the new term.

Scoring for this Section:

This section is unscored. CMSD expects that the school will thoughtfully and candidly identify, and propose well thought-out and credible strategies for addressing, current and anticipated performance and operational challenges. If applicable, this would include the applicant’s identification of significant changes to important aspects of the school’s operation and/or charter contract provisions in a new contract term.

Notes/Questions from Renewal Team:

- The school discussed their efforts with the support of an outside consultant to develop new school improvement plans for all three of their schools.
- The team noted a lack of instructional goals in this section.
- The team is concerned about the sustainability of the academic and DEI plans.
- The team is interested in learning more about the status of the new teacher scope and sequence.

Overall Score Summary Table

| Section | Earned Points | Possible Points |
|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| Academic Performance | 50 | 50 |
| Financial Performance | 41.79 | 45 |
| Organizational Performance | 44.78 | 45 |
| Renewal Site Visit | 7 | 10 |
| Total | 143.57 | 150 |

Recommendation

Based on the performance data and additional information summarized above, and on the school's overall renewal application score of 143.57 out of 150 points possible, the reviewers recommend CMSD's renewal of Near West Intergenerational School for a new sponsorship contract term.



Charter Renewal Site Visit Report

Near West Intergenerational School

November 2023

Review Information:

As part of the charter renewal process, CMSD conducts renewal site visits aligned to the standards to augment evidence collected through the Performance Framework. The renewal site visit is designed to help evaluate objectively the success of the school, whether it is meeting its mission to provide a high-quality public education to its students, and what the outlook for the school's performance may be if it is granted a new contract. The site visits are conducted to ensure a thorough review of each school and to provide an opportunity to see the school in action. For this reason, site visits will be planned with reference to each school's renewal performance report and may differ in length, scope, and depth based on the school's past performance and current standing with CMSD. Areas explored may include, but need not be limited to, school and school community culture, leadership, instruction, support for all learners, professional development, and organizational reflection and planning.

The CMSD Renewal Site Visit took place at Near West Intergenerational School on November 6, 2023 from 7:00 am to 4:30 pm. The site visit was conducted by a team of educational consultants (Toni Cross and Mary McCool Berry) and by a CMSD School Quality Manager (Meagan Coggins). The site visit team collected evidence through interviews with key stakeholders, observations of classrooms, and a review of various school documents. The team conducted focus groups with school leaders, board members, classroom teachers, families, and 28 students. The team observed instruction in 14 classrooms and reviewed various school documents.

Team Reviewer: Mary McCool Berry, *Educational Consultant*

Team Reviewer: Toni Cross, *Educational Consultant*

Team Reviewer: Meagan Coggins, *CMSD*

Rated Quality Standards

Quality Standard 1: The Quality of Instructional Practices (Classroom Climate) – meets expectations (1.5)

Quality Standard 2: The Quality of Instructional (Purposeful Teaching) – meets expectations (1.5)

Quality Standard 3: The Quality of Students’ Supports – approaches expectations (1.0)

Quality Standard 4: The Quality of Educators’ Supports – meets expectations (1.5)

Quality Standard 5: The Quality of School Leadership and Management – meets expectations (1.5)

Overall Renewal Site Visit Score: 7/10

Strengths

The school reflects a safe and trustworthy professional climate. Teachers consistently described positive relationships with each other and an environment in which they can readily seek and receive support. Teachers frequently reported how their colleagues support them, such as offering suggestions to develop a classroom culture or being supportive of each other personally. Teachers also frequently expressed feeling appreciated and supported by school leaders. Teachers reported that they feel comfortable approaching school leaders for feedback, and that the feedback provided by the principal was frequently helpful in developing their instructional practice.

Classroom interactions are cooperative and conducive to learning. The site visit team observed classroom norms and routines implemented across classrooms. In many of these classrooms, these routines support students’ sharing of their learning and understandings. Site visit team members also observed teachers’ responsiveness to student’s nonacademic needs, e.g., in several classrooms, there was an opportunity for students to take a break or to engage with the teacher around social and emotional learning.

Opportunities for Growth

The school does not have a coherent, comprehensive, and aligned English Language Arts (ELA) curriculum. The instructional materials for Kindergarten, Grade 1, and Grade 2 of Units of Study (Lucy Calkins & TCRWP Colleagues) do not meet curriculum expectations and are not in alignment with the science of reading. The texts included in the materials are not appropriately complex for the grade level and do not build in complexity over the course of the year. Materials do not include questions and tasks aligned to grade-level standards, but rather focus on strategy instruction. Additionally, materials rely on cueing, including meaning, syntax, and visual cues to teach reading skills. Foundational skills instruction lacks a cohesive and intentional scope and sequence for systematic and explicit instruction in phonological awareness and phonics. The program also lacks a research-based rationale for the order of phonological awareness and phonics instruction.

A culture of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) is informally emerging at the school. School staff shared various interpretations of how they value diversity, equity, and inclusion. Some teachers shared that DEI was not an issue because kindness is a value of the school, while others mentioned everyone is accepted for who they are. Leaders and teachers both discussed the importance of using multicultural reading materials that reflect student backgrounds. Leaders also discussed the importance of unpacking biases; however, teachers did not share this or identify related professional learning opportunities that have taken place in this academic year. A few teachers noted a network-level training that took place before 2021, but when asked, teachers could not name any structures that they have consistently implemented because of the training. Additionally, school staff were not able to name targeted practices designed to improve outcomes when looking at data for different subgroups. Pushing for a shared understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion – and then implementing policies to formalize beliefs that are informally shared across stakeholders at the school is an area of opportunity to leverage.

Quality Standard 1: Instructional Practices (Classroom Climate)

In this quality standard the school the school **meets expectations**

The main strengths within this standard:

- The classroom environment is responsive and respectful. When observing instruction, the site visit team noticed that many classrooms had behavior expectations that were understood by most students; in these classrooms behavior did not interrupt instruction or teacher redirection was effective when addressing minor misbehaviors.
- In some classrooms, teachers implemented strategies for students' cognitive engagement, such as having students explain their work to a partner or class, giving students opportunities to lead a partnered assignment, or having students justify their thinking when formatively assessed.

The most significant areas of opportunity within this standard:

- Learning time was not consistently maximized across classrooms, in some rooms students were engaged in only a portion of the academic tasks in each lesson and would spend other time disengaged working on a non-academic task or walking around the classroom. In some instances, teachers successfully redirected or used a buddy room, in other instances, students lost significant learning time.

Improvement strategies that could be considered:

- Ensure all teachers can access the consistent feedback cycle for coaches to observe all classes with an identified need and collect evidence of learning within lessons; differentiate PD or provide extra teacher opt-in workshops around learning time OR an identified area of need.

Quality Standard 2: Instructional Practices (Purposeful Teaching)

In this quality standard the school **meets expectations**.

The main strengths within this standard:

- Students engage in academic discourse when working in groups, with a partner, or 1:1 with the teacher. In many classrooms, students explain the task they are working on and how they got to the answer.

The most significant areas of opportunity within this standard:

- During whole group activities, there was less opportunity for students to engage in learning for the duration of the lesson. For example, in some classes one student answered the question and had a dialogue with the instructor while the other students listened passively or began to take their focus off of the teacher; not all students were redirected back into learning.
- Checks for understanding and formative assessments were inconsistently implemented across classrooms.

Improvement strategies that could be considered:

See Quality Standard 1

Quality Standard 3: Students' Supports

In this quality standard the school **meets expectations**.

The main strength within this standard:

- The school provides a safe environment to support students' learning. Leaders, teachers, and families all reported that the school is a safe place for teaching and learning. Leaders and teachers explained the systems that are in place for physical safety including a secure building, clear dismissal procedures, and adults who prioritize student wellbeing. In addition, leaders and teachers noted that the entire staff is trained in the responsive classroom model and that there are consistent behavioral expectations across the school. Moreover, teachers and leaders reported a heavy focus across the school on social-emotional learning (SEL). To this end, teachers and leaders explained that the school has a counselor who runs a social and emotional learning block for all grades to participate in on a rotating four-week cycle.
- School staff employ strategies to ensure effective communication and collaboration with all students' families. When asked, all families reported they were able to get in contact with the school via the openness of school leaders or directly with their student's teacher(s). Families mentioned the use of Bloomz or Powerschool as a method of effective communication with the school.

The most significant areas of opportunity within this standard:

- DEI is not yet embedded in policy or systems at the school or network level, there is a vested interest from school staff, to leverage these mindsets to create concrete policies and shared understandings of equity and inclusion would push the work forward.

Improvement strategies that could be considered:

- While on-site administration has created a culture of safety, kind candidness, and learning for staff, there is a schism of communication between staff and network-level admin. Experiences are not consistent, and teacher voice could be better leveraged in the development of quality professional development experiences.

Quality Standard 4: Educators' Supports

In this quality standard the school **meets expectations.**

The main strengths within this standard:

- Professional Development (PD) and community involvement is aligned to network goals including returning back to cluster and multi-age education. Teachers and leaders noted community meetings visits to other IG schools, sophomore service from a neighboring high school, and middle school students assisting with lunch and other moments of the school day for the elementary school students. The PD scope and sequence is aligned to network priorities.

The most significant areas of opportunity within this standard:

- PD does not intently include instruction; teacher feedback on PD is not applied at the network level and all teachers do not consider PD as helpful in improving their instructional practice. Teachers reported that many PDs are in response to issues that are not relevant to their school or is not differentiated for teachers who are not new to the field.
- Building coaches are not as available or present for coaching at the school, some teachers looking for more direct instructional coaching, and though there is a system, they do not always have access to it.

Improvement strategies that could be considered:

- Network-level coaching to be more widely and consistently available to teaching staff who request it.
- Include teacher voice and feedback in network-level professional development, specifically around curriculum and instruction.
- Conduct a needs assessment for teaching and learning that identifies key teaching and planning skills and design a tiered approach to adult learning within the school/network that allows teachers to scaffold their own learning, collaborate with colleagues, plan vertically, and observe model teachers.

Quality Standard 5: School Leadership and Management

In this quality standard the school **meets expectations.**

The main strengths within this standard:

- School leaders regularly observe the quality of instruction and provide regular, meaningful, and timely feedback that teachers report has helped to improve their instructional practice.
- School leaders promote a collaborative learning structure where teachers are able to collaborate with others and leverage their personal expertise to improve the school. For example, teachers have the opportunity to lead some elements of school-based PD.

The most significant areas of opportunity within this standard:

- The ELA curriculum is not aligned with state standards. See Page 1, Opportunities for Growth.
- The integration of science and social studies into the core curriculum is absent in grades K-4.

Improvement strategies that could be considered:

- The addition of an ELA curriculum that aligns with state standards and the science of reading expectations.
- The addition of social studies and science to the elementary level students would be within the mission of the institution to provide scholars with academic skills to excel at learning and citizenship and be prepared to enter high school with a well-rounded foundation.