

Title 10: Education Institutions and Agencies

Part 404: Board Policies

Part 404 Chapter 1 Performance Framework

Rule 1.1 Performance Framework Policy. The Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board (MCSAB or Board) has the responsibility of making sure charter schools provide an excellent education for Mississippi public school students. The Board also acknowledges that charter schools need independence in order to develop and apply the policies and educational strategies that maximize their effectiveness. The Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework (Performance Framework) balances these two considerations as the primary accountability mechanism for all charter schools authorized by the MCSAB.

The MCSAB is accountable for implementing a rigorous and fair oversight process that respects the autonomy that is vital to charter school success. The Performance Framework helps the Board fulfill this responsibility by providing:

- Clear standards and expectations for schools
- A transparent, consistent oversight process that is respectful of school autonomy
- A focus on student outcomes and not on inputs

Source: Miss Code Ann, § 37-28-29, 37-28-31



CHARTER SCHOOL PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

BOARD APPROVED ~ March 2024

Table of Contents

- A. Introduction 3
- B. Academic Performance Framework6
- C. Academic Performance Framework Internal Companion Guidance 24
- D. Financial Performance Framework 34
- E. Financial Performance Framework Internal Companion Guidance..... 52
- F. Organizational Performance Framework..... 59
- G. Organizational Performance Framework Internal Companion Guidance 90
- H. Annual Performance Framework Report Template 112
- I. Intervention Ladder 137
- J. Statement of Assurance.....140

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Introduction



Introduction

The Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board (MCSAB or Board) has the responsibility of making sure charter schools provide an excellent education for Mississippi public school students. The Board also acknowledges that charter schools need independence in order to develop and to apply the policies and educational strategies that maximize their effectiveness. The Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework (Performance Framework) balances these two considerations as the primary accountability mechanism for all charter schools authorized by the MCSAB.

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) functions as a resource for federal education requirements, special education compliance, and funding for charter schools. However, the MCSAB is accountable for implementing a rigorous and fair oversight process that respects the autonomy that is vital to charter school success. The Performance Framework helps the Board fulfill this responsibility by providing:

- Clear standards and expectations for schools
- A transparent, consistent oversight process that is respectful of school autonomy
- A focus on student outcomes, not inputs

Background

The MCSAB first released the Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework through the Board's creation in 2013. This revised performance framework takes into consideration the valuable input of Mississippi's stakeholders—including school leaders and representatives, community advocates, and external experts. The Board invites Mississippi's charter schools to be partners in the continuous improvement of the Performance Framework, as it remains a dynamic process subject to continuous review and improvement.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Introduction



Guiding Criteria for the MCSAB Performance Framework

The content of the framework is guided by the following criteria:

Research-motivated	Measurable
Stakeholder Agreement	Aligned

- Research-motivated: There is strong theory and empirical evidence to support the use of the performance indicator
- Measurable: Data are available and accessible to measure and track progress on the performance indicator
- Stakeholder Agreement: Stakeholders prioritize the performance indicators and agree that a school could impact the performance indicators
- Aligned: Indicators are aligned to Miss Code Ann. § 37-28-29, national best practices, and the charter contract

Using Information from the Performance Framework

MCSAB will use the information from the Performance Framework for multiple purposes and activities:

- Providing each school with a complete Annual Performance Framework Report
- Communicating clear information so all stakeholders can understand where Mississippi's charter schools are meeting or exceeding standards, and where they are failing to achieve key performance standards
- Capturing comprehensive information for data-driven charter renewal determinations, in combination with other materials
- Differentiating monitoring and oversight based on each school's performance
- Offering incentives for high-performing charter schools that regularly achieve their academic, financial soundness, and organizational performance standards
- Providing objective information for students and families who want to learn more about the charter schools in their community

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Introduction



Framework Structure

The Performance Framework is comprised of three performance areas:

1. Academic Performance
2. Financial Performance
3. Organizational Performance

Determination of Charter School Performance

MCSAB will use each section of the framework as a stand-alone performance evaluation tool; therefore, each school will receive a separate, overall rating for Academic Performance, Financial Performance, and Organizational Performance. MCSAB will exercise a high degree of professional judgment to evaluate evidence, assign ratings, and assess the overall academic, financial, and organizational health of a school. The Performance Framework serves as a tool to assist MCSAB in monitoring and decision-making and is meant to complement, not replace, the critical role of professional judgment in determining overall charter school performance.

Dissemination of Information

To ensure the integrity of the accountability model, MCSAB will adhere to the following business rules for dissemination of results from the Performance Framework evaluation:

- As soon as practical after receipt of the necessary data, schools will receive Academic, Financial, and Organizational Annual Performance Framework reports, Framework Excel workbooks, and backup documentation for review. Within fifteen (15) business days of receipt, written evidence must be submitted for any factual errors identified.
- The finalized report in PDF format and Framework Excel workbooks will be the official sole source documentation retained and published by MCSAB.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Academic Performance Framework

The MCSAB academic performance framework is a multi-measure framework that provides information about whether the charter school's education program results in high student outcomes. The academic performance framework indicators, measures, metrics, and cut scores are designed to (1) align to but not be limited to the measures defined by the Mississippi Charter School Law, (2) include outcome measures covering the full span of grade levels offered by a school, (3) include measures where publicly available data are available and easy to use in calculations, and (4) use comparisons to the geographic district, where available, to provide information about relative performance.

The academic performance framework is comprised of seven indicators:

1. State Accountability
2. Academic Proficiency
3. Academic Growth
4. Academic Gap
5. Academic Readiness
6. Postsecondary Readiness
7. School-Specific [OPTIONAL]

Each indicator within the academic performance framework includes measures and metrics. Measures and metrics provide the details to evaluate the indicator.

Ratings

The academic performance framework includes a rubric with rating criteria and cut scores for each metric that indicate the metric performance targets associated with four ratings:

1. Exceeds Expectations
2. Meets Expectations

Academic Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



3. Approaches Expectations
4. Fails to Meet Expectations

Weights

The academic performance framework assigns weights to indicators and measures based on the importance of the indicators and weights. The weights may vary based on the grade configuration of the charter school and data availability (note: more information about the weights can be found in the academic performance framework workbook).

Calculating an Overall Academic Performance Rating

Academic performance framework data are collected, scored, and aggregated based on the following steps:

1. Collect data for each metric based on internal companion guidance
2. Enter data in academic performance framework workbook
3. Verify data with charter schools
4. Score metric data based on rating criteria and cut scores
5. Take average of data scores within a metric to produce measure score
6. Multiply measure score by measure weights to produce weighted measure subscores (weights based on grade configuration and data availability)
7. Add weighted measure subscores within indicators to produce weighted indicator scores
8. Divide weighted indicator scores by indicator weights to produce indicator scores (weights based on grade configuration and data availability)
9. Add indicator scores to produce overall academic performance framework score that corresponds to a rating

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 1: State Accountability

Measure 1(a): School Grade

This measure evaluates the official letter grade assigned to all public schools as calculated by MDE.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(1a) School Letter Grade	Letter Grade (A-F)	F	D	B-C	A

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
MS Succeeds Report Card	All	All	3-8, HS

Cut Score Notes:

- Cut score ranges based on prior academic performance framework scoring

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 2: Academic Proficiency

Measure 2(a): MAAP Proficiency, Overall

This measure evaluates the difference in overall academic proficiency between charter schools and the geographic school district in which the school is located.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(2a) MAAP Proficiency, Overall	Percent of students scoring PL4 (Proficient) or PL5 (Advanced)	20 percentage points or more below geographic district average	19 percentage points or less below geographic district average	Equal to or up to 19 percentage points above geographic district average	20 percentage points or more above geographic district average

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
1. Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) 2. MDE fall enrollment count	All	English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics, Science, Algebra I, Biology I, English II, and US History	3-8, HS

Cut Score Notes:

- Cut scores based on an analysis of historical MAAP proficiency and growth data for three years of data (2016-17 - 2018-19)
- The analysis used overall and subgroup data by grade level to examine the distribution of differences between school and geographic district or state averages, testing cut score options with the district or state average serving as the floor of the Meets Expectations category
- The range of 20 percent around the district average allowed for the most differentiation between schools

Academic Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 2: Academic Proficiency

Measure 2(b): MAAP Proficiency, Subgroup

This measure evaluates the difference in subgroup academic proficiency between charter schools and the geographic school district in which the school is located.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(2b) MAAP Proficiency, Subgroup	Percent of students scoring PL4 (Proficient) or PL5 (Advanced)	20 percentage points or more below geographic district average	19 percentage points or less below geographic district average	Equal to or up to 19 percentage points above geographic district average	20 percentage points or more above geographic district average

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
1. Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) 2. MDE fall enrollment count	Subgroups (gender, race, poverty, special education, English learner)	English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics, Science, Algebra I, Biology I, English II, and US History	3-8, HS

Cut Score Notes:

- Cut scores based on an analysis of historical MAAP proficiency and growth data for three years of data (2016-17 - 2018-19)
- The analysis used overall and subgroup data by grade level to examine the distribution of differences between school and geographic district or state averages, testing cut score options with the district or state average serving as the floor of the Meets Expectations category
- The range of 20 percent% around the district average allowed for the most differentiation between schools

Academic Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 3: Academic Growth

Academic Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 3: Academic Growth

Measure 3(a): MAAP Growth, Overall

This measure evaluates the difference in overall weighted average growth percent, the growth measure for the state assessment, between charter schools and the geographic school district in which the school is located.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(3a) MAAP Growth, Overall	Weighted average growth percent	20 percentage points or more below geographic district average	19 percentage points or less below geographic district average	Equal to or up to 19 percentage points above geographic district average	20 percentage points or more above geographic district average

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
1. Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) 2. MDE fall enrollment count	All	English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics	3-8, HS

Cut Score Notes:

- Cut scores based on an analysis of historical MAAP proficiency and growth data for three years of data (2016-17 - 2018-19)
- The analysis used overall and subgroup data by grade level to examine the distribution of differences between school and geographic district or state averages, testing cut score options with the district or state average serving as the floor of the Meets Expectations category
- The range of 20 percent around the district average allowed for the most differentiation between schools

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 3: Academic Growth

Measure 3(b): MAAP Growth, Subgroup

Academic Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 3: Academic Growth

Measure 3(b): MAAP Growth, Subgroup

This measure evaluates the difference in subgroup weighted average growth percent, the growth measure for the state assessment, between charter schools and the geographic school district in which the school is located.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(3a) MAAP Growth, Subgroup	Weighted average growth percent	20 percentage points or more below geographic district average	19 percentage points or less below geographic district average	Equal to or up to 19 percentage points above geographic district average	20 percentage points or more above geographic district average

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
1. Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) 2. MDE fall enrollment count	Subgroups (gender, race, poverty, special education, English learner)	English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics	3-8, HS

Cut Score Notes:

- Cut scores based on an analysis of historical MAAP proficiency and growth data for three years of data (2016-17 - 2018-19)
- The analysis used overall and subgroup data by grade level to examine the distribution of differences between school and geographic district or state averages, testing cut score options with the district or state average serving as the floor of the Meets Expectations category
- The range of 20 percent around the district average allowed for the most differentiation between schools

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 3: Academic Growth

Measure 3(c): School-Selected Growth

Academic Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 3: Academic Growth

Measure 3(c): School-Selected Growth

This measure evaluates academic growth for students in the charter school, which may include grade levels not tested by the state assessment.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(3c) School-Selected Growth [School chooses one benchmark assessment and one metric]	Percent of students meeting growth projection between fall and spring (option 1)	29% or less	30% to 49%	50% to 69%	70% or more
	Median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) (option 2)	Median SGP of 44 or less	Median SGP between 45 and 49	Median SGP between 50 and 64	Median SGP of 65 or higher
	TBD based on agreement between MCSAB and school (option 3)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
1. NWEA MAP, STAR, or another benchmark assessment (approved by MCSAB) that reports student-level growth projects OR 2. STAR or another benchmark assessment (approved by MCSAB) that reports student-level median SGP OR 3. Another benchmark assessment (approved by MCSAB) that reports a student-level growth measure	Grade Levels	Reading, Mathematics	KG-8

Cut Score Notes:

- Documentation from assessments that report student growth projections (e.g., NWEA MAP and STAR) indicate a normal distribution, on average, of the percent of students who meet growth projections, which supports putting the floor for Meeting Expectations at 50 percent%
- Median SGP cut scores based on review of median SGP ranges used by national authorizers
- MCSAB and school may agree on different student growth targets based on assessment vendor documentation

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 4: Academic Gap

Measure 4(a): MAAP Academic Gap

This measure evaluates the difference in subgroup academic gaps between charter schools and the geographic school district in which the school is located.

Measure	Metric
(4a) MAAP Academic Gap	Academic gap between major subgroups

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
1. Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP)	Subgroups (gender, race, poverty, special education, English learner)	English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics	3-8

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 5: Academic Readiness

Measure 5(a): Kindergarten Readiness

This measure evaluates the kindergarten reading readiness of students in charter schools.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(5a) Kindergarten Readiness	Average spring scale score	Spring scale score between 300-487	Spring scale score between 488-674	Spring scale score between 675-774	Spring scale score between 775-900

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
1. Kindergarten Readiness Assessment	All	Reading	KG

Cut Score Notes:

- Cut score ranges based on STAR Early Literacy Achievement Standards: Early Emergent Reader (300-487), Late Emergent Reader (488-674), Transitional Reader (675-774), Probable Reader (775-900)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 5: Academic Readiness

Measure 5(b): 3rd Grade Reading Readiness

This measure evaluates the difference in 3rd grade reading readiness between charter schools and the geographic school district in which the school is located.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(5b) 3rd Grade Reading Readiness	Percent of students scoring at or above PL3	20 percentage points or more below geographic district average	19 percentage points or less below geographic district average	Equal to or up to 19 percentage points above geographic district average	20 percentage points or more above geographic district average

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
1. Mississippi Academic Assessment Program (MAAP)	All	English Language Arts (ELA) Subscore	3rd

Cut Score Notes:

- PL3 and above meets requirements of Mississippi Literacy-Based Promotion Act
- Cut score ranges based on the analysis of other Mississippi proficiency and growth data

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 6: Postsecondary Readiness

Measure 6(a): Graduation Rate

This measure evaluates the high school 4-year cohort graduation rate for charter schools.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(6a) Graduation Rate	4-year cohort graduation rate	69% or less	70% and 79%	80% and 89%	90% or higher

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
MS Succeeds Report Card	All, Subgroups		HS

Cut Score Notes:

- Cut score ranges based on review of absolute 4-year cohort graduation rate ranges for used by regional and national authorizers

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 6: Postsecondary Readiness

Measure 6(b): Application Rate

This measure evaluates the postsecondary application rate for charter schools.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(6b) Application Rate	Percent of 12th grade students applying to a postsecondary institution	49% or less	50% and 69%	70% and 89%	90% or higher

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
1. School student exit survey 2. MDE fall enrollment count	All		HS

Cut Score Notes:

- Postsecondary application rate cut score range is based on the ranges for admission and matriculation rates in NACSA's [Core Performance Framework and Guidance](#)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 6: Postsecondary Readiness

Measure 6(c): Admission Rate

This measure evaluates the postsecondary admission rate for charter schools.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(6c) Admission Rate	Percent of 12th grade students admitted to a postsecondary institution	49% or less	50% and 69%	70% and 89%	90% or higher

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
1. School student exit survey 2. MDE fall enrollment count	All		HS

Cut Score Notes:

- Postsecondary admission rate cut score range based on the ranges in NACSA's [Core Performance Framework and Guidance](#)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 6: Postsecondary Readiness

Measure 6(d): Matriculation Rate

This measure evaluates the immediate postsecondary enrollment rate for charter schools.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(6d) Matriculation Rate	Percent of graduates enrolled in postsecondary institutions in the fall following graduation	49% or less	50% and 69%	70% and 89%	90% or higher

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
1. School student exit survey OR National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) 2. MDE fall enrollment count	All		HS

Cut Score Notes:

- Immediate postsecondary enrollment rate cut score range based on the ranges in NACSA's [Core Performance Framework and Guidance](#)

Academic Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 6: Postsecondary Readiness

Measure 6(e): Employment Rate

This measure evaluates the immediate postsecondary enrollment rate for charter schools.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
(6e) Employment Rate	Percent of graduates who did not enroll in postsecondary institutions employed in the fall following graduation (including military service)	49% or less	50% and 69%	70% and 89%	90% or higher

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
1. School student exit survey	All		HS

Cut Score Notes:

- Postsecondary employment rate cut score range based on ranges in NACSA's [Core Performance Framework and Guidance](#)

Academic Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework



Indicator 7: School-Specific [OPTIONAL]

Measure 7(a): TBD based on agreement between MCSAB and school

The school-specific indicator is optional in the academic performance framework. Charter schools may opt to use this indicator to identify and set targets for alternative measures of school performance. The school may select one or more alternative measures for the school-specific indicator. School-specific measures may include, but are not limited to, student/family satisfaction, student engagement, student social-emotional development, and school climate. The school must work with MCSAB to approve measures and targets.

Measure	Metric	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
		1	2	3	4
7(a) TBD based on agreement between MCSAB and school	TBD based on agreement between MCSAB and school	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

MCSAB staff will reference the following information to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Groups	Subject	Grade Levels
Data provided by school			

Cut Score Notes: TBD

Annual Performance Framework

Academic Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



The Internal Companion Guidance document is intended to provide MCSAB staff and charter schools with guidance on how the components of the Academic Performance Framework will be defined and calculated to create the Annual Performance Report for each school. MCSAB staff should use this document in conjunction with the Academic Performance Framework Workbook.

Contents

Indicator 1: State Accountability.....	3
Measure 1(a): School Grade	3
Indicator 2: Academic Proficiency.....	3
Measure 2(a): MAAP Proficiency, Overall	3
Measure 2(b): MAAP Proficiency, Subgroup	4
Indicator 3: Academic Growth	4
Measure 2(a): MAAP Growth, Overall.....	4
Measure 2(b): MAAP Growth, Subgroup	5
Measure 2(c): School-Selected Growth.....	5
Indicator 4: Academic Gap.....	6
Measure 4(a): MAAP Academic Gap.....	6
Indicator 5: Academic Readiness	7
Measure 5(a): Kindergarten Readiness	7
Measure 5(b): 3 rd Grade Reading Readiness	7
Indicator 6: Postsecondary Readiness.....	8
Measure 6(a): Graduation Rate.....	8
Measure 6(b): Application Rate	8
Measure 6(c): Admission Rate.....	8
Measure 6(d): Matriculation Rate	9
Measure 6(e): Employment Rate	9
Indicator 7: School-Specific [OPTIONAL].....	10
Measure 7(a): TBD	10

Geographic School District

The following measures use metrics that compare charter school data with data from traditional public schools in the school district in which the school is located, or the geographic school district:

- (2a) MAAP Proficiency, Overall
- (2b) MAAP Proficiency, Subgroup
- (3a) MAAP Growth, Overall
- (3b) MAAP Growth, Subgroup
- (5b) 3rd Grade Reading Readiness

The geographic school district shall be composed of traditional public schools from the district in which the charter school is located that have the same school type (i.e., elementary, elementary/middle, middle, middle/high, and high schools) as the charter school. Annually, MCSAB will identify the set of traditional public schools in each charter school's geographic school district. The set of schools in the geographic school district will be the same for a charter school for each of the measures listed above.

Identify the set of traditional public schools in a charter school's geographic school district with the following steps:

1. Use the MDE fall enrollment count data file to establish the lowest and highest grade levels offered at (1) the charter school and (2) all the traditional public schools in the school district in which the charter school is located
2. Establish the school type for the charter school and all traditional public schools in the school district using the following rules:
 - Elementary School: lowest grade = PK/ECE or KG and highest grade = PK/ECE, KG, 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5
 - Elementary/Middle School: lowest grade = PK/ECE or KG and highest grade = 6, 7, or 8
 - Middle School: lowest grade = 5 or 6 and highest grade = 5, 6, 7, or 8
 - Middle/High School: lowest grade = 5 or 6 and highest grade = 9, 10, 11, or 12
 - High School: lowest grade = 9 and highest grade = 9, 10, 11, or 12
3. Once the school type is established for the charter school, identify the traditional public schools (excluding magnet and special schools) from the district in which the charter school is located that have the same school type. Match charter schools identified as elementary/middle with both elementary and middle traditional public schools. Match charter schools identified as middle/high with both middle and high traditional public schools.

Use the list of traditional public schools matched to the charter school by school type as the charter school's geographic school district for analysis of the measures listed above.

Annual Performance Framework

Academic Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Indicator 1: State Accountability

Measure 1(a): School Grade

Metric: Letter Grade (A-F)

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect charter school grade data from MS Succeeds Report Card when released by MDE
- Enter charter school grade into “data – mde” tab of the Academic Framework workbook
- Score charter school grade data based on rating criteria and cut scores

Indicator 2: Academic Proficiency

Measure 2(a): MAAP Proficiency, Overall

Metric: Percent of students scoring PL4 (Proficient) or PL5 (Advanced)

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect school-level overall proficiency data from MAAP data files provided by MDE for the charter school and schools in the geographic school district with the same school type as the charter school
- For each school, add the percent of students scoring PL4 (Proficient) with the percent of students scoring PL5 (Advanced) for the total percent of students scoring PL4 (Proficient) or PL5 (Advanced) for each subgroup, by subject area
- Calculate an average school-level overall percent proficiency (PL4 + PL5) for schools in the geographic school district with the same school type as the charter school, by subject area
- Enter the charter school overall percent proficient (PL4 + PL5) and geographic school district average overall percent proficient (PL4 + PL5) into “data-mde” tab of the Academic Framework workbook, by subject area
- Subtract the charter school’s school-level overall percent proficient (PL4 + PL5) from geographic school district overall average percent proficient (PL4 + PL5), by subject area
- Score difference between charter school and geographic district average based on rating criteria and cut scores

Measure 2(b): MAAP Proficiency, Subgroup

Metric: Percent of students scoring PL4 (Proficient) or PL5 (Advanced)

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect school-level subgroup proficiency data from MAAP data files provided by MDE for the charter school and schools in the geographic school district with the same school type as the charter school
 - Note: only subgroups reported in MAAP data files by MDE are eligible for scoring
- For each school, add the percent of students scoring PL4 (Proficient) with the percent of students scoring PL5 (Advanced) for the total percent of students scoring PL4 (Proficient) or PL5 (Advanced) for each subgroup, by subject area
- Calculate average school-level subgroup percent proficient (PL4 + PL5) for each reported subgroup for schools in the geographic school district with the same school type as the charter school, by subject area
- Enter the charter school subgroup percent proficient (PL4 + PL5) and geographic school district average subgroup percent proficient (PL4 + PL5) for each subgroup into “data-mde” tab of the Academic Framework workbook, by subject area
- Subtract the charter school’s school-level subgroup percent proficient (PL4 + PL5) from geographic school district overall average percent proficient (PL4 + PL5) for each subgroup, by subject area
- Score difference between charter school and geographic district average for each subgroup based on rating criteria and cut scores

Indicator 3: Academic Growth

Measure 3(a): MAAP Growth, Overall

Metric: Weighted average growth percent

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect school-level overall weighted average growth percent data from MAAP data files provided by MDE for the charter school and schools in the geographic school district with the same school type as the charter school
- Calculate an average school-level weighted average growth percent for schools in the geographic school district with the same school type as the charter school, by subject area
- Enter the charter school overall weighted average growth percent and geographic school district average weighted average growth percent into “data-mde” tab of the Academic Framework workbook, by subject area

Annual Performance Framework

Academic Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



- Subtract the charter school's school-level overall weighted average growth percent from geographic school district overall average weighted average growth percent, by subject area
- Score difference between charter school and geographic district average based on rating criteria and cut scores

Measure 3(b): MAAP Growth, Subgroup

Metric: Weighted average growth percent

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect school-level subgroup weighted average growth percent data from MAAP data files provided by MDE for the charter school and schools in the geographic school district with the same school type as the charter school
 - Note: only subgroups reported in MAAP data files by MDE are eligible for scoring
- Calculate average school-level subgroup weighted average growth percent for each reported subgroup for schools in the geographic school district with the same school type as the charter school, by subject area
- Enter the charter school subgroup weighted average growth percent and geographic school district average subgroup weighted average growth percent for each subgroup into "data-mde" tab of the Academic Framework workbook, by subject area
- Subtract the charter school's school-level subgroup weighted average growth percent from geographic school district overall average weighted average growth percent for each subgroup, by subject area
- Score difference between charter school and geographic district average for each subgroup based on rating criteria and cut scores

Measure 3(c): School-Selected Growth

Metric: Percent of students meeting growth projection between fall and spring (option 1)

Metric Calculation Notes:

- If the metric is selected, collect from the charter school the percent of students making growth projection, by subject area and grade level, on NWEA MAP, STAR, or another MCSAB-approved benchmark assessment that reports student-level growth projections
- All students taking both fall and spring benchmark assessment are eligible and should be included in metric calculation
- Enter the charter school percent of students making growth projections, by subject area and grade level, into "data-mde" tab of the Academic Framework workbook
- Score percent of students making growth projection data, by subject area and grade level,

Annual Performance Framework

Academic Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



based on rating criteria and cut scores

Metric: Median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) (option 2)

Metric Calculation Notes:

- If the metric is selected, collect from the charter school the median student growth percentile (SGP), by subject area and grade level, on STAR or another MCSAB-approved benchmark assessment that reports student-level median SGP
- All students taking both fall and spring benchmark assessment are eligible and should be included in metric calculation
- Enter the charter school median SGP, by subject area and grade level, into “data – benchmark assessment” tab of the Academic Framework workbook
- Score median SGP data, by subject area and grade level, based on rating criteria and cut scores

Metric: TBD based on agreement between MCSAB and school (option 3)

Metric Calculation Notes:

- If charter school and MCSAB agree on another benchmark assessment or another metric based on the assessments listed (e.g., NWEA MAP and STAR), they will work together to identify an appropriate student growth metric and targets based on documentation from assessment vendor

Indicator 4: Academic Gap

Measure 4(a): MAAP Academic Gap

Metric: Academic gap between major subgroups

Metric Calculation Notes:

- If charter school LEAs are not included in MDE academic gap data file, do not include measure in performance framework
- Currently, the MDE academic gap data files only include gaps in academic proficiency. Use the available data. If new MDE gap data files include gaps in both academic proficiency and academic growth, report both.
- Collect charter school LEA academic gap data from academic gapdata files provided by MDE

Annual Performance Framework

Academic Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



- Include only subgroups reported by MDE in academic gap data file (schools do not need to request a waiver for subgroups with low N counts)
- Collect LEA-level academic gap data from academic gap data files provided by MDE for the charter school LEA
 - Note: MDE academic gap data files report data at the LEA-level, not the school-level

Indicator 5: Academic Readiness

Measure 5(a): Kindergarten Readiness

Metric: Average spring scale score

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect charter school average spring scale score from Kindergarten Readiness Assessment from MDE report
- Enter the charter school average spring scale score data into the “data—kg readiness” tab of the Academic Framework workbook
- Score average spring scale score based on rating criteria and cut scores

Measure 5(b): 3rd Grade Reading Readiness

Metric: Percent of students scoring at or above PL3

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect 3rd grade percent scoring PL3 or higher data from MAAP ELA subscore report provided by MDE for the charter school and schools in the geographic school district with the same school type as the charter school
 - Note: percent scoring PL3 or higher may be called “Met LBPA Requirements” in MDE report

Annual Performance Framework

Academic Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



- Calculate an average 3rd grade percent scoring PL3 or higher for schools in the geographic school district with the same school type as the charter school
- Enter the charter school 3rd grade percent scoring PL3 or higher and geographic school district average 3rd grade percent scoring PL3 or higher into “data-mde” tab of the Academic Framework workbook
- Subtract the charter school’s 3rd grade percent scoring PL3 or higher from geographic school district 3rd grade percent scoring PL3 or higher
- Score difference between charter school and geographic district average based on rating criteria and cut scores

Indicator 6: Postsecondary Readiness

Measure 6(a): Graduation Rate

Metric: 4-year cohort graduation rate

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect charter school 4-year cohort graduation rate data from MS Succeeds Report Card data files provided by MDE
- Enter the charter school 4-year cohort graduation rate data into the “data-high school” tab of the Academic Framework workbook
- Score 4-year cohort graduation rate based on rating criteria and cut scores

Measure 6(b): Application Rate

Metric: Percent of 12th grade students applying to a postsecondary institution

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect from the charter school the number of 12th grade students who submitted postsecondary applications before high school graduation
- Collect fall count enrollment numbers for 12th grade students at charter school from the MDE fall enrollment count data file
- Divide the number of 12th grade students who applied to a postsecondary institution by the 12th grade fall enrollment numbers
- Enter the charter school application rate data into the “data-high school” tab of the Academic Framework workbook
- Score application rate based on rating criteria and cut scores

Measure 6(c): Admission Rate

Internal Companion Guidance_Academic Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Annual Performance Framework

Academic Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Metric: Percent of 12th grade students admitted to a postsecondary institution

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect from the charter school the number of 12th grade students who were admitted to a postsecondary institution before high school graduation
- Collect fall count enrollment numbers for 12th grade students at charter school from the MDE fall enrollment count data file
- Divide the number of 12th grade students who were admitted to a postsecondary institution by the 12th grade fall enrollment numbers
- Enter the charter school admission rate data into the “data–high school” tab of the Academic Framework workbook
- Score admission rate based on rating criteria and cut scores

Measure 6(d): Matriculation Rate

Metric: Percent of graduates enrolled in postsecondary institutions in the fall following high school graduation

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect from the charter school the number of high school graduates who immediately enrolled in a postsecondary institution in the fall following high school graduation
 - Note: charter school may have access to NSC StudentTracker data which provides information about college enrollment across the country
- Collect charter school number of high school graduates from MS Succeeds Report Card data files provided by MDE
- Divide the number of graduates who immediately enrolled in a postsecondary institution by the total number of high school graduates
- Enter the charter school matriculation rate data into the “data–high school” tab of the Academic Framework workbook
- Score matriculation rate based on rating criteria and cut scores

Measure 6(e): Employment Rate

Metric: Percent of graduates who did not enroll in postsecondary institutions employed in the fall following high school graduation (including military service)

Metric Calculation Notes:

Annual Performance Framework

Academic Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



- Collect from the charter school the number of graduates who do not plan to enroll in a postsecondary institution in the fall following graduation
- Collect from the charter school the number of graduates who plan to work or join the military by the fall following graduation
- Divide the number of graduates who plan to work or join the military by the number of graduates who do not plan to enroll in a postsecondary institution
- Enter the charter school employment rate data into the “data–high school” tab of the Academic Framework workbook
- Score employment rate based on rating criteria and cut scores

Indicator 7: School-Specific [OPTIONAL]

Measure 7(a): TBD

Metric: TBD based on agreement between MCSAB and school

Metric Calculation Notes:

- If charter school and MCSAB agree to include a school-specific measure, they will work together to identify appropriate data collection and measurement strategies, as well as metrics and targets

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Financial Performance Framework

The MCSAB financial performance framework indicators, measures, metrics, and cut scores are based on alignment with the Mississippi Charter School Law and informed by national best practices established in the National Association of Charter School Authorizer's (NACSA) *Core Performance Framework and Guidance*,¹ which was created from a review of model authorizer practices, charter school lender guidance, professional judgment, and practices used by other nonprofit and governmental entities.

The indicators, measures, and metrics have been implemented by a wide range of regional and national authorizers, including the Alabama Public Charter School Commission, the Tennessee Department of Education, the Indiana Charter School Board, the Georgia State Charter School Commission, the Washington State Charter School Commission, the Colorado Charter School Institute, the D.C. Public Charter School Board, and the New Jersey Department of Education, among others.

The financial performance framework is comprised of the following indicators and measures:

1. Short-term Financial Health (Current Year)
 - a. Current Ratio
 - b. Unrestricted Days Cash
 - c. Current-year Enrollment Variance
 - d. Debt (or lease) Default
2. Long-term Financial Health (Multiple Years)
 - a. Debt-to-Asset Ratio
 - b. Total Margin
 - c. Cash Flow
3. Financial Management and Oversight
 - a. MCSAB and MDE Financial Reporting and Compliance Requirements
 - b. Annual Financial Audit/Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) Requirements

¹ <www.qualitycharters.org>

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Measures

The financial performance framework includes a combination of compliance measures and performance measures:

- Compliance measures evaluate if a school is meeting legal and contractual obligations
- Performance measures evaluate if a school is meeting a target

Ratings

The financial performance framework includes a rubric with rating criteria and cut scores for each metric that indicate the measure performance targets associated with three ratings:

1. Meets Expectations
2. Approaches Expectations
3. Fails to Meet Expectations

Data

The financial performance framework relies primarily on data collected from the independent annual financial audit submitted by schools. Audit data is often dated by the time it is submitted to the authorizer and may not provide a complete view of a school's financial health. **MCSAB will use the audit data to diagnose immediate, initial financial concerns and may follow up directly with schools to clarify or receive updated financial information before calculating an overall financial performance rating, if there are concerns.**

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Calculating an Overall Financial Performance Rating

MCSAB will exercise a high degree of professional judgment to evaluate data, assign ratings, and assess the overall financial health of a school. The methodology described below serves as a tool to assist MCSAB in monitoring and decision-making and is meant to complement, not replace, the critical role of professional judgment in determining overall financial performance.

Financial performance framework data are collected, scored, and aggregated based on the following steps:

1. Collect data for each measure based on internal companion guidance
2. Enter data in the financial performance framework workbook
3. Verify data with charter schools, including receiving up-to-date financial information upon request
4. Score measure data based on rating criteria and cut scores
5. Take average of data scores within a measure to produce indicator subscore
6. Take average of indicator subscores to produce an indicator score
7. Average indicator scores to produce overall financial performance framework score that corresponds to a rating

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Indicator 1: Short-term Financial Health (Current Year)

Measure 1(a): Current Ratio

This measure evaluates whether a school has enough resources to meet short-term financial obligations, or those due within one year.

Measure	Measure Type	Metric	Target Differentiation	1	2	3
Current Ratio	Performance	Ratio of current assets and current liabilities	All Years	Less than or equal to 0.9	Between 0.9 and 1.0 or equal to 1.0 <u>or</u> Between 1.0 and 1.1 and one-year trend is negative	Greater than or equal to 1.1 <u>or</u> Between 1.0 and 1.1 and one-year trend is positive

MCSAB staff will reference the following data source(s) and calculation method to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Metric Calculation
1. Audited Statement of Financial Position	Current Ratio = Total Current Assets/Total Current Liabilities (Positive Trend = Increase from prior year current ratio) (Negative Trend = Decrease from prior year current ratio)

Cut Score Notes: Common industry standard sets a minimum of 1.0. A positive trend greater than 1.0 suggests increasing financial health, therefore NACSA sets greater than or equal to 1.1 as a target that also meets expectations. Common standards suggest a ratio less than or equal to 0.9 indicates a serious financial health risk.²

² National Association of Charter School Authorizers. *Core Financial Performance Framework and Guidance*. <www.qualitycharters.org>

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Indicator 1: Short-term Financial Health (Current Year)

Measure 1(b): Unrestricted Days Cash

This measure evaluates the number of days a school can continue to pay its operating expenses, given the amount of cash available.

Measure	Measure Type	Metric	Target Differentiation	FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS	APPROACHES EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS
				1	2	3
Unrestricted Days Cash	Performance	Ratio of unrestricted cash and total expenses	Year 1 and Year 2	Less than or equal to 15 days cash	Between 15-30 days cash <u>or</u> Between 30-60 days cash and one-year trend is negative	Greater than or equal to 30 days cash
			Year 3+	Less than or equal to 15 days cash	Between 15-30 days cash <u>or</u> Between 30-60 days cash and one-year trend is negative	Greater than or equal to 60 days cash <u>or</u> between 30-60 days cash and one-year trend is positive

MCSAB staff will reference the following data source(s) and calculation method to evaluate this measure:

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Data Source	Metric Calculation
1. Audited Statement of Financial Position and Audited Statement of Activities	Unrestricted Days Cash = Unrestricted Cash/([Total Expenses - Depreciation Expense] /365) (Depreciation expense is removed from the total expenses denominator because it is not a cash expense.)

Cut Score Notes: Common industry standard is at least 30 days cash for operating expenses. NACSA suggests a 60-day cut score for meeting expectations because charter school cash flow can often times be irregular. Schools in Year 3 of operation and beyond can also meet expectations by showing an increasing cash balance from earlier years and having enough cash to pay at least 30 days cash, as they are considered financially stable and show positive trending. With fewer than 15 days cash, a school is at high risk for immediate financial challenges.³

³ National Association of Charter School Authorizers. *Core Financial Performance Framework and Guidance*. <www.qualitycharters.org> Financial Performance Framework Proposed 2024
 A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Indicator 1: Short-term Financial Health (Current Year)

Measure 1(c): Current-year Enrollment Variance

This measure evaluates how well a school is meeting its board-approved, budgeted enrollment targets. Because enrollment numbers primarily dictate revenue, this measure helps an authorizer understand if the school can generate enough revenue to fund operations.

Measure	Measure Type	Metric	Target Differentiation	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
				1	2	3
Current-year Enrollment Variance	Performance	Ratio of actual enrollment compared to projected enrollment in the board-approved budget	All Years	Actual enrollment is less than or equal to 85% of budgeted enrollment in the current year	Actual enrollment is 86%-94% of budgeted enrollment in the current year	Actual enrollment is equal to or greater than 95% of budgeted enrollment in the current year ⁴

MCSAB staff will reference the following data source(s) and calculation method to evaluate this measure:

⁴ A charter school shall not enroll more than 120% of the total number of students that it is authorized to enroll pursuant to the Charter School's Enrollment Projection Table in the Charter Contract without an approved amendment . MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.6.2)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Data Source	Metric Calculation
1. July 31 charter school board-approved enrollment budget for current year 2. Actual enrollment as of October 1 via MSIS submission	Current-year Enrollment Variance = Actual enrollment as of October 1/Projected Enrollment in July 31 charter school board-approved budget

Cut Score Notes: A school may be at significant risk if the enrollment variance is less than 85 percent, which indicates a large gap in revenue that the school will no longer receive for operating expenses. If enrollment variance is equal to or greater than 95 percent, schools will generally be able to meet expenses and may not be at significant risk.⁵

⁵ National Association of Charter School Authorizers. *Core Financial Performance Framework and Guidance*. <www.qualitycharters.org> Financial Performance Framework Proposed 2024
 A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Indicator 1: Short-term Financial Health (Current Year)

Measure 1(d): Debt (or lease) Default

This measure evaluates whether a school is paying its debt obligations in a timely manner, or if the school is out of compliance with requirements in its loan covenants with lenders. Default typically occurs when a school does not make minimum payments on debt.

Measure	Measure Type	Metric	Target Differentiation	FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS	APPROACHES EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS
				1	2	3
Debt (or lease) Default	Performance	Compliance with loan covenants and debt service payments	All Years	School is in default of loan covenant(s) and/or is delinquent with debt service payments	School is in default of loan covenant but has worked with lenders to restructure debt service payments	School is not in default of loan covenant(s) and/or is not delinquent with debt service payments

MCSAB staff will reference the following data source(s) and calculation method to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Metric Calculation
1. Notes to the audited Financial Statements	Review notes to the audited Financial Statement to determine if school is/is not in default of loan covenant(s) and /or is/is not delinquent with debt service payments.

Cut Score Notes: Missed payments or non-compliance with the terms of loan agreements may indicate financial distress.⁶

⁶ National Association of Charter School Authorizers. *Core Financial Performance Framework and Guidance*. <www.qualitycharters.org> Financial Performance Framework Proposed 2024
A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Indicator 2: Long-term Financial Health (Sustainability Over Multiple Years)

Measure 2(a): Debt-to-Asset Ratio

This measure evaluates whether a school is maintaining a healthy balance between assets and liabilities over time.

Measure	Measure Type	Metric	Target Differentiation	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
				1	2	3
Debt-to-Asset Ratio	Performance	Ratio of total liabilities and total assets	All Years	Greater than 1.0	Between 0.9 and 1.0	Less than 0.9

MCSAB staff will reference the following data source(s) and calculation method to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Metric Calculation
1. Audited Statement of Financial Position	Debt to Asset Ratio = Total Liabilities/Total Assets

Cut Score Notes: Common industry standard is a debt to asset ratio that is greater than 1.0. It could indicate potential long-term financial challenges, as the school has more liabilities than assets. A ratio less than 0.9 generally indicates stronger financial health.⁷

⁷ National Association of Charter School Authorizers. *Core Financial Performance Framework and Guidance*. <www.qualitycharters.org> Financial Performance Framework Proposed 2024
A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Indicator 2: Long-term Financial Health (Sustainability Over Multiple Years)

Measure 2(b): Total Margin

This measure evaluates whether a school is managing costs appropriately within its available resources for the current year as well as over a three-year time period.

Measure	Measure Type	Metric	Target Differentiation
Total Margin	Performance	Ratio of net income and total revenues	Year 1 and Year 2
			Year 3+

1	2	3
Current Year Total Margin is negative	N/A	Current Year Total Margin is positive (or greater than 0)
3-Year Total Margin is less than or equal to -1.5% <u>or</u> Current Year Total Margin is less than -10%	3-Year Total Margin is greater than -1.5 percent, but trend does not "Meet Expectations"	3-Year Total Margin is positive (or greater than 0) and Current Year Total Margin is positive <u>or</u> 3-Year Total Margin is greater than -1.5%, the trend is positive for the last two years, and the Current Year Total Margin is positive

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



MCSAB staff will reference the following data source(s) and calculation method to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Metric Calculation
1. For Year 1 and Year 2 calculations: Audited Statement of Financial Position	Current Year Total Margin = Current Year Net Income/Current Year Total Revenue
2. For Year 3+ calculations: Three years of Audited Statements of Financial Position (Year 3 = most recent year) (Year 1 = earliest year of operation)	Cumulative 3-year Total Margin: Total Three-Year Net Income/Total Three-Year Revenues

Cut Score Notes: Common industry standard is that total margin is positive. NACSA suggests cut scores should be flexible over a three-year time frame, in the event schools operate at a deficit for a certain period of time to accommodate a large expense. The cut scores require a positive total margin in the most recent year to meet expectations. A school may be at financial risk if a margin in any year is less than -10 percent or a cumulative three-year total margin is less than or equal to -1.5 percent.⁸

⁸ National Association of Charter School Authorizers. *Core Financial Performance Framework and Guidance*. <www.qualitycharters.org> Financial Performance Framework Proposed 2024
A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Indicator 2: Long-term Financial Health (Sustainability Over Multiple Years)

Measure 2(c): Cash Flow

This measure evaluates cash inflows and outflows related to a school's main operational activities for the current year as well as over multiple years. This measure requires at least two years of data to calculate.

Measure	Measure Type	Metric	Target Differentiation	FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS	APPROACHES EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS
				1	2	3
Cash Flow	Performance	Trend in cash balance from year to year	Year 1 and Year 2	One-Year Cash Flow, or Total Cash Balance, is negative	N/A	One-Year Cash Flow, or Total Cash Balance, is positive
			Year 3+	Multi-Year Cumulative Cash Flow is negative	Multi-Year Cumulative Cash Flow is positive, but trend does not "Meet Expectations"	Multi-Year Cumulative Cash Flow is positive and Cash Flow is positive each year <u>or</u> Multi-Year Cumulative Cash Flow is positive, Cash Flow is positive in one of two years, and Cash Flow in the most recent year is positive

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



MCSAB staff will reference the following data source(s) and calculation method to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Metric Calculation
1. For Year 1 and Year 2 calculations: At least two years of Audited Statement of Cash Flows 2. For Year 3+ calculations: At least three years of Audited Statement of Cash Flows (Year 3 = most recent year) (Year 1 = earliest year of operation)	$\text{One-Year Cash Flow} = \text{Year 2 Total Cash} - \text{Year 1 Total Cash}$ $\text{Multi-Year Cash Flow} = \text{Year 3 Total Cash} - \text{Year 1 Total Cash}$

Cut Score Notes: An increasing cash balance from year to year indicates increasing financial health over time.⁹

⁹ National Association of Charter School Authorizers. *Core Financial Performance Framework and Guidance*. <www.qualitycharters.org>

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Indicator 3: Financial Management and Oversight

Measure 3(a): MCSAB and MDE Financial Reporting and Compliance Requirements

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with financial reporting obligations as required by MCSAB and the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE).

Measure	Measure Type	Metric	Target Differentiation
MCSAB and MDE Financial Reporting and Compliance Requirements	Compliance	N/A	All Years

1	2	3
<p>1</p> <p>Fails to Meet Expectations</p> <p>The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to financial reporting and compliance and failures have not been remedied.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>Approaches Expectations</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>3</p> <p>Meets Expectations</p> <p>The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to financial reporting and compliance.</p>

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Metric Calculation
Evidence of compliance with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete, accurate, and timely submission of quarterly financial reports due at the end of each quarter 2. Complete, accurate, and timely submission of annual board-approved budget due by July 31 annually 3. Timely submission of the annual independent financial audit due on or before September 30 annually 4. Annual independent financial audit completed by firm approved by State Auditor 5. Annual independent financial audit only completed by same auditor for three consecutive years 6. MDE Financial Data for Financial Exchange Transaction System (FETS) due mid-October annually 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Epicenter submissions per Annual Reporting Calendar 2. MDE: Notification 3. Ongoing MCSAB Monitoring 4. Charter Contract Exhibit G-Charter School Fiscal Oversight Policy

Citations:

- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-57(1)
- MCSAB Charter School Contract (3.2)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



Indicator 3: Financial Management and Oversight

Measure 3(b): Annual Financial Audit/Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) Requirements

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with financial practice and management expectations.

Measure	Measure Type	Metric	Target Differentiation
Annual Financial Audit/Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) Requirements	Compliance	N/A	All Years

Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
1	2	3
The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to financial management and oversight and failures have not been remedied.	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal or contractual obligation, but the school is actively working toward compliance.	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to financial management and oversight.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework



MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data Source	Metric Calculation
Evidence of compliance with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An unqualified audit opinion 2. An audit without significant findings, recurring findings, material weaknesses, or significant internal control weaknesses 3. An audit that does not include a going concern disclosure in the audit notes 	Primary Source: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annual independent financial audit Secondary Source: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Financial Practices Self-Assessment

Citations:

- Miss Code Ann. § 37-28-57(1)
- MCSAB Charter School Contract (3.2)

Annual Performance Framework

Financial Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



The Internal Companion Guidance document is intended to provide MCSAB staff and charter schools with guidance on how the components of the Financial Performance Framework will be defined and calculated to create the Annual Performance Report for each school. MCSAB staff should use this document in conjunction with the Financial Performance Framework Workbook.

Contents

Indicator 1: Short-term Financial Health (Current Year).....	2
Measure 1(a): Current Ratio	2
Measure 1(b): Unrestricted Days Cash.....	2
Measure 1(c): Current Year Enrollment Variance	3
Measure 1(d): Debt (or lease) Default	3
Indicator 2: Long-term Financial Health (Sustainability Over Multiple Years)	4
Measure 2(a): Debt-to-Asset Ratio	4
Measure 2(b): Total Margin.....	4
Measure 2(c): Cash Flow.....	5
Indicator 3: Financial Management and Oversight.....	5
Measure 3(a): MCSAB and MDE Financial Reporting and Compliance Requirements	5
Measure 3(b): Annual Financial Audit/Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) Requirements	6

Indicator 1: Short-term Financial Health (Current Year)

Measure 1(a): Current Ratio

Metric: Ratio of current assets and current liabilities

This measure evaluates whether a school has enough resources to meet short-term financial obligations, or those due within one year.

Metric Calculation:

Current Ratio = Total Current Assets/Total Current Liabilities
(Positive Trend = Increase from prior year current ratio)
(Negative Trend = Decrease from prior year current ratio)

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect "Total Current Assets" data from Statement of Financial Position in audit
- Collect "Total Current Liabilities" data from Statement of Financial Position in audit
- Enter data into "current ratio" tab of the Financial Performance Framework Workbook
- Score based on rating criteria and cut scores

Measure 1(b): Unrestricted Days Cash

Metric: Ratio of unrestricted cash and total expenses

This measure evaluates the number of days a school can continue to pay its operating expenses, given the amount of cash available.

Metric Calculation:

Unrestricted Days Cash = Unrestricted Cash/([Total Expenses - Depreciation Expense] /365)
(Depreciation expense is removed from the total expenses denominator because it is not a cash expense.)

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect "Cash" data from Statement of Financial Position in audit if not restricted
- Collect "Total Expenses" from Statement of Activities in audit
- Collect "Depreciation" from Statement of Cash Flows in audit
- Enter data into "unrestricted days cash" tab of the Financial Performance Framework Workbook

Annual Performance Framework

Financial Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



- Score based on rating criteria and cut scores

Measure 1(c): Current-year Enrollment Variance

Metric: Ratio of actual enrollment compared to projected enrollment in the board-approved budget

This measure evaluates how well a school is meeting its board-approved, budgeted enrollment targets. Because enrollment numbers primarily dictate revenue, this measure helps an authorizer understand if the school can generate enough revenue to fund operations.

Metric Calculation:

Current-year Enrollment Variance = Actual enrollment as of October 1/Projected Enrollment in July 31 charter school board-approved budget

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect actual enrollment count from official Fall October 1 enrollment count in MSIS
- Collect projected enrollment number from July 31 charter school board-approved budget
- Enter data into “enrollment variance” tab of the Financial Performance Framework Workbook
- Score based on rating criteria and cut scores

Measure 1(d): Debt (or lease) Default

Metric: Compliance with loan covenants and debt service payments

This measure evaluates whether a school is paying its debt obligations in a timely manner, or if the school is out of compliance with requirements in its loan covenants with lenders. Default typically occurs when a school does not make minimum payments on debt.

Metric Calculation:

Review notes to the audited Financial Statement to determine if school is/is not in default of loan covenant(s) and /or is/is not delinquent with debt service payments.

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Review Notes to Financial Statements in audit for reference to debt, default, missed payments, etc.
- The absence of a finding means a school is in compliance with this measure
- Enter data into “debt default” tab of the Financial Performance Framework Workbook

Annual Performance Framework

Financial Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



- Score based on rating criteria and cut scores

Indicator 2: Long-term Financial Health (Sustainability Over Multiple Years)

Measure 2(a): Debt-to-Asset Ratio

Metric: Ratio of total liabilities and total assets

This measure evaluates whether a school is maintaining a healthy balance between assets and liabilities over time.

Metric Calculation:

Debt to Asset Ratio = Total Liabilities/Total Assets

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect "Total Liabilities" data from Statement of Financial Position in audit
- If a school has long-term liabilities, it will be included in "Total Liabilities"
- Collect "Total Assets" from Statement of Financial Position in audit
- Do not use "Net Assets"
- Enter data into "debt to asset ratio" tab of the Financial Performance Framework Workbook
- Score based on rating criteria and cut scores

Measure 2(b): Total Margin

Metric: Ratio of net income and total revenues

This measure evaluates whether a school is managing costs appropriately within its available resources for the current year as well as over a three-year time period.

Metric Calculation:

Current Year Total Margin = Current Year Net Income/Current Year Total Revenue

Cumulative 3-year Total Margin = Total Three-Year Net Income/Total Three-Year Revenues

Metric Calculation Notes:

- Collect "Change in Net Assets" from Statement of Activities in audit
- Collect "Total Revenue" from Statement of Activities in audit
- Enter data into "total margin" tab of the Financial Performance Framework Workbook
- Score based on rating criteria and cut scores

Annual Performance Framework

Financial Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Measure 2(c): Cash Flow

Metric: Trend in cash balance from year to year

This measure evaluates cash inflows and outflows related to a school's main operational activities for the current year as well as over multiple years.

Metric Calculation:

One-Year Cash Flow = Year 2 Total Cash – Year 1 Total Cash

Multi-Year Cash Flow = Year 3 Total Cash – Year 1 Total Cash

(Year 3 = most recent year)

(Year 1 = earliest year of operation)

Metric Calculation Notes:

- This measure requires at least two years of data to calculate
- Collect "Cash, End of Year" from Statement of Cash Flows in audit
- Enter data into "cash flow" tab of the Financial Performance Framework Workbook
- To calculate One-Year Cash Flow, subtract Year 1 Total Cash Balance from Year 2 Total Cash Balance.
- To calculate Multi-Year Cash Flow, subtract the most recent year Cash Flow from Year 1 Cash Flow.
- Score based on rating criteria and cut scores

Indicator 3: Financial Management and Oversight

Measure 3(a): MCSAB and MDE Financial Reporting and Compliance Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with financial reporting and compliance obligations as required by MCSAB and the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE).

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Complete, accurate, and timely submission of quarterly financial reports due at the end of each quarter	1. Epicenter submissions per Annual Reporting Calendar 2. MDE: Notification 3. Ongoing MCSAB Monitoring

Annual Performance Framework

Financial Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Complete, accurate, and timely submission of annual board-approved budget due by July 31 annually 3. Timely submission of the annual independent financial audit due on or before September 30 annually 4. Annual independent financial audit completed by firm approved by State Auditor 5. Annual independent financial audit only completed by same auditor for three consecutive years 6. MDE Financial Data for Financial Exchange Transaction System (FETS) due mid-October annually 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Charter Contract Exhibit G-Charter School Fiscal Oversight Policy
---	--

Measure Notes:

- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “financial management & oversight” tab of the Financial Performance Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

Measure 3(b): Annual Financial Audit/Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with financial practice and management expectations.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An unqualified audit opinion 2. An audit devoid of significant findings and conditions, material weaknesses, or significant internal control weaknesses 3. An audit that does not include a going concern disclosure in the notes or an explanatory paragraph within the audit report 	Primary Source: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annual independent financial audit Secondary Source: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Financial Practices Self-Assessment

Measure Notes:

- A summary of findings is often located in the Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs at the end of a typical audit
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good

Annual Performance Framework

Financial Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



- standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “financial management & oversight” tab of the Financial Performance Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

Audit Opinion Notes:

- The audit opinion provides the professional opinion of the auditor as to whether the financial statements, as provided by the school, fairly represent the financial position of the school
- Auditors provide one of four opinions:
 - Unqualified, also known as “unmodified,” means the auditor found no significant issues and believes the financial statements accurately reflect the organization’s financial position
 - Qualified, also known as “modified,” means the auditor has found an error or misstatement that made a significant difference to the financial statements; however, that error does not indicate a wider organizational problem
 - Adverse means that the auditor believes the financial statements do not accurately represent the financial position of the organization because of large or widespread problems in the accounting process
 - Disclaimed means that the auditor did not have enough information to come to an opinion about the accuracy of the financial statements

Material Findings Notes:

- The auditor will assess the adequacy of the school’s internal controls and will make note of “material weaknesses” or “significant deficiencies” or “recurring findings”
- A material weakness is a lapse in internal controls that can jeopardize the accuracy of the financial statements because a control does not allow employees to detect, prevent, or correct an error, leading to the possible misstatement of financial information
- A significant deficiency is a lapse in internal controls that, while important and needing corrective action, does not rise to the level of a material weakness
- If a school had a material finding in a prior year that has not been corrected, an auditor will note a “recurring” or “unresolved prior year” finding

Going Concern Notes:

- A “going concern disclosure” is found in the audit notes and indicates an auditor’s concerns about a school’s financial viability
- Audits consider schools that are a “going concern” to be financially healthy enough to operate for a year¹

¹ National Association of Charter School Authorizers. *Core Organizational Performance Framework and Guidance*.

Annual Performance Framework

Financial Performance

Internal Companion Guidance

<www.qualitycharters.org>



Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



Organizational Performance Framework

The MCSAB organizational performance framework indicators, measures, metrics, and cut scores reflect only the minimum requirements in the Mississippi Charter School Law and the MCSAB charter school contract. Informed by national best practices as established in the National Association of Charter School Authorizer's (NACSA) *Core Performance Framework and Guidance*,¹ the framework streamlines reporting requirements where applicable to reduce administrative burdens on schools and authorizer staff.

The organizational performance framework is comprised of six indicators:

1. Educational Program Requirements
2. Enrollment and Admissions
3. Discipline
4. Special Populations
5. School Environment
6. Governance and Reporting

Measures

The organizational performance framework includes a combination of compliance measures and performance measures:

- Compliance measures evaluate if a school is meeting legal and contractual obligations.
- Performance measures evaluate if a school is meeting a target.

Ratings

The organizational performance framework includes a rubric with rating criteria and cut scores for each metric that indicate the measure performance targets associated with three ratings:

1. Meets Expectations

¹ <www.qualitycharters.org>

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



2. Approaches Expectations
3. Fails to Meet Expectations

Data

Assessing organizational performance and compliance requires the evaluation of multiple data sources throughout the course of a school year. MCSAB may collect data such as reports, statements of assurances, board documents, permits, school policies, etc. to evaluate organizational compliance.

Calculating an Overall Organizational Performance Rating

MCSAB will exercise a high degree of professional judgment to evaluate evidence, determine compliance, and assign ratings. The methodology described below serves as a tool to assist MCSAB in monitoring and decision-making and is meant to complement, not replace, the critical role of professional judgment in determining overall organizational performance. Organizational performance framework data are collected, scored, and aggregated based on the following steps:

1. Collect data for each measure based on internal companion guidance
2. Enter data in organizational performance framework workbook
3. Verify data with charter schools
4. Score measure data based on rating criteria and cut scores
5. Take average of data scores within a measure to produce indicator subscore
6. Take average of indicator subscores to produce an indicator score
7. Average indicator scores to produce overall organizational performance framework score that corresponds to a rating

Organizational Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 1: Educational Program Requirements

Measure 1(a): Essential Terms of the Charter Contract

This measure evaluates a school’s implementation of the essential terms listed in its charter contract. Schools may have multiple essential terms, depending on their school design.

Measure	Measure Type	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
		1	2	3
Essential Terms of the Charter Contract	Compliance	The school failed to fully implement all essential terms as defined in the charter contract.	The school fully implemented at least one essential term as defined in the charter contract.	The school fully implemented all essential terms as defined in the charter contract.

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of: 1. Alignment to the educational model 2. Adherence to the essential terms as listed in Exhibit C of the charter contract	1. Charter Contract Exhibit C Educational Program Requirements - Essential Terms 2. Approved Contract Amendments (as applicable) 3. Board meeting agendas, packets, reports, minutes 4. Site Visit Observation (as applicable) 5. Renewal Application (as applicable) 6. School website

Citation(s): MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.5.1)

Measure Notes:

Organizational Performance Framework Proposed 2024
 A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



- This measure is not intended to evaluate how well a school is performing on its essential terms.²
- A charter school may not modify the essential terms items listed in Exhibit C without an approved amendment from the Authorizer via the amendment process set forth in the Board's Annual Reporting Calendar.³

² National Association of Charter School Authorizers. *Core Organizational Performance Framework and Guidance*. <www.qualitycharters.org>

³ MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.5.1)

Organizational Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 1: Educational Program Requirements

Measure 1(b): Educational Program Requirements

This measure evaluates if a school is complying with the specific elements of its education program that are required by law.

Measure	Measure Type	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
		1	2	3
Educational Program Requirements	Compliance	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to educational program requirements and failures have not been remedied.	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal or contractual obligation, but the school is actively working toward compliance.	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to educational program requirements.

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> MS State Standards Requirements Instructional Days Requirements Compliance with MS Educator Code of Ethics Policy Graduation and promotion requirements State assessments 	Primary Source: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Signed Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Calendar Charter Contract Exhibit H Employee Code of Ethics

Citation(s):

Organizational Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



- MCSAB Charter School Contract (4.2.3), (2.8.1), (2.5.4), (2.12.1), (2.19.1)
- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-23(5)
- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-15

Organizational Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 1: Educational Program Requirements

Measure 1(c): Teacher and Employee Credentialing Requirements

This measure evaluates if a school is complying with state requirements for teacher and administrator qualifications.

Measure	Measure Type	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
		1	2	3
Teacher and Employee Credentialing Requirements	Compliance	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to teacher and employee credentialing requirements and failures have not been remedied.	N/A	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to teacher and employee credentialing requirements.

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Appropriate qualifications and credentials for school staff	Primary Source: 1. Board Member and School Staff Information Form 2. Site Visit results, if applicable Secondary Source(s): 1. Mississippi Educator Career Continuum Archive (MECCA) (for verification)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



Citation(s):

- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-47(1)(a)
- MCSAB Charter School Contract (4.2.1)

Measure Notes: Charter schools must comply with applicable federal laws, rules and regulations regarding the qualification of teachers and other instructional staff. No more than twenty-five percent (25%) of teachers in a charter school may be exempt from state teacher licensure requirements. Administrators of charter schools are exempt from state administrator licensure requirements. However, teachers and administrators must have a bachelor's degree as a minimum requirement, and teachers must have demonstrated subject-matter competency. Within three (3) years of the date of a teacher's employment by a charter school, the teacher must have, at a minimum, alternative licensure approved by the Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Licensure and Development.⁴

⁴ Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-47(1)(a)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 1: Educational Program Requirements

Measure 1(d): Annual Chronic Absenteeism Rate

This measure evaluates student attendance. Chronic absenteeism measures the percentage of students in a school who have missed 10 percent or more of their enrolled school days for any reason. Chronically absent students are more likely to fall behind academically and are less likely to graduate from high school.⁵

Measure	Measure Type	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
		1	2	3
Annual Chronic Absenteeism Rate	Performance	Greater than or equal to 20%	19%-14%	Less than or equal to 13%

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
1. Annual chronic absenteeism rate by school	1. MDE Chronic Absenteeism Report (published annually)

Citation(s): Miss. Code Ann. § 37-13-91; Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-29(1)(d)

Measure Notes: The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) defines chronic absenteeism as missing 10 percent (18 days) of the school year for any reason.⁶

⁵ <<https://www.mdek12.org/chronicabsenteeism>>

⁶ <<https://www.mdek12.org/chronicabsenteeism/calculation>>

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 2: Enrollment and Admissions

Measure 2(a): Underserved Student Enrollment Percentage Requirement

This measure evaluates if a school is complying with the statutory requirement that a charter school’s underserved population must reflect 80 percent or greater of the geographic district’s underserved student population.

Measure	Measure Type	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
		1	2	3
Underserved Student Enrollment Percentage Requirement	Compliance	The school's percentages of students who qualify for free lunch and students with disabilities percentages, respectively, are less than 80% of the geographic district's underserved enrollment percentage by grade levels served.	N/A	The school's percentages of students who qualify for free lunch and students with disabilities percentages, respectively, are equal to or greater than 80% of the geographic district's underserved enrollment percentage by grade levels served.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Free lunch enrollment by grade levels served for geographic district and charter school 2. Students with disabilities enrollment by grade levels served for geographic district and charter school	1. MDE data request (MOU)

Citation(s):

- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-23(5)
- MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.7.2)

Measure Notes: Because schools that have a Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) designation may not report the free lunch status of individual students, schools (both charter and geographic district) with the CEP designation will be treated as 100 percent free lunch.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 2: Enrollment and Admissions

Measure 2(b): Enrollment and Admission Requirements

This measure evaluates if a school is complying with obligations related to recruitment, lottery, enrollment, admissions, and truancy policies.

Measure	Measure Type	1	2	3
		Fails to Meet Expectations The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to enrollment and admissions requirements and failures have not been remedied.	Approaches Expectations N/A	Meets Expectations The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to enrollment and admissions requirements.
Enrollment and Admissions Requirements	Compliance			

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Recruitment and enrollment policy, lottery policy 2. Non-discriminatory admissions* 3. Attendance laws and truancy policy	Primary Source: 1. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source(s): 1. Charter Contract Exhibit E-Charter School Enrollment Policies and Procedures

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Citation(s):

- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-23
- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-23(3)
- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-23(6)
- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-23(7)
- MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.7.1), (2.7.4)

Measure Notes: *A finding by the Authorizer that the Charter School is operating in a discriminatory manner in its admissions practices shall be grounds for termination of the Charter Contract. The Authorizer, prior to termination of the contract, may take remedial steps short of revocation in accordance with its policies.⁷

The Charter Operator shall not enroll more than 120 percent of the total number of students that it is authorized to enroll pursuant to the Charter School's Enrollment Projection Table.⁸

⁷ MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.7.4)

⁸ MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.6.2)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 2: Enrollment and Admissions

Measure 2(c): Re-current Enrollment Rate

This measure evaluates changes in a school's enrollment from year to year.

Measure	Measure Type	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
		1	2	3
Re-current Enrollment Rate	Performance	Re-current enrollment rate decrease is greater than or equal to fifteen percent (-15%)	-14% and -11%	Re-current enrollment rate decrease is less than ten percent (-10%)

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
1. Current Year Net Membership 2. Previous Year Net Membership	1. MDE publicly reported annual net membership data via the Superintendent's Annual Report

Citation(s):

- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-29(1)(e)

Calculation Methodology:

- Re-current Enrollment Rate = (Current Year Net Membership - Previous Year Net Membership)/(Previous Year Net Membership)

Measure Notes: Student mobility within a school year is common, but significant decreases in student enrollment over time may indicate the school is failing to keep enrolled students, which impacts a school's budget and recruitment strategy.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 3: Discipline

Measure 3(a): Student Discipline Requirements

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with their code of conduct and discipline policy.

Measure	Measure Type	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
		1	2	3
Student Discipline Requirements	Compliance	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to student discipline requirements and failures have not been remedied.	N/A	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to student discipline requirements.

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Student code of conduct 2. Discipline policy	Primary Source: 1. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source(s): 1. Student Handbook

Citation(s): Miss. Code Ann. § 37-9-14; Miss. Code Ann. § 37-11-29; MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.10)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 3: Discipline

Measure 3(b): In-school and Out-of-School Suspension and Expulsion Rates

This measure evaluates whether a school is excessively excluding students from regular instruction.

Measure	Measure Type	FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS	APPROACHES EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS
		1	2	3
In-school and Out-of-school Suspension and Expulsion Rates	Performance	Any of the school's rates are 2.5 or more percentage points higher than the geographic district's rates.	Any of the school's rates are higher than the geographic district's rates, but the higher rates are less than 2.5 percentage points higher.	The school's in-school and out-of-school suspension and expulsion rates are at or below the geographic district's rates.

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In-school suspension rates for charter school and geographic district Out-of-school suspension rates for charter school and geographic district Expulsion rates for charter school and geographic district 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> MS Succeeds Report Card MDE data request (MOU)

Citation(s): Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-29(1)(f)

Calculation Methodology:

Organizational Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



- Establish the geographic school district for the charter school
 - The geographic school district shall be composed of traditional public schools from the district in which the charter school is located that have the same school type (i.e., elementary, elementary/middle, middle, middle/high, and high schools) as the charter school
- Given that publicly available MDE data for suspension and expulsion rates are masked for less than 5%, MCSAB will secure a MOU with MDE to collect charter and geographic district data annually

Cut Score Notes:

- Cut score ranges are based on prior precedence from previous performance framework

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 4: Special Populations

Measure 4(a): Student with Disabilities Rights and Requirements

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with obligations for protecting the rights of students with disabilities.

Measure	Measure Type	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
		1	2	3
Students with Disabilities Rights and Requirements	Compliance	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to students with disabilities rights and requirements and failures have not been remedied.	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal or contractual obligation, but the school is actively working toward compliance.	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to students with disabilities rights and requirements.

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Organizational Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



Data/Evidence	Source(s)
<p>Evidence of compliance with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification: Effective steps are implemented to identify and refer students in need of special education services. 2. Operational Compliance: School complies with rules relating to academic program, assessments, and discipline. 3. IEPs: Appropriate staff implemented individualized education plans and section 504 plans. 4. Accessibility: Provided students and families access to school facility and high-quality educational programming consistent with legal obligations and student abilities. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MDE Office of Special Education Onsite Fiscal Monitoring Protocol 2. MDE Office of Special Education Policies and Procedures Monitoring Protocol 3. MDE Office of Special Education Delivery of Services Monitoring Protocol (FAPE/LRE) 4. MDE Office of Special Education Child Find—Initial Evaluation 5. MDE Office of Special Education Child Find—Re-Evaluation 6. MDE Special Education Determination Report 7. Site Visit Report

Citation(s):

- IDEA (20 U.S.C. §1401 et seq.)
- ADA (42 U.S.C. §12101 et seq.)
- Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. §794)
- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-29(4)
- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-43(3)
- MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.19.1)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 4: Special Populations

Measure 4(b): English Learner (EL) Student Rights and Requirements

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with obligations for protecting the rights of English Learner students.

Measure	Measure Type	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
		1	2	3
English Learner(EL) Student Rights and Requirements	Compliance	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to EL student rights and requirements and failures have not been remedied.	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal or contractual obligation, but the school is actively working toward compliance.	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to EL student rights and requirements.

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Organizational Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



Data/Evidence	Source(s)
<p>Evidence of compliance with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification: Effective steps are implemented to identify students in need of EL services. 2. Delivery: Appropriate EL services are provided to identified EL students by appropriate staff and according to the school's policy. 3. Accommodations: EL students are provided with appropriate accommodations on assessments. 4. Exiting: EL students are exited from services according to their capacities. 5. Monitoring: Former EL students are monitored for at least two years upon exiting services. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MDE Office of Federal Programs and Grants Management–Fiscal Monitoring Instrument for ESSA Programs 2. Site Visit Report, if applicable

Citation(s):

- Title III, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)
- MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.7.1)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 5: School Environment

Measure 5(a): Facilities, Health, Safety, and Transportation Requirements

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with all relevant inspections, codes, and regulations related to facilities, health, safety, and transportation.

Measure	Measure Type	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
		1	2	3
Facilities, Health, Safety, and Transportation Requirements	Compliance	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to facilities, health, safety, and transportation requirements and failures have not been remedied.	N/A	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to facilities, health, safety, and transportation requirements.

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Organizational Performance Framework Proposed 2024
A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local and state fire and life safety codes 2. Public health sanitary codes 3. ADA requirements 4. Transportation plan 5. Bus safety protocols 6. Health service requirements 7. Property insurance 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fire Marshal Inspection 2. Facility Review (Fire Safety and Maintenance) 3. Facility Review (Cafeteria/Kitchen, Public Health) 4. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints 5. State Department of Health Food Service Permit 6. Current certificates of insurance signed by an authorized representative of the insurer 7. Certificate of Occupancy (Epicenter) 8. MDPH Immunization Compliance Report 9. Site visit report, if applicable

Citation(s):

- 42 U.S.C. §12101, *et seq.*
- MCSAB Charter School Contract (1.3.7), (2.13.1), (2.14.1), (2.25.1), (3.6)
- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-43(5)

Measure Notes: A charter school may not modify the transportation policy without approval from the Authorizer.⁹

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



⁹ MCSAB Charter Contract (2.14.1)

Organizational Performance Framework Proposed 2024
A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 5: School Environment

Measure 5(b): Student Records and Information Handling Requirements

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with obligations related to the management of student records and information.

Measure	Measure Type	FAILS TO MEET EXPECTATIONS	APPROACHES EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS
		1	2	3
Student Records and Information Handling Requirements	Compliance	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to student records and information handling requirements and failures have not been remedied.	N/A	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to student records and information handling requirements.

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Public records requirements 2. Student record-keeping and records transfer requirements	Primary Source: 1. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source: 1. Site Visit Report, if applicable

Citation(s): Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-45(6); MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.16)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 5: School Environment

Measure 5(c): Background Check Requirements

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with fingerprint background check requirements.

Measure	Measure Type	1	2	3
		1 Fails to Meet Expectations	2 Approaches Expectations	3 Meets Expectations
Background Check Requirements	Compliance	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to background check requirements and failures have not been remedied.	N/A	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to background check requirements.

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Updated background checks	Primary Source: 1. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source(s): 1. Site Visit Report, if applicable 2. Charter Contract Exhibit I-Criminal Background Checks

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Citation(s):

- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-49(1)
- MCSAB Charter School Contract (4.4.1)

Measure Notes:

- All charter school teachers and other school personnel, as well as members of the governing board and any education service provider with whom a charter school contracts, are subject to criminal history record checks and fingerprinting requirements applicable to employees of other public schools.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 5: School Environment

Measure 5(d): Employee Rights and Requirements

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with obligations related to employee rights.

Measure	Measure Type	1	2	3
		Fails to Meet Expectations The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to employee rights and requirements and failures have not been remedied.	Approaches Expectations N/A	Meets Expectations The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to employee rights and requirements.
Employee Rights and Requirements	Compliance			

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) 2. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) 3. Employment contracts	Primary Source: 1. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source(s): 1. School Employee Handbook

Citation(s): MCSAB Charter School Contract (1.3.7), (2.16.2), (4.1)

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 6: Governance and Reporting

Measure 6(a): School Board Governance Requirements

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with school board governance obligations.

Measure	Measure Type	1	2	3
		Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
School Board Governance Requirements	Compliance	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to governance requirements and failures have not been remedied.	N/A	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to governance requirements.

MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Registered non-profit status 2. Mississippi Open Meetings Act §25-41-1 3. Mississippi Public Records Act 4. Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) 5. Charter board bylaws, conflict of interest policy, and charter board composition	1. Mississippi Secretary of State Office Charities Search 2. IRS Tax Exempt Organization Search 3. Charter Board Bylaws 4. Articles of Incorporation 5. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints 6. Charter Board Member and School Staff Information (form) 7. Charter Board packets/minutes

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Organizational Performance Framework



Citation(s):

- Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-39(2)
- Miss. Code Ann. § 25-41-1
- Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) 20 U.S.C.A § 1232(g)
- MCSAB Charter School Contract (1.1.4), (2.3.1), (2.3.3), (2.3.4), (2.27.5)

Organizational Performance Framework Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



Indicator 6: Governance and Reporting

Measure 6(b): MCSAB and MDE Reporting, Training, and Meeting Requirements

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with training and meeting requirements as well as the timely submission of required documents to MCSAB or to the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE).

Measure	Measure Type	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
		1	2	3
MCSAB and MDE Reporting, Training, and Meeting Requirements	Compliance	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to MCSAB and MDE reporting, training, and meeting requirements and failures have not been remedied.	N/A	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to MCSAB and MDE reporting, training, and meeting requirements.

Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework

Organizational Performance Framework



MCSAB staff will reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submission of all required reports, attendance and enrollment data, test results, and other information in a timely and accurate manner as set forth by the MCSAB and MDE 2. Timely communication of deficiencies to the MCSAB 3. Attendance at required trainings and meetings by MCSAB, including meetings with MCSAB and/or MDE staff, MCSAB committee meetings, and MCSAB board meetings 	1. Epicenter dashboard submissions per Annual Reporting Calendar

Citation(s): MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.1.1), (2.17.1), (2.24.1), (2.24.2), (2.3.5)

Measure Notes: Schools have a five-day grace period after the submission deadline to comply before a reporting submission is deemed late. Schools are notified in writing should additional documentation be required throughout the year. Submission deadlines for additional documentation is generally ten days after notification, with the same grace period as all other submissions.

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



The Internal Companion Guidance document is intended to provide MCSAB staff and charter schools with guidance on how the components of the Organizational Performance Framework will be defined and calculated to create the Annual Performance Report for each school. MCSAB staff should use this document in conjunction with the Organizational Performance Framework Workbook.

Contents

Indicator 1: Education Program Requirements	2
Measure 1(a): Essential Terms of the Charter Contract	2
Measure 1(b): Educational Program Requirements	3
Measure 1(c): Teacher and Employee Credentialing Requirements	3
Measure 1(d): Annual Chronic Absenteeism Rate	4
Indicator 2: Enrollment and Admissions	5
Measure 2(a): Underserved Student Enrollment Percentage Requirement	5
Measure 2(b): Enrollment and Admissions Requirements	6
Measure 2(c): Re-current Enrollment Rate	7
Indicator 3: Discipline	8
Measure 3(a): Student Discipline Requirements	8
Measure 3(b): In-school and Out-of-School Suspension and Expulsion Rates	9
Indicator 4: Special Populations	10
Measure 4(a): Students with Disabilities Rights and Requirements	10
Measure 4(a): English Language Learner (ELL) Student Rights and Requirements	13
Indicator 5: School Environment	15
Measure 5(a): Facilities, Health, Safety, and Transportation Requirements	15
Measure 5 (b): Student Records and Information Handling Requirements	17
Measure 5 (c): Background Check Requirements	18
Measure 5 (d): Employee Rights and Requirements	19
Indicator 6: Governance and Reporting	20
Measure 6(a): School Board Governance Requirements	20
Measure 6(b): MCSAB and MDE Reporting, Training, and Meeting Requirements	21

Indicator 1: Education Program Requirements

Measure 1(a): Essential Terms of the Charter Contract

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates a school’s implementation of the essential terms listed in its charter contract. Schools may have multiple essential terms, depending on their school design.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of: 1. Alignment to the educational model 2. Adherence to the essential terms as listed in Exhibit C of the charter contract	1. Charter Contract Exhibit C Educational Program Requirements - Essential Terms 2. Approved Contract Amendments (as applicable) 3. Board meeting agendas, packets, reports, minutes 4. Site Visit Observation (as applicable) 5. Renewal Application (as applicable) 6. School website

Measure Notes:

- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “educational program requirements” tab of the Organizational Performance Framework Workbook based on rating criteria
- Measure is not intended to evaluate how well a school is performing on its essential terms
 - It evaluates only whether the school’s programming is aligned to the essential terms laid out in its contract and whether the school has received approval for changes to those essential terms through the authorizer’s contract amendment process¹

Other Notes:

- A charter school may not modify the essential terms items listed in Exhibit C without an approved amendment from the Authorizer

¹ National Association of Charter School Authorizers. *Core Financial Performance Framework and Guidance*. <www.qualitycharters.org>

² MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.5.1)

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Measure 1(b): Educational Program Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates if a school is complying with the specific elements of its education program that are required by law.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MS State Standards Requirements 2. Instructional Days Requirements 3. Compliance with MS Educator Code of Ethics Policy 4. Graduation and promotion requirements 5. State assessments 	Primary Source: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Signed Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Academic Calendar 2. Charter Contract Exhibit H Employee Code of Ethics

Measure Notes:

- Reference the signed Charter School Board Annual Statement of Assurances document as a primary source of compliance for this measure
- Confirm there are no verified complaints
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, ~~or~~ and return to goodstanding notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “educational program requirements” tab of the Organizational Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

Measure 1(c): Teacher and Employee Credentialing Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates if a school is complying with state requirements for teacher and administrator qualifications.

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Reference the following data/evidence and source to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Appropriate qualifications and credentials for school staff	Primary Source: 1. Board Member and School Staff Information Form 2. Site Visit report, if applicable 3. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source(s): 1. Mississippi Educator Career Continuum Archive (MECCA) (for verification)

Measure Notes:

- Review Board Member and School Staff Information Form for current teacher licenses.
- Reference the signed Charter School Board Annual Statement of Assurances document as a primary source of compliance
- Confirm there are no verified complaints
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “educational program requirements” tab of the Organizational Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

Other Notes:

- Under state law, at least 75% of a charter school’s teachers must meet state requirements for licensure. All teachers must have a bachelor’s degree and demonstrate subject-matter competence (such as through a passing score on a subject-matter test) as well as meet any other applicable federal requirements. Administrators are not required to have state licensure but must have a bachelor’s degree. A charter school may not employ nonimmigrant foreign workers, regardless of visa status, as teachers without a waiver from the MCSAB.³

³ Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-47(1)(a)

Measure 1(d): Annual Chronic Absenteeism Rate

Measure Type: Performance

This measure evaluates student attendance. Chronic absenteeism measures the percentage of students in a school who have missed 10 percent or more of their enrolled school days for any

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



reason. Chronically absent students are more likely to fall behind academically and are less likely to graduate from high school.⁴

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
1. Annual chronic absenteeism rate by school	1. MDE Chronic Absenteeism Report (published annually)

Measure Notes:

- Collect chronic absenteeism rates for the relevant school year from the Chronic Absenteeism Report provide by MDE for each charter school
- Enter the chronic absenteeism rate data into the “educational program requirements” tab of the Organizational Performance Framework Workbook
- Score chronic absenteeism rate based on rating criteria and cut scores
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance

Indicator 2: Enrollment and Admissions

Measure 2(a): Underserved Student Enrollment Percentage Requirement

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates if a school is complying with the statutory requirement that a charter school’s underserved population must reflect 80 percent or greater of the geographic district’s underserved student population.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Free lunch enrollment by grade levels served for geographic district and charter school 2. Students with disabilities enrollment by grade levels served for geographic district and charter school	1. MDE data request (MOU)

⁴<<https://www.mdek12.org/chronicabsenteeism>

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Measure Notes:

- Establish the geographic school district for the charter school
 - The geographic school district shall be composed of traditional public schools from the district in which the charter school is located that have the same school type (i.e., elementary, elementary/middle, middle, middle/high, and high schools) as the charter school
- Collect percentage of students who qualify for free lunch enrollment by grade levels served for charter school from the data request (MOU) provided by MDE
- Collect percentage of students who qualify for free lunch enrollment by grade levels served for the geographic school district from the data request (MOU) provided by MDE
- Collect percentage of students with disabilities by grade levels served for charter school from the data request (MOU) provided by MDE
- Collect percentage of students with disabilities by grade levels served for the geographic school district from the data request (MOU) provided by MDE
- Divide the charter school percentage of students who qualify for free lunch enrollment by the geographic district percentage of students who qualify for free lunch enrollment
- Divide the charter school percentage of students with disabilities by the geographic district percentage of students with disabilities
- Enter data into the “enrollment and admissions” tab of the Organizational Performance Framework Workbook
- The charter school percentage will be calculated as a percentage of the geographic district percentage (i.e. charter school percentage divided by the geographic district percentage)
- Score based on rating criteria and cut scores
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance

Other Notes:

- Because schools that have a Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) designation may not report the free lunch status of individual students, schools (both charter and geographic district) with the CEP designation will be treated as 100 percent free lunch.

Measure 2(b): Enrollment and Admissions Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates if a school is complying with obligations related to recruitment, lottery, enrollment, admissions, and truancy policies.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Recruitment and enrollment policy, lottery policy 2. Non-discriminatory admissions* 3. Attendance laws and truancy policy	Primary Source: 1. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source(s): 1. Charter Contract Exhibit E-Charter School Enrollment Policies and Procedures

Measure Notes:

- Reference the signed Charter School Board Annual Statement of Assurances document as a primary source of compliance
- Confirm there are no verified complaints
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “enrollment and admissions requirements” tab of the Organizational Framework Workbook based on rating criteria
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance

Other Notes:

- *A finding by MCSAB that the school is operating in a discriminatory manner in its admissions practices shall be grounds for termination of the Charter Contract
 - The Authorizer, prior to termination of the contract, may take remedial steps short of revocation in accordance with its policies⁵
- In all cases, student recruitment and enrollment decisions shall be made in a nondiscriminatory manner and without regard to race, creed, color, ethnicity, sex, disability, national origin, religion, gender, income level, minority status, limited English proficiency, ancestry, need for special education services, or academic or athletic ability⁶

⁵ MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.7.4)

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance



Internal Companion Guidance

⁶ MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.7.1)

- For a school's pre-opening year, MCSAB will review the school's Recruitment and Enrollment Policy and its lottery policy as submitted through Epicenter prior to school opening
- Schools are allowed to enroll up to 120% of the number of students in the Enrollment Projection Table without seeking permission for an enrollment increase from the Authorizer Board⁷

Measure 2(c): Re-current Enrollment Rate

Measure Type: Performance

This measure evaluates changes in a school's enrollment from year to year.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
1. Current Year Net Membership 2. Previous Year Net Membership	1. MDE publicly reported annual net membership data via the Superintendent's Annual Report

Calculation Methodology

- Calculation requires data from two school years and is only applicable to schools after their first full year of operation
- Re-current Enrollment Rate = $(\text{Current Year Net Membership} - \text{Previous Year Net Membership}) / (\text{Previous Year Net Membership})$

Measure Notes:

- Collect total current year net membership data for the relevant school year from the Superintendent's Annual Report provided by MDE
- Collect total previous year net membership data for the relevant school year from the Superintendent's Annual Report provided by MDE
- Enter the total current year net membership data and the total previous year net membership data into the "enrollment and admissions" tab of the Organizational Performance Framework Workbook
- Score based on rating criteria and cut scores

Annual Performance Framework Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance

⁷ MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.6.2)



Other Notes:

- MDE defines net membership as the number of students belonging to a school unit at any given time.
- Membership is an ever-changing number and is found by adding the total number of student entries and total student re-entries and subtracting the number of withdrawals.
- Student mobility within a school year is common, but significant decreases in student enrollment over time may indicate the school is failing to keep enrolled students, which impacts a school's budget and recruitment strategy

Indicator 3: Discipline

Measure 3(a): Student Discipline Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with their code of conduct and discipline policy.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Student code of conduct 2. Discipline policy	Primary Source: 1. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source(s): 1. Student Handbook

Measure Notes:

- Reference the signed Charter School Board Annual Statement of Assurances document as a primary source of compliance
- Confirm there are no verified complaints
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the "Measure Score/Subscore" column of the "discipline" tab of the Organizational Performance Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

Other Notes:

- Per the charter contract, schools must submit their student handbook, including the student code of conduct, complaint policy, and discipline management plan, for authorizer approval

Internal Companion Guidance_Organizational Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Measure 3(b): In-school and Out-of-School Suspension and Expulsion Rates

Measure Type: Performance

This measure evaluates whether a school is excessively excluding students from regular instruction.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
1. In-school suspension rates for charter school and geographic district 2. Out-of-school suspension rates for charter school and geographic district 3. Expulsion rates for charter school and geographic district	1. MS Succeeds Report Card 2. MDE data request (MOU)

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Measure Notes:

- This measure includes three separate rates: (1) In-school suspension rate, (2) Out-of-school suspension rate, and (3) Expulsion rate
- Establish the geographic school district for the charter school
 - The geographic school district shall be composed of traditional public schools from the district in which the charter school is located that have the same school type (i.e., elementary, elementary/middle, middle, middle/high, and high schools) as the charter school
- Collect in-school suspension rate for charter school for the relevant school year from MS Succeeds Report Card or MOU data request (as applicable)
- Collect in-school suspension rate for geographic district for the relevant school year from MS Succeeds Report Card or MOU data request (as applicable)
- Collect out-of-school suspension rate for charter school for the relevant school year from MS Succeeds Report Card or MOU data request (as applicable)
- Collect out-of-school suspension rate for geographic district for the relevant school year from MS Succeeds Report Card or MOU data request (as applicable)
- Collect expulsion rate for charter school for the relevant school year from MS Succeeds Report Card or MOU data request (as applicable)
- Collect expulsion rate for geographic district for the relevant school year from MS Succeeds Report Card or MOU data request (as applicable)
- Enter the data into the “discipline” tab of the Organizational Performance Framework Workbook.
- Score difference between charter school and geographic district rates based on rating criteria and cut scores.

Other Notes:

- Given that publicly available MDE data for suspension and expulsion rates are masked for less than 5 percent, MCSAB will secure a MOU with MDE to collect charter and geographic district data annually
- Cut score ranges are based on prior precedence from previous performance framework

Indicator 4: Special Populations

Measure 4(a): Students with Disabilities Rights and Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with obligations for protecting the rights of students with disabilities.

Internal Companion Guidance_Organizational Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Identification: Effective steps are implemented to identify and refer students in need of special education services 2. Operational Compliance: School complies with rules relating to academic program, assessments, and discipline 3. IEPs: Appropriate staff implemented students individualized education plans and section 504 plans 4. Accessibility: Provided students and families access to school facility and high-quality educational programming consistent with legal obligations and student abilities	1. MDE Office of Special Education Onsite Fiscal Monitoring Protocol 2. MDE Office of Special Education Policies and Procedures Monitoring Protocol 3. MDE Office of Special Education Delivery of Services Monitoring Protocol (FAPE/LRE) 4. MDE Office of Special Education Child Find-Initial Evaluation 5. MDE Office of Special Education Child Find-Re-Evaluation 6. MDE Special Education Determination Report 7. Site Visit Report (as applicable)

Measure Notes:

- Both MCSAB and MDE have responsibility for ensuring charter schools’ compliance in special education
- The MDE Office of Special Education performs routine oversight and monitoring of special education services for all public schools in Mississippi
- MCSAB will use findings from this monitoring as well as its own oversight to determine if the school is compliant
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “special populations” tab of the Organizational Performance Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

Identification Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools ensure effective steps are implemented to identify and refer students in need of special education services:

- Child Find-Initial Evaluation: MCSAB will review the findings for Record Review Items CFI-8, CFI-9, CFI-11, and CFI-12
- MDE Policies and Procedures Monitoring Protocol: MDE Special Education Monitoring Team will review whether the charter school abides by special education regulations
- Review the findings for Record Review Item CF-A and CF-B

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Operational Compliance Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools administer appropriate state and assessments, including alternate assessments, discipline procedures, and appropriate academic programming when appropriate:

- MDE Delivery of Service Monitoring Protocol: MDE special education monitoring team will review whether the school provides access to appropriate assessments.
- MCSAB will base its evaluation on whether the MDE monitoring team determines the school is compliant and will review the finding for Record Review Item DS-19
- MDE Fiscal Monitoring Instrument for Federal Programs: MDE Federal Programs monitoring team will review whether the charter school provides English learners access to appropriate assessments under Title III, Part A
- Review the findings for NN-7 through NN-9, as applicable

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools implement special education services and curricular modifications and accommodations are provided:

- Special Education Determination Report: Review the Special Education Determination Level to assess whether the school is providing appropriate programming
- MDE Special Education Policies and Procedures Implementation Protocol: MDE special education monitoring team will review whether the charter school abides by special education regulations
- Review the findings for Record Review Items FAPE-A through FAPE-D, LRE-A, and LRE-B
- Site Visit Report (as applicable): School site visit team may collect information about the implementation of special education

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools conduct appropriate and timely evaluations, re-evaluations, and re-evaluation waivers. If schools contract with external evaluators, they must establish and implement standards of practice for evaluators, per the charter school contract.

- MDE Special Education Monitoring—Child Find-Initial Evaluation: Review the findings for Record Review Items CFI-1 through CFI-7; CFI-10; and CFI-13
- MDE Special Education Monitoring—Child Find-Re-Evaluation: Review the findings for Record Review Items CFR-1 through CFR-5

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools abide by IDEA regulations concerning discipline of students with disabilities:

- MDE Discipline Monitoring Protocol: Review the findings for Record Review Items Dis-1 through Dis-7
- MDE Policies and Procedures Implementation Protocol: Review the finding for Record Review Item Dis-A

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Individualized Education Plan (IEP) Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools ensure appropriate staff implemented students individualized education plans and section 504 plans:

- MDE Delivery of Services Monitoring Protocol: MDE special education monitoring team will review whether IEPs and 504 plans are appropriately written
- Use MDE’s determination for its assessment of whether the school is compliant.
- Review the findings for Record Review Items DS-1 through DS-18; DS-20.1.-3., 20.6.-8.; DS-22; DS-23; and FAPE-1

Accessibility Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools provided students and families access to school facility and high-quality educational programming consistent with legal obligations and student abilities.

- Special Education Performance Determination Report: Review the chronic absenteeism of students with disabilities compared to both the chronic absenteeism of the school’s students without disabilities and the state average chronic absenteeism of the students with disabilities
- MDE Delivery of Services Monitoring Protocol: MDE special education monitoring team will review whether the charter school abides by special education regulations
- Review the findings for Record Review Items DS-20.4.-5. as well as DS-21

Measure 4(b): English Learner (EL) Student Rights and Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with obligations for protecting the rights of English Learner students.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Identification: Effective steps are implemented to identify students in need of EL services 2. Delivery: Appropriate EL services are provided to identified EL students by appropriate staff and according to the school's policy 3. Accommodations: EL students are provided with appropriate accommodations on assessments	1. MDE Office of Federal Programs and Grants Management - Fiscal Monitoring Instrument for ESSA Programs 2. Site Visit Report (as applicable)

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



- | | |
|--|--|
| 4. Exiting: EL students are exited from services according to their capacities
5. Monitoring: Former EL students are monitored for at least two years upon exiting services | |
|--|--|

Measure Notes:

- Both MCSAB and MDE have responsibility for ensuring charter schools' compliance in special education
- MDE Office of Federal Programs and Grants Management performs routine oversight and monitoring of English Learner services for all public schools in Mississippi
- MCSAB will use findings from this monitoring as well as its own oversight to determine if the school is compliant
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the "Measure Score/Subscore" column of the "special populations" tab of the Organizational Performance Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

Identification Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools implement effective steps to identify students in need of EL services:

- MDE Fiscal Monitoring Instrument for Federal Programs: MDE Federal Programs monitoring team will review whether the charter school abides by regulations concerning the identification of English learners under Title III, Part A
- Review the findings for NN-4 and NN-15, as applicable

Delivery Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools provide appropriate EL service to identified EL students by appropriate staff and according to the school's policy:

- MDE Fiscal Monitoring Instrument for Federal Programs: MDE Federal Programs monitoring team will review whether the charter school abides by regulations concerning the provision of English learner services under Title III, Part A
- Review the findings for NN-1 through NN-3, NN-5 and NN-6, NN-10 through NN-12, NN-14, and NN-16, as applicable

Accommodations Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools provide ELL students with appropriate accommodations on assessments:

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



- MDE Fiscal Monitoring Instrument for Federal Programs: MDE Federal Programs monitoring team will review whether the charter school provides English learners access to appropriate assessments under Title III, Part A
- Review the findings for NN-7 through NN-9, as applicable

Exiting Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools exit EL students from services according to their capacities:

- MDE Fiscal Monitoring Instrument for Federal Programs: MDE Federal Programs monitoring team will review whether the charter school abides by regulations concerning the provision of English learner services under Title III, Part A
- Review the findings for NN-1 through NN-3, NN-5 and NN-6, NN-10 through NN-12, NN-14, and NN-16, as applicable

Monitoring Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools Former EL students are monitored for at least two years upon exiting services:

- MDE Fiscal Monitoring Instrument for Federal Programs: MDE Federal Programs monitoring team will review whether the charter school abides by regulations concerning the provision of English learner services under Title III, Part A
- Review the findings for NN-1 through NN-3, NN-5 and NN-6, NN-10 through NN-12, NN-14, and NN-16, as applicable

Indicator 5: School Environment

Measure 5(a): Facilities, Health, Safety, and Transportation Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with all relevant inspections, codes, and regulations related to facilities, health, safety, and transportation.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local and state fire and life safety codes 2. Public health sanitary codes 3. ADA requirements 4. Transportation plan 5. Bus safety protocols 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fire Marshal Inspection 2. Facility Review (Fire Safety and Maintenance) 3. Facility Review (Cafeteria/Kitchen, Public Health) 4. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints 5. State Department of Health Food Service Permit

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



- 6. Health service requirements
- 7. Property insurance

- 6. Current certificates of insurance signed by an authorized representative of the insurer
- 7. Certificate of Occupancy
- 8. MDPH Immunization Compliance Report
- 9. Site visit report, if applicable

Measure Notes:

- Reference the signed Charter School Board Annual Statement of Assurances document as needed
- Confirm there are no verified complaints
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “school environment” tab of the Organizational Performance Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

Local and State Fire and Life Safety Codes Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools meet all relevant fire and life safety codes for public schools:

- Fire Marshal Inspection: Use the Fire Marshal inspection to ensure that a school’s facility is safe for students
- Facility Review: Review the findings from the Fire Safety and Maintenance portions of the Facility Review
- Certificate of Occupancy: Confirm the submission of the Certificate of Occupancy

Public Health Sanitary Codes Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if the school passed all relevant inspections:

- Facility Review: Review the findings from the Cafeteria/Kitchen and Public Health section
- State Department of Health Food Service Permit: This certificate allows a school to store and serve food on-site
 - Check that this certificate has been issued prior to opening and will also review that it is up to date each year

ADA Requirements Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if schools facilities are compliant with ADA regulations:

- Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints
- Site Visit Report (as applicable)

Internal Companion Guidance_Organizational Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Transportation Plan Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if the school follows its transportation policy as approved by the MCSAB:

- Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints
- Site Visit Report (as applicable)

Bus Safety Protocols Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if the school follows applicable bus safety protocols:

- Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints
- Site Visit Report (as applicable)

Health Service Requirements Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if the school is meeting obligations related to health services.

- Facility Review: Review the findings from the Public Health section
- MDPH Immunization Compliance Report
- Site Visit Report (as applicable)

Property Insurance Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if the school provides documentation of required insurance coverage:

- Current certificates of insurance signed by an authorized representative of the insurer

Other Notes:

- A charter school may not modify the transportation policy without approval from the Authorizer⁸

Measure 5 (b): Student Records and Information Handling Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with obligations related to the management of student records and information.

⁸ MCSAB Charter Contract (Approved 7/31/2020)(2.14.1)

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Public records requirements 2. Student record-keeping and records transfer requirements	Primary Source: 1. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source: 1. Site Visit Report, if applicable

Measure Notes:

- Reference the signed Charter School Board Annual Statement of Assurances document as a primary source of compliance
- Confirm there are no verified complaints
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “school environment” tab of the Organizational Performance Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

Measure 5 (c): Background Check Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with fingerprint background check requirements.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
1. Evidence of updated background checks	Primary Source: 1. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source(s): 1. Site Visit Report, if applicable 2. Charter Contract Exhibit I-Criminal Background Checks

Measure Notes:

- Reference the signed Charter School Board Annual Statement of Assurances document as a primary source of compliance
- Confirm there are no verified complaints
- MCSAB may also conduct onsite reviews of documents related to employee background

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



checks per the procedure developed in consultation with relevant entities

- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “school environment” tab of the Organizational Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

Other Notes:

- All charter school teachers and other school personnel, as well as members of the governing board and any education service provider with whom a charter school contracts, are subject to criminal history record checks and fingerprinting requirements applicable to employees of other public schools⁹

Measure 5 (d): Employee Rights and Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with obligations related to employee rights.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) 2. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) 3. Employment contracts 	Primary Source: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints Secondary Source(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School Employee Handbook

Measure Notes:

- Reference the signed Charter School Board Annual Statement of Assurances document as a primary source of compliance
- Confirm there are no verified complaints
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “school environment” tab of the Organizational Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

⁹ Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-49

Indicator 6: Governance and Reporting

Measure 6(a): School Board Governance Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with all relevant inspections, codes, and regulations related to facilities, health, safety, and transportation.

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Registered non-profit status 2. Mississippi Open Meetings Act §25-41-1 3. Mississippi Public Records Act 4. Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) 5. Charter board bylaws, conflict of interest policy, and charter board composition	1. Mississippi Secretary of State Office Charities Search 2. IRS Tax Exempt Organization Search 3. Charter Board Bylaws 4. Articles of Incorporation 5. Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints 6. Charter Board Member and School Staff Information (form) 7. Charter Board packets/minutes

Measure Notes:

- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “governance and reporting” tab of the Organizational Performance Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

Registered Non-Profit Status Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if a school is in compliance with the legal requirement that it hold 501(c)(3) status:

- Secretary of State’s Office Charities Search Tool: Determine if the organization has complied with state law
- Organizations listed as “current-registered” are considered compliant
- IRS Tax Exempt Organization Search Tool: Determine if the organization has maintained its 501(c)(3) status
- Organizations currently listed in Publication 78 are considered compliant

Mississippi Open Meetings Act § 25-41-1 Notes:

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



Reference the following sources to evaluate if a school abides by the Mississippi Open Meetings Act:

- Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints
- Charter Board Bylaws
- Charter Board packets/minutes

Mississippi Public Records Act and FERPA Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if a school abides by the Mississippi Public Records Act and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA):

- Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints
- Charter Board Bylaws
- Charter Board packets/minutes

Charter Board Bylaws, Conflict of Interest Policy, and Charter Board Composition Notes:

Reference the following sources to evaluate if a school complying with governance requirements:

- Statement of Assurance and no verified complaints
- Charter Board Bylaws
- Charter Board Member and School Staff Information (form)
- Charter Board packets/minutes

Measure 6(b): MCSAB and MDE Reporting, Training, and Meeting Requirements

Measure Type: Compliance

This measure evaluates whether a school is complying with training and meeting requirements as well as the timely submission of required documents to MCSAB or to the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE).

Reference the following data/evidence and sources to evaluate this measure:

Data/Evidence	Source(s)
Evidence of compliance with: 1. Submission of all required reports, attendance and enrollment data, test results, and other information in a timely and accurate manner as set forth by the MCSAB and MDE	1. Epicenter dashboard submissions per Annual Reporting Calendar

Annual Performance Framework

Organizational Performance

Internal Companion Guidance



- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Timely communication of deficiencies to the MCSAB3. Attendance at required trainings and meetings by MCSAB, including meetings with MCSAB and/or MDE staff, MCSAB committee meetings, and MCSAB board meetings | |
|--|--|

Measure Notes:

- Confirm submission of completed forms in Epicenter per the Annual Reporting Calendar
- Consider interventions issued, authorizer notes, remediation status, or return to good standing notices (as applicable) when determining compliance
- Enter rating in the “Measure Score/Subscore” column of the “governance and reporting” tab of the Organizational Framework Workbook based on rating criteria

Other Notes:

- Both MCSAB and MDE require reporting from charter schools
- MCSAB uses Epicenter for all reporting, while MDE uses a variety of platforms
- Charter schools make submissions to MDE directly
- MCSAB will use information from both Epicenter and MDE to determine if a school is compliant
- Several MDE offices require timely submissions from charter schools:
 - MDE notifies schools and MCSAB in the event requested reporting or data submissions are late.
 - MCSAB will evaluate the school based on whether it received any late notifications from MDE as well as whether MDE requires the school to complete corrective action
- Schools have a five-day grace period after the submission deadline to comply before a reporting submission is deemed late
- Schools are notified in writing should additional documentation be required throughout the year
- Submission deadlines for additional documentation is generally ten days after notification, with the same grace period as all other submissions

The following is a sample performance framework report:

Annual Performance Framework Report



[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]

School Year	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Operational Year	2	3	4	5	6
Year / Contract Years	2 / 5	3 / 5	4 / 5	5 / 5	1 / 3
Grade Configuration	5-7	5-8	5-8	5-8	5-8
Additional info about school					

Academic Performance	2017-18*	2018-19*	2019-20**	2020-21**	2021-22
	Fails to Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	No Rating	No Rating	Approaches Expectations
Financial Performance	2017-18*	2018-19*	2019-20***	2020-21***	2020-21
	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	No Rating	No Rating	Meets Expectations
Organizational Performance	2017-18*	2018-19*	2019-20*	2020-21*	2020-21
	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations		Meets Expectations

* Rating based on prior performance framework
 ** No academic performance ratings in 2019-20 and 2020-21 due to MDE waivers for COVID-19
 *** No financial rating in 2019-20 due to timing of audit findings

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



SY 2021-22

Academic Performance

Approaches Expectations

Indicator	(1) State Accountability	(2) Academic Proficiency	(3) Academic Growth	(4) Academic Gap	(5) Academic Readiness	(7) School-Specific [OPTIONAL]
Weight	[weight %]	[weight %]	[weight %]	0%	0%	0%
Rating	Approaches Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	No Rating	No Rating	No Rating

Financial Performance

Meets Expectations

Indicator	(1) Short-term Financial Health	(2) Long-term Financial Health	(3) Financial Management & Oversight
Rating	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations

Organizational Performance

Meets Expectations

Indicator	(1) Educational Program Requirements	(2) Enrollment & Admissions	(3) Discipline	(4) Special Populations	(5) School Environment	(6) Governance & Reporting
Rating	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



Academic Performance

Approaches Expectations

(1) State Accountability | [weight %]

Rating	Score	Criteria
Exceeds Expectations	4	A
Meets Expectations	3	B or C
Approaches Expectations	2	D
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	F

Measure	Measure Weight	School Grade	Score	Measure Rating
(1a) School Letter Grade	[weight %]	D	2	Approaches Expectations

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(2) Academic Proficiency | [weight %]

Rating	Score	Criteria
Exceeds Expectations	4	20 percentage points or more above geographic district average
Meets Expectations	3	Equal to or up to 19 percentage points above geographic district average
Approaches Expectations	2	19 percentage points or less below geographic district average
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	20 percentage points or more below geographic district average

Measure	Measure Weight	Subject	School % Prof	District % Prof	Difference	Score	Rating	Measure Rating
(2a) MAAP Proficiency, Overall	[weight%]	ELA	14.9%	27.1%	-12.2%	2	Approaches Expectations	Approaches Expectations
		Math	15.0%	23.8%	-8.8%	2	Approaches Expectations	
		Science	39.9%	32.5%	7.1%	3	Meets Expectations	

Measure	Measure Weight	Subject	Subgroup	School % Prof	District % Prof	Difference	Score	Rating	Measure Rating
(2b) MAAP Proficiency, Subgroup	[weight%]	ELA	Black or African American	14.9%	27.1%	-12.2%	2	Approaches Expectations	Approaches Expectations
			Economically Disadvantaged	14.9%	27.1%	-12.2%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Female	14.9%	27.1%	-12.2%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Male	15.3%	23.5%	-8.2%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Students with Disabilities	25.8%	13.7%	12.1%	3	Meets Expectations	
		Math	Black or African American	15.5%	23.3%	-7.8%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Economically Disadvantaged	15.0%	23.8%	-8.8%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Female	14.7%	25.5%	-10.8%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Male	15.3%	22.1%	-6.8%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Students with Disabilities	19.4%	12.1%	7.3%	3	Meets Expectations	
		Science	Black or African American	39.4%	31.7%	7.7%	3	Meets Expectations	
			Economically Disadvantaged	39.6%	32.5%	7.1%	3	Meets Expectations	
			Female	26.5%	33.3%	-6.8%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Male	50.9%	31.6%	19.3%	3	Meets Expectations	
			Students with Disabilities	20.0%	12.0%	8.0%	3	Meets Expectations	

Annual Performance Framework Report



School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(3) Academic Growth | [weight %]

Rating	Score	Criteria
Exceeds Expectations	4	20 percentage points or more above geographic district average
Meets Expectations	3	Equal to or up to 19 percentage points above geographic district average
Approaches Expectations	2	19 percentage points or less below geographic district average
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	20 percentage points or more below geographic district average

Measure	Measure Weight	Subject	School Growth %	District Growth %	Difference	Score	Rating	Measure Rating
(3a) MAAP Growth, Overall	[weight%]	ELA	44.3%	49.3%	-5%	2	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations
		Math	62%	52.6%	9.4%	3	Meets Expectations	

Measure	Measure Weight	Subject	Subgroup	School Growth %	District Growth %	Difference	Score	Rating	Measure Rating
(3b) MAAP Growth, Subgroup	[weight%]	ELA	Black or African American	14.9%	27.1%	-12.2%	2	Approaches Expectations	Approaches Expectations
			Economically Disadvantaged	14.9%	27.1%	-12.2%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Female	14.9%	27.1%	-12.2%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Male	15.3%	23.5%	-8.2%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Students with Disabilities	25.8%	13.7%	12.1%	3	Meets Expectations	
		Math	Black or African American	15.5%	23.3%	-7.8%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Economically Disadvantaged	15.0%	23.8%	-8.8%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Female	14.7%	25.5%	-10.8%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Male	15.3%	22.1%	-6.8%	2	Approaches Expectations	
			Students with Disabilities	19.4%	12.1%	7.3%	3	Meets Expectations	

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(3) Academic Growth | [weight %]

Rating	Score	Criteria
Exceeds Expectations	4	70% or more
Meets Expectations	3	50% to 69%
Approaches Expectations	2	30% to 49%
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	29% or less

Measure	Measure Weight	Subject	Subgroup	% of Students Meeting Growth Projection	Score	Rating	Measure Rating
(3c) School-Selected Growth	[weight%]	Reading	Grade 5	56%	3	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations
			Grade 6	65%	3	Meets Expectations	
			Grade 7	75%	4	Exceeds Expectations	
		Math	Grade 5	56%	3	Meets Expectations	
			Grade 6	65%	3	Meets Expectations	
			Grade 7	75%	4	Exceeds Expectations	

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(4) Academic Gap | 0 %

Rating	Score	Criteria
Exceeds Expectations	4	20 percentage points or more below geographic district average
Meets Expectations	3	Equal to or up to 19 percentage points below geographic district average
Approaches Expectations	2	19 percentage points or less above geographic district average
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	20 percentage points or more above geographic district average

Measure	Measure Weight	Subject	Subgroup	School Gap	District Gap	Difference	Score	Rating	Measure Rating
(4) MAAP Academic Gap	0%	ELA	Black or African American	--	--	--	--	No Rating	No Rating
			Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	No Rating	
			Female	--	--	--	--	No Rating	
			Male	--	--	--	--	No Rating	
			Students with Disabilities	--	--	--	--	No Rating	
		Math	Black or African American	--	--	--	--	No Rating	
			Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	No Rating	
			Female	--	--	--	--	No Rating	
			Male	--	--	--	--	No Rating	
			Students with Disabilities	--	--	--	--	No Rating	

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(5) Academic Readiness | 0%

Rating	Score	Criteria
Exceeds Expectations	4	Spring scale score between 775-900
Meets Expectations	3	Spring scale score between 675-774
Approaches Expectations	2	Spring scale score between 488-674
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	Spring scale score between 300-487

Measure	Measure Weight	Subject	School Spring Scale Score	Score	Measure Rating
(5a) Kindergarten Readiness	0%	Reading	--	--	No Rating

Rating	Score	Criteria
Exceeds Expectations	4	20 percentage points or more above geographic district average
Meets Expectations	3	Equal to or up to 19 percentage points above geographic district average
Approaches Expectations	2	19 percentage points or less below geographic district average
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	20 percentage points or more below geographic district average

Measure	Measure Weight	Subject	School % Prof	District % Prof	Difference	Score	Measure Rating
(5b) 3 rd Grade Reading Readiness	0%	Reading	--	--	--	--	No Rating

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(7) School-Specific [OPTIONAL] | 0%

Rating	Score	Criteria
Exceeds Expectations	4	TBD
Meets Expectations	3	TBD
Approaches Expectations	2	TBD
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	TBD

Measure	Measure Weight	Subject	Raw Data	Score	Measure Rating
(7a) TBD	0%	TBD	--	--	No Rating

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



Financial Performance

Meets Expectations

(1) Short-term Financial Health (Current Year)

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	Greater than or equal to 1.1 <u>or</u> Between 1.0 and 1.1 and one-year trend is positive
Approaches Expectations	2	Between 0.9 and 1.0 or equal to 1.0 <u>or</u> Between 1.0 and 1.1 and one-year trend is negative
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	Less than or equal to 0.9

Measure	Measure Type	Target Differentiated	Total Ratio	Score	Measure Rating
(1a) Current Ratio	Performance	All Years	2.2	3	Meets Expectations

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	(YR 1 & YR2): Greater than or equal to 30 days cash (YR 3+): Greater than or equal to 60 days cash <u>or</u> between 30-60 days cash and one-year trend is positive
Approaches Expectations	2	Between 15-30 days cash <u>or</u> Between 30-60 days cash and one-year trend is negative
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	Less than or equal to 15 days cash

Measure	Measure Type	Target Differentiated	Unrestricted Days Cash	Score	Measure Rating
(1b) Unrestricted Days Cash	Performance	Year 1 and 2 Year 3+	--	--	No Rating

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	Actual enrollment is equal to or greater than 95% of budgeted enrollment in the current year
Approaches Expectations	2	Actual enrollment is 86-94% of budgeted enrollment in the current year
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	Actual enrollment is less than or equal to 85% of budgeted enrollment in the current year

Measure	Measure Type	Target Differentiated	Variance	Score	Measure Rating
(1c) Current-year Enrollment Variance	Performance	All Years	98%	3	Meets Expectations

Annual Performance Framework Report



Short-term Financial Health (Current Year)

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	School is not in default of loan covenant(s) and/or is not delinquent with debt service payments
Approaches Expectations	2	School is in default of loan covenant but has worked with lenders to restructure debt service payments.
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	School is in default of loan covenant(s) and/or is delinquent with debt service payments

Measure	Measure Type	Target Differentiated	Debt Default	Score	Measure Rating
(1d) Debt (or lease) Default	Performance	All Years	School is not in default of loan covenant(s) and/or is not delinquent with debt service payments	3	Meets Expectations

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(2) Long-term Financial Health (Sustainability Over Multiple Years)

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	Less than 0.9
Approaches Expectations	2	Between 0.9 and 1.0
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	Greater than 1.0

Measure	Measure Type	Target Differentiated	Debt-to-Asset Ratio	Score	Measure Rating
(2a) Debt-to-Asset Ratio	Performance	All Years	0.8	3	Meets Expectations

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	(YR1 & YR2): Current Year Total Margin is positive (or greater than 0) (YR3): 3-Year Total Margin is positive (or greater than 0) and Current Year Total Margin is positive <u>or</u> 3 -Year Total Margin is greater than -1.5%, the trend is positive for the last two years, and the Current Year Total Margin is positive
Approaches Expectations	2	(YR1 & YR2): N/A (YR3): 3-Year Total Margin is greater than -1.5 percent, but trend does not "Meet Expectations"
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	(YR1 & YR2): Current Year Total Margin is negative (YR 3+): 3-Year Total Margin is less than or equal to -1.5% <u>or</u> Current Year Total Margin is less than -10%

Measure	Measure Type	Target Differentiated	Total Margin	Score	Measure Rating
(2b) Total Margin	Performance	Year 1 and 2 YR 3+	--	--	No Rating

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	(YR1 & YR2): One-Year Cash Flow, or Total Cash Balance, is positive (YR3): Multi-Year Cumulative Cash Flow is positive, and Cash Flow is positive each year <u>or</u> Multi-Year Cumulative Cash Flow is positive, Cash Flow is positive in one of two years, and Cash Flow in the most recent year is positive
Approaches Expectations	2	(YR1 & YR2): N/A (YR3): Multi-Year Cumulative Cash Flow is positive, but trend does not "Meet Expectations"
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	(YR1 & YR2): One-Year Cash Flow, or Total Cash Balance, is negative (YR3): Multi-Year Cumulative Cash Flow is negative

Measure	Measure Type	Target Differentiated	Cash Flow	Score	Measure Rating
(2c) Cash Flow	Performance	Year 1 and 2	--	--	No Rating

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(2) Long-term Financial Health (Sustainability Over Multiple Years)

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(3) Financial Management and Oversight

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to financial reporting and compliance.
Approaches Expectations	2	N/A
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to financial reporting and compliance and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Target Differentiated	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(3a) MCSAB and MDE Financial Reporting and Compliance Requirements	Compliance	All Years	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to financial reporting and compliance	3	Meets Expectations

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to financial management and oversight.
Approaches Expectations	2	N/A
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to financial management and oversight and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Target Differentiated	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(3b) Annual Financial Audit / Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) Requirements	Compliance	All Years	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to financial management and oversight	3	Meets Expectations

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



Organizational Performance

Meets Expectations

(1) Educational Program Requirements

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fully implemented all essential terms as defined in the charter contract.
Approaches Expectations	2	The school fully implemented at least one essential term as defined in the charter contract.
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fully implement any essential term as defined in the charter contract.

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(1a) Essential Terms of the Charter Contract	Compliance	The school fully implemented all essential terms as defined in the charter contract	3	Meets Expectations

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to educational program requirements.
Approaches Expectations	2	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal or contractual obligation, but the school is actively working toward compliance.
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to educational program requirements and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(1b) Educational Program Requirements	Compliance	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to educational program requirements	3	Meets Expectations

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to teacher and employee credentialing requirements.
Approaches Expectations	2	N/A
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to teacher and employee credentialing requirements and failures have not been remedied.

Annual Performance Framework Report



Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(1c) Teacher and Employee Credentialing Requirements	Compliance	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to teacher and employee credentialing requirements and failures have not been remedied	1	Fails to Meet Expectations

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



Educational Program Requirements

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	Less than or equal to 13%
Approaches Expectations	2	14-19%
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	Greater than or equal to 20%

Measure	Measure Type	Chronic Absenteeism Rate	Score	Measure Rating
(1d) Annual Chronic Absenteeism Rate	Performance	15.0%	2	Approaches Expectations

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(2) Enrollment and Admissions

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school's percentages of students who qualify for free lunch and students with disabilities percentages, respectively, are equal to or greater than 80% of the local district's underserved enrollment percentage by grade levels served
Approaches Expectations	2	N/A
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school's percentages of students who qualify for free lunch and students with disabilities percentages, respectively, are less than 80% of the local district's underserved enrollment percentage by grade levels served

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(2a) Underserved Student Enrollment Percentage Requirement	Compliance	The school's percentages of students who qualify for free lunch and students with disabilities percentages, respectively, are equal to or greater than 80% of the local district's underserved enrollment percentage by grade levels served	3	Meets Expectations

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to enrollment and admissions requirements.
Approaches Expectations	2	N/A
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to enrollment and admissions requirements and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(2b) Enrollment and Admissions Requirements	Compliance	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to enrollment and admissions requirements	3	Meets Expectations

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



Enrollment and Admissions

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	Re-current enrollment rate decrease is less than or equal to ten percent (-10%)
Approaches Expectations	2	-11% and -14%
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	Re-current enrollment rate decrease is greater than or equal to fifteen percent (-15%)

Measure	Measure Type	Current Year Total Net Membership	Previous Year Total Net Membership	Re-Current Enrollment Rate	Score	Measure Rating
(2c) Re-current Enrollment Rate	Performance	350	410	-15.0%	1	Fails to Meet Expectations

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(3) Discipline

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to student discipline requirements.
Approaches Expectations	2	N/A
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to student discipline requirements and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(3a) Student Discipline Requirements	Compliance	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to enrollment and admissions requirements	3	Meets Expectations

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school's in-school and out-of-school suspension and expulsion rates are at or below the geographic district's rates
Approaches Expectations	2	Any of the school's rates are higher than the geographic district's rates, but the higher rates are less than 2.5 percentage points higher
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	Any of the school's rates are 2.5 or more percentage points higher than the geographic district's rates

Measure	Measure Type	Sub-measure	School %	District %	Diff	Score	Rating	Measure Rating
(3b) In-school and Out-of-school Suspension & Expulsion Rates	Performance	In-school suspension rate	10.0%	11.0%	-1.0%	3	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations
		Out-of-school suspension rate	18.3%	15.9%	2.4%	2	Approaches Expectations	
		Expulsion rate	2.5%	3.5%	-1.0%	3	Meets Expectations	

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(4) Special Populations

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to students with disabilities rights and requirements.
Approaches Expectations	2	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal or contractual obligation, but the school is actively working toward compliance.
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to students with disabilities rights and requirements and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(4a) Students with Disabilities Rights and Requirements	Compliance	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to students with disabilities rights and requirements	3	Meets Expectations

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to EL student rights and requirements.
Approaches Expectations	2	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal or contractual obligation, but the school is actively working toward compliance.
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to ELL student rights and requirements and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(4b) English Learner (EL) Student Rights and Requirements	Compliance	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to EL student rights and requirements	3	Meets Expectations

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(5) School Environment

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to facilities, health, safety, and transportation requirements.
Approaches Expectations	2	N/A
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to facilities, health, safety, and transportation requirements and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(5a) Facilities, Health, Safety, and Transportation Requirements	Compliance	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to facilities, health, safety, and transportation requirements	3	Meets Expectations

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to student records and information handling requirements.
Approaches Expectations	2	N/A
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to student records and information handling requirements and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(5b) Student Records and Information Handling Requirements	Compliance	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to student records and information handling requirements	3	Meets Expectations

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to background check requirements.
Approaches Expectations	2	N/A
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligations related to background check requirements and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(5c) Background Check Requirements	Compliance	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to background check requirements	3	Meets Expectations

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(5) School Environment

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to employee rights and requirements.
Approaches Expectations	2	N/A
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligations related to employee rights and requirements and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(5d) Employee Rights and Requirements	Compliance	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to employee rights and requirements	3	Meets Expectations

School Response:

Annual Performance Framework Report

[SCHOOL NAME] | [SCHOOL YEAR] | [GRADE CONFIGURATION]



(6) Governance and Reporting

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to governance requirements.
Approaches Expectations	2	N/A
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to governance requirements and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(6a) School Board Governance Requirements	Compliance	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to governance requirements	3	Meets Expectations

Rating	Score	Criteria
Meets Expectations	3	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to MCSAB and MDE reporting, training, and meeting requirements.
Approaches Expectations	2	N/A
Fails to Meet Expectations	1	The school failed to fulfill at least one legal and contractual obligation related to MCSAB and MDE reporting, training, and meeting requirements and failures have not been remedied.

Measure	Measure Type	Criteria Rating	Score	Measure Rating
(6b) MCSAB and MDE Reporting, Training, and Meeting Requirements	Compliance	The school fulfilled all legal and contractual obligations related to MCSAB and MDE reporting, training, and meeting requirements	3	Meets Expectations

School Response:

Introduction

The Mississippi Charter School Authorizer Board (MCSAB) has a responsibility to monitor the performance and legal compliance of all charter schools it oversees. MCSAB may conduct or require oversight activities that enable it to fulfill this responsibility, including conducting appropriate inquiries and investigations that are aligned with the terms of the law and charter contract and do not infringe on charter school autonomy.¹ MCSAB also has the duty and legal authority to revoke or not renew a charter contract if it determines that the charter school has failed to comply with the terms of the law or charter contract.²

The Intervention Ladder provides guidelines for how MCSAB may respond to schools' academic, financial, and organizational performance that does not meet MCSAB's standards by establishing the general conditions that may cause authorizer intervention as well as the types of actions that may follow. In alignment with national best practices,³ MCSAB will apply interventions that:

- Give schools clear, prompt notice of deficiencies
- Allow schools to correct deficiencies within reasonable timeframes
- Respect school autonomy by identifying needed remedies and working with schools to identify specific courses of action.

MCSAB has identified several interventions it may use to fulfill its oversight responsibilities, including general conditions that may cause a school to enter the Intervention Ladder, as well as potential actions MCSAB may take. It is not possible to include all situations that may cause a school to enter the Intervention Ladder, the general conditions provided here are examples. MCSAB will use evidence and professional judgment to determine when a school will enter and exit the Intervention Ladder. MCSAB reserves the right to place a charter school at any level without going through the preceding steps if more immediate actions are warranted.



Good Standing

All schools begin outside of the Intervention Ladder and are considered to be in **Good Standing**. Schools in good standing receive standard oversight. Schools must meet performance standards outlined in the performance framework in exchange for this level of oversight.

¹ Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-31(1)

² Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-33(7)

³ National Association of Charter School Authorizers. *Principles & Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing*. <www.qualitycharters.org>

Intervention Ladder Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Level 1: Notice of Concern

MCSAB may issue a Notice of Concern when it has concerns about a school's performance or compliance. A Notice of Concern may be appropriate if:

- A school shows signs of weak or declining financial, academic, and/or organizational performance through ongoing oversight or during annual review
- A school repeatedly fails to comply with MCSAB and/or MDE reporting obligations in a timely and accurate manner
- MCSAB receives a verified⁴ complaint of material concern (e.g. a complaint that a school may be operating out of compliance with their charter contract)
- A school receives an overall rating of "Approaches Expectations" on any one area of the performance framework⁵
- Note: Not all conditions above need to apply for MCSAB to issue a Notice of Concern

Potential MCSAB action(s) may include but are not limited to:

- Written Notice of Concern to governing board identifying area(s) of concern and timeline to remedy (as applicable)
- Meetings with school staff and governing board to determine an agreed upon course of action
- Monitoring of school's implementation of agreed upon course of action

Upon remedying the concern, the school may return to **Good Standing**.

Level 2: Notice of Breach

MCSAB may issue a Notice of Breach when it has reason to believe a school may be in material violation of an applicable law, rule, policy, or contract provision. A Notice of Breach may be appropriate if:

- A school shows continued signs of weak academic, financial, or organizational performance through ongoing oversight or during annual review
- A school fails to resolve or make progress toward remedying previous Notices of Concerns
- A school fails to comply with applicable laws, regulations, and/or the terms of the charter contract
- A school fails to submit the annual financial audit by the statutory deadline⁶
- A school receives an overall rating of "Fails to Meet Expectations" on the academic, financial, and/or organizational framework
- Note: Not all conditions above need to apply for MCSAB to issue a Notice of Breach

⁴ [MCSAB Complaint Procedure](#)

⁵ MCSAB Charter Contract (5.1.8) Meets or Exceeds standards are the desired performance levels and annual designations on the performance framework of less than Meets or Exceeds will result in an intervention.

Intervention Ladder Proposed 2024

A portion of this project has been funded through the Charter School Program (CSP) Grant.

Intervention Ladder



⁶ MCSAB Charter Contract (3.2.5)

Potential MCSAB action(s) may include but are not limited to:

- Written Notice of Breach to school board identifying area(s) of breach and timeline to remedy (as applicable)
- Meeting the governing board
- A requirement for a detailed corrective action plan developed by the school and approved by MCSAB staff
- Monitoring of the school's implementation of the steps required to cure the breach
- Additional site visits
- Additional reporting (as applicable)

Upon remedying the breach, the school may return to **Good Standing**.

Level 3: Revocation Review

MCSAB may issue a Revocation Review when it has reason to believe a school may be at risk of contract revocation. MCSAB may issue a Revocation Review if:

- A school commits a serious violation of the law, regulations, and/or the terms of the charter contract
- A school continues to fail to comply with applicable laws, regulations, and/or the terms of the charter contract
- A school fails to make substantive progress toward meeting the terms of its corrective action plan for a Notice of Breach
- MCSAB has reason to believe a school may be:
 - Failing to act strictly as a nonprofit corporation⁷
 - Operating in a discriminatory manner,⁸ particularly in its admissions practices⁹

Potential MCSAB action(s) may include:

- Written notice to the governing board stating intent to consider revocation
- Meeting with the governing board
- A requirement for a detailed corrective action plan developed by the school and approved by MCSAB staff
- Additional site visits

Findings from the Revocation Review may determine whether a school enters into revocation proceedings. Data gathered from the performance framework data collection and reporting process can be used to initiate charter school revocation proceedings.¹⁰ If a school enters revocation proceedings, MCSAB will follow the closure and revocation procedures outlined in the Mississippi Charter School Law¹¹ and MCSAB policy.¹²

⁷ MCSAB Charter School Contract (1.1.4)

⁸ MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.26.3)

⁹ MCSAB Charter School Contract (2.7.4)

¹⁰ Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-33(7)

¹¹ Miss. Code Ann. § 37-28-33 and 35-

¹² Mississippi Administrative Code Part 402, Chapter 5.

Intervention Ladder



Mississippi Charter School Performance Framework Statement of Assurance



Open or Pending Compliance Issue Description	Remediation Status