State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
Shepard Building
255 Westminster Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903-3400

Angélica Infante-Green
Commissioner

Enclosure 6b5
December 17, 2019

December 17, 2019

TO: Members of the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education

FROM: Angélica Infante-Green, Commissioner

RE: **Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts – Charter Renewal Approval**

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT, the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education move to renew the charter of Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts for 3 years, for the term beginning with school year 2020-21 expiring at the end of school year 2022-23, with conditions.

Enclosed Documents:

The following documents provide further detail regarding the Commissioner's recommendation and analysis contributing to that recommendation:

- Commissioner's Recommendation Overview: including an overview of the charter.
- RIDE's Renewal Report: containing detailed information regarding the performance of the charter and findings as a result of the renewal site visit.
- Charter's Response: including additional information and context provided independently by the charter in regards to the renewal recommendation and report.
- Annual Performance Dashboards: containing detail on performance ratings for each school and each year of the charter's term.

Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts
Overview of Commissioner's Charter Renewal Recommendation
Recommendation: 3-Year Renewal, with conditions

Charter Overview:

Current Charter Overview			
Charter Type	Independent	2018-19 Grades Served	7-12
School-Year Opened	2010-11	2018-19 Enrollment	215
Current Charter Term	2015/16 – 2019/20	Authorized Enrollment	204
Enrolling Communities	Providence	Location(s)	Providence

School Mission and Model	
School Mission:	The mission of TAPA is the following: "Through a rigorous arts-integrated program, TAPA, a public charter school in Providence, Rhode Island, cultivates artist-scholars who are prepared for collegiate and professional success and leadership in a global society. TAPA develops well-rounded, educated, artistic and professional community leaders who practice service and teamwork in initiating and implementing goals, with a focus on the global society. Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts is an academically rigorous, arts-integrated public charter school for students in grades 7-12. TAPA is a community of practice, where culture, the performing arts and an expanded learning time are all fundamental components of a rigorous academic program. TAPA is woven into the diverse and creative fabric of the city of Providence, fostering engaged, well-rounded artistic leaders."
School Model:	The school's model centers on the performing arts, an inclusive culture and arts-integration throughout its academic program. The school offers four arts majors in Dance, Theatre, Music and Film.

Renewal Recommendation Overview:

Summary of Recommendation	
Recommended Action:	**The Commissioner recommends that the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education move to <u>renew</u> the charter of Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts for <u>3 years</u>, with conditions.**
Recommended Charter Term:	From SY2020-21 through SY2022-23
Recommended Conditions:	The time-bound conditions address the charter's specific issues and deficiencies found throughout the renewal process. In addition to meeting the expectations of each renewal condition, the charter may be required to present its progress in meeting the conditions to the Council. The Commissioner, with the advice and consent of the Council, reserves the authority to take action, as outlined in the charter school regulations section 2.5 (200-RICR-20-05-2.2.5), should the charter not meet the expectations of the required renewal conditions. 1. TAPA must submit a comprehensive plan, including interim metrics and goals, to address Math achievement for all grades for RIDE approval by June 1, 2020. 2. By December 31, 2020, TAPA must submit evidence of plan implementation, including documentation of interim results.

Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts
Overview of Commissioner's Charter Renewal Recommendation
Recommendation: 3-Year Renewal, with conditions

Recommendation Key Points:	Over the course of this term, TAPA's academic results have been mixed and in recent consecutive years, TAPA under performed on the charter Academic Performance indicator. The school received a 2-star rating on statewide accountability in both 2018 and 2019, approaching expectations on the School Performance sub-indicator. This triggered an analysis of the School Comparison sub-indicator, which includes three criteria (Sending District Comparison, EL Progress, Growth). In 2018 and 2019, the school did not meet expectations on School Comparison:
	
	• Weighted Average Comparison**:**
	  ○ In 2019, the school did not meet expectations. For Math, the school's percent of students' proficient, including error, is below the weighted average proficiency of enrolling districts on both the SAT and RICAS. In ELA on the SAT, the percent of students proficient, including error, is above the weighted average proficiency of enrolling districts. On RICAS ELA, the school did not reliably (accounting for standard error) outperform the weighted average proficiency of its sending district.
	  ○ In 2018, the school did not meet expectations in the Sending District Comparison. The school did not reliably outperform the weighted average proficiency of its sending district in ELA and performed lower than its sending district in Math.
	
	• English Language Proficiency: In 2019, the school did not meet expectations, earning 1 ELP point, (out of 4). Its ELP index score was 52 (out of 110), with 22% of Multilingual Learners meeting their English language progress target. In 2018, TAPA did not have enough students to measure ELP.
	
	• Growth: The school approached expectations in growth in both 2018 and 2019.
	ELA Growth:
	  ○ In 2019, 31% of students showed low growth on state assessments, 34% typical growth, and 35% high growth. In 2018, 37% of students showed low growth on state assessments, 30% typical growth, and 32% high growth.
	  ○ In 2019, the school earned two points (out of 3) in ELA (growth index of 1.04 out of 2). In 2018, the school earned 2 points for ELA with a growth index of 0.95 out of 2.
	
	• Math Growth:
	  ○ In 2019, 43% of students showed low growth on state assessments, 36% typical growth, and 21% high growth. In 2018, 45% of students showed low growth on state assessments, 33% typical growth, and 22% high growth.
	  ○ In 2019, the school earned one point in Math (growth index of 0.78 out of 2). In 2018, the school earned 1 point for math with a growth index of 0.76 out of 2.
	
	Other Academic Considerations:
	The school's performance in Math in both RICAS and SAT are below both the state average. However, TAPA did outperform all but one the sending district high schools on the 2019 SAT.
	• In ELA on the SAT, 34.4% of TAPA students were proficient; which is approximately 15% higher than the high school with second highest proficiency percentage in the district.
	• In Math, 9.4% of TAPA's students were proficient; this percentage was also higher than the second highest proficiency percentage in the district.
	
	Diploma Plus: The school earned 2 out of 3 points in the postsecondary success measure in statewide accountability. 42% (11 out 26 students) in the class of 2018 earned a postsecondary credential, indicating that the seniors of the TAPA are earning college credit.
	
	Financial Management: In 2019, the school purchased and moved into a new location, and maintained fiscal health through the term.

Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts
Overview of Commissioner's Charter Renewal Recommendation
Recommendation: 3-Year Renewal, with conditions

Overview of Charter Performance Ratings:

The following table depicts the charter's performance according to the Charter Performance Review System. For more detail on performance ratings, please see the charter's renewal report and annual performance dashboards.

Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts					
Indicators		**SY15-16**	**SY16-17**	**SY17-18**	**SY18-19**
Academic	(1A) School Performance	A	M	A	A
	(1B) School Comparison	DNM	NR	DNM	DNM
Sustainability	(1) Financial	M	M	M	M
	(2) Organizational	M	M	M	M
	(3) Compliance	M	M	M	M
Renewal Process Tier		Tier 4. In-Depth Renewal Process			
Updated Tier Designation		Tier 4. (Academic)			

Ratings Key			
E	Exceeds Expectations	DNM	Does Not Meet Expectations
M	Meets Expectations	NR	Not Rated
A	Approaches Expectations	NA	Not Applicable

Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts

Renewal Report| 2019

About This Report

In 2015, RIDE embarked on a process to revise the existing charter performance framework based on lessons learned over 5 years of implementation and alignment to national best practice. The updated Charter School Performance Review System was created in collaboration with a committee of charter school practitioners and the National Association of Charter School Authorizers. The purpose of the revision was to increase transparency of charter performance review, provide clarity on charter's performance annually, and ensure consistency of decisions that prioritize the school's academic performance. The 2016-17 school year was the first year of implementation, and all charter schools received 2015-16 performance ratings applied retroactively to initiate the new performance framework.

This report comprises performance ratings for the previous four years of the charter's term (2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19). Performance ratings utilize data from school-generated annual reports and other RIDE monitoring results. As part of the renewal process, RIDE provided initial renewal tier designations, based off the two most recent years of available data, to inform the renewal process. The final tier designation is updated based on results from the 2018-19 school year.

Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts (TAPA) initially received a "Tier 4" designation due to Academic results in School Comparison and followed the in-depth renewal process. The renewal site visit was conducted over a two-day period in late March 2019. To prepare for the site visit, the team, comprised of RIDE staff from the Division of Innovation, reviewed the charter's performance reports to date, the charter's renewal application, and programmatic and organizational documentation submitted by the school. The site visit consisted of classroom observations and interviews with the charter school board, all members of the school's leadership team, teachers, parents, and students. The site visit is an integral part of the team's ability to corroborate information provided by the charter school, follow up on areas of the school's operations that are not meeting performance expectations and ensure the team has gathered information to help determine performance ratings for the Organizational and Compliance Indicators.

Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts
Renewal Report| 2019

CHARTER OVERVIEW

TAPA is an independent charter school, serving students from Providence. The chartered opened in 2010, and can enroll up to 204 students. The school is located in downtown Providence and serves students in grades 7-12.

The school's model centers on the performing arts, an inclusive culture and arts-integration throughout its academic program. The school offers four arts majors in Dance, Theatre, Music and Film.

The mission of TAPA is the following: *"Through a rigorous arts-integrated program, TAPA, a public charter school in Providence, Rhode Island, cultivates artist-scholars who are prepared for collegiate and professional success and leadership in a global society.*

TAPA develops well-rounded, educated, artistic and professional community leaders who practice service and teamwork in initiating and implementing goals, with a focus on the global society.

Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts is an academically-rigorous, arts-integrated public charter school for students in grades 7-12. TAPA is a community of practice, where culture, the performing arts and an expanded learning time are all fundamental components of a rigorous academic program. TAPA is woven into the diverse and creative fabric of the city of Providence, fostering engaged, well-rounded artistic leaders."

Enrollment Demographic Information

Descriptive demographics are based on October enrollment data reported to RIDE by the charter school and reported publicly by RIDE.

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Total Enrollment	208	200	212	215
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligibility	81.7%	90.0%	87.3%	84.2%
Students Receiving Special Education Services	15.4%	10.5%	10.4%	10.2%
Students Receiving ESL Services	5.3%	7.5%	9.9%	6.5%
Multiracial	4.3%	3.0%	2.8%	2.3%
African-American	23.6%	21.0%	22.6%	21.9%
Latino/Hispanic	66.3%	68.5%	66.5%	65.6%
Native American	0%	0%	0%	0%
Asian	2.9%	3.0%	1.4%	1.4%
Pacific Islander	0.5%	0.5%	0%	0.5%
White/Caucasian	2.4%	4.0%	6.6%	8.4%

Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts

Renewal Report| 2019

PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW

TAPA received a "Tier 4" final tier designation for the renewal process due to its overall ratings in Academic Performance (School Comparison). TAPA initially received a "Tier 4" designation due to academic performance and followed the in-depth renewal process.

In the 2018-19 school year, TAPA received an "Approaches" expectations rating in the School Performance indicator and a rating of "Does Not Meet" expectation in the School Comparison sub-indicator. Furthermore, the school received a "Meets" expectations rating or better on each overall indicator and each criteria associated with the Sustainability indicators. In 2015-16 and in 2017-18 the school approached expectations in School Performance based on the results of the statewide accountability system. As a result, RIDE conducted the School Comparison analysis, which found the school "Did Not Meet Expectations" in either year. Additional information for each indicator and criteria rating is included in this report.

Each indicator's specific criteria ratings inform an overall indicator rating. Each charter receives a detailed annual performance dashboards that identifies ratings for each individual criteria and overall indicators. These performance dashboards accompany the renewal report.

Indicators		SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	SY18-19
Academic	(1A) School Performance	A	M	A	A
	(1B) School Comparison	DNM	NR	DNM	DNM
Sustainability	(1) Financial	M	M	M	M
	(2) Organizational	M	M	M	M
	(3) Compliance	M	M	M	M
Renewal Process Tier		Tier 4. In-Depth Renewal Process			
Updated Tier Designation		Tier 4 (Academic)			

Ratings Key			
E	Exceeds Expectations	DNM	Does Not Meet Expectations
M	Meets Expectations	NR	Not Rated
A	Approaches Expectations	NA	Not Applicable

Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts
Renewal Report| 2019

PRIMARY INDICATOR: ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

School Performance			
SY15-16	**SY16-17**	**SY17-18**	**SY18-19**
Approaches Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Approaches Expectations**	**Approaches Expectations**

Summary: Academic data is available for the 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years.

For the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years, the school received a CIS score of 38 and 52 (respectively), commensurate with a "warning" and "typical" level per RIDE's school classification system under the ESEA waiver. In the 2017-18 school year, the school earned two-stars on the statewide accountability system due to overall academic achievement.

In 2015-16 and 2017-18, the "Approaches" expectations rating triggered the completion of the School Comparison sub-indicator. In 2015-16, the school did not meet expectations on any of the three criteria in the indicator. At that time under RIDE's school classification system under the ESEA, the criteria were proficiency compared to enrolling districts, gap closure, and growth. In 2017-18, the school did not meet expectations on School Comparison because it did not reliability outperform its sending district. In the school year 2018-19, the school earned two-stars on statewide accountability, again triggering the school comparison indicator. The school did not meet expectations on School Comparison in 2018-19.

Through a review of documents, the charter's renewal application, and on-site interviews, there is evidence that the school utilizes internal academic data as well as results on the state assessment to evaluate its student achievement. The school utilizes the STAR assessment for interim evaluations of student performance in Math and ELA and set growth goals for each student based on interim assessments.

School Comparison			
SY15-16	**SY16-17**	**SY17-18**	**SY18-19**
Does Not Meet Expectations	**Not Rated**	**Does Not Meet Expectations**	**Does Not Meet Expectations**

In 2015-16 and 2017-18, RIDE conducted an analysis of the School Comparison sub-indicator due to the school receiving an "Approaches" expectations rating for the School Performance sub-indicator. Based on this analysis, the school was rated as "Does Not Meet" expectations for the School Comparison sub-indicator due to receiving an "Does Not Meet" rating on criteria 1.B.1. In 2015-16, RIDE's school classification system under the ESEA was based on a Composite Index Score of multiple measures. Criterion 1.B.2 reflected the gap closure measure and 1.B.3 reflected the growth measure. The school did not meet expectations on those criteria in 2015-16. In 2017-18, under the star rating system, the school did not have enough EL students to make an

accountability determination for Criteria 1.B.2 and the school approached expectations for criteria 1.B.3

In 2018-19, RIDE conducted a similar analysis of the School Comparison sub-indicator due to the school receiving an "Approaches" expectations rating for School Performance. The school did not outperform its sending district in Math, and it earned 1 ELP Progress point as measured by school index score published in the statewide school accountability, earning the school a "Does Not Meet" rating in the school comparison sub-indicator.

1.B.1 Proficiency Compared to Enrolling Districts

The school "Did Not Meet Expectations," in 2015-16 because the school's proficiency rate compared to its enrolling district, including margin of error, was below the weighted average proficiency of its enrolling district in Math and ELA. Meaning, the school performed lower than its sending districts in Math and ELA.

2015-16					
Subject	School's Proficiency	Margin of Error	Low Range - Margin of Error	High Range + Margin of Error	Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts
ELA	9.2%	3.9%	5.3%	13.1%	18.3%
Math	1.4%	1.6%	0%	3%	11%

The school "Did Not Meet Expectations," 2017-18 because the school's proficiency rate compared to its enrolling district, including margin of error, was below the weighted average proficiency of its enrolling district in Math. The weighted average proficiency of its enrolling district in ELA is within the charter school's performance range. Meaning, the school performed about the same (not statistically different) as its sending district in ELA and performed lower than its sending districts in Math.

2017-18					
Subject	School's Proficiency	Margin of Error	Low Range - Margin of Error	High Range + Margin of Error	Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts
ELA	17%	5.1%	11.9%	22.1%	20.35%
Math	2%	1.9%	0.1%	3.9%	12.29%

In 2018-19, The school "Did Not Meet Expectations," the charter school's percent of students' proficient, including error, is below the weighted average proficiency of enrolling districts in Math on both the SAT and RICAS. In ELA on the SAT, the percent of students proficient, including error, is above the weighted average proficiency of enrolling districts. On RICAS ELA, the weighted average proficiency of enrolling districts in ELA is within the charter school's performance range.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">SAT 2018-19</th></tr>
<tr><th>SAT Subject</th><th>School's % Proficient</th><th>Margin of Error</th><th>Low Range - Margin of Error</th><th>High Range + Margin of Error</th><th>Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts</th></tr>
<tr><td>ELA</td><td>34.38</td><td>8.01</td><td>26.4</td><td>42.39</td><td>25.51</td></tr>
<tr><td>Math</td><td>9.38</td><td>4.92</td><td>4.46</td><td>14.30</td><td>14.81</td></tr>
</table>
<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">RICAS 2018-19</th></tr>
<tr><th>RICAS Subject</th><th>School's % Proficient</th><th>Margin of Error</th><th>Low Range - Margin of Error</th><th>High Range + Margin of Error</th><th>Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts</th></tr>
<tr><td>ELA</td><td>15.28</td><td>8.09</td><td>7.19</td><td>23.37</td><td>17.22</td></tr>
<tr><td>Math</td><td>5.63</td><td>5.18</td><td>0.45</td><td>10.81</td><td>11.92</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.B.2 English Language Proficiency</td><td>In 2015-16, under the ESEA and the measures that made up RIDE's school classification system, criterion 1.B.2 reflected the gap closure measure. The school not meet expectations for gap closure because its performance fell in the bottom performance range for ELA and the second to bottom range for Math.

In 2017-18, under the new statewide accountability system, this criterion measures English Learner's progress in language attainment as measured by the ACCESS test. This criterion was not rated because the school did not have enough EL students to make an accountability determination.

In 2018-19, the school "Did Not Meet Expectations", because the school earned one ELP point as measured by the statewide accountability system. In 2019, two years of data are combined to ensure a high enough N size for the calculation. The school's ELP index score was 52 out of 110 with approximately 22% of multi-lingual learners meeting their progress target.</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.B.3 Growth</td><td>In 2015-16, under the ESEA and the measures that made up RIDE's school classification system, criterion 1.B.3 reflected the growth measure for elementary and middle grades. The school not meet expectations for growth because its performance fell in the bottom performance range for ELA and the second to bottom range for Math.

In 2017-18, the growth measure was available for all tested grades as part of the star rating system. The school "Approached Expectations," because it two points for growth in ELA, with a growth index of 0.95 out of 2 and one point for growth in Math, with a growth index of 0.76 out of 2.

In 2018-19, the school "Approached Expectations", because the school earned two</td></tr>
</table>

	points for growth in ELA, with a growth index of 1.04 and one point for growth in math, with a growth index of 0.78.

SUSTAINABILITY INDICATOR 1

Financial Performance			
SY15-16	**SY16-17**	**SY17-18**	**SY18-19**
Meets Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Meets Expectations**	**Meets Expectations**

Summary
The charter received an overall "Meets Expectations" annual rating in Financial Performance for each year of its term. Financial ratings are based primarily on the charter's audit and therefore, financial information lags a year. For example, financial ratings for 2018-19 are based on the charter's FY18 audit.

The board's finance committee is most involved in fiscal oversight of the charter. It meets monthly with the Finance Director and reports to the larger board. The Finance Director and the School leader work together to set and revise the budget before going to Finance Committee and the full board for approval. Additional information regarding financial management can be found in Compliance criteria 3.20-3.28.

1.1 Current Ratio	The charter met expectations each year.
1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	The charter met expectations each year.
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	The charter met expectations each year.
1.4 Total Margin & 3-Year Aggregate Total Margin	The charter met expectations each year.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	The charter met expectations in each applicable year.

SUSTAINABILITY INDICATOR 2

Organizational Performance

SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18	SY18-19
Meets Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Meets Expectations**	**Meets Expectations**

Summary: All annual ratings and each criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets or Exceeds Expectations."

2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	School-specific goals were not established over the course of this term.
2.2 School Environment	The charter met or exceeded expectations in this criterion in each applicable year. The charter's attendance rate in 2018-19 was 95.03%, greater than the state middle and high school average of 92.11%. Student retention also met expectations with over 80% of students choosing to return to the school each year. Demand for the school is high, and the school's waitlist has consistently comprised over 50% of available seats. The school utilizes a variety of tactics, systems and structures to engage parents and families. The school has a dedicated, bilingual family liaison who is responsible for ensuring families feel connected to the school and organizing extra services such as food pantry and free computer use for parents. In interviews, parents noted they use the student information system, Skyward, regularly and have teachers consistently communicate directly with families via calls or texts. The Parent PTO, called the Parent ensemble is active, teacher conferences and other special events are well attended. At the beginning of each year, teachers and administrators conduct home visits for all new families to foster connection. 2019 SurveyWorks data show 46% (the state average is 42%) of students responding favorably to questions related to school climate, and 84% (the state average is 71%) of families responding favorably to questions related to school climate.
2.3 Equity and Access	Use of attrition data and applicant pool composition were not a factor of this criterion until the 16-17 school year. The charter met expectations each year. School administrators review attrition data and described procedures for understanding and using the information. The family liaison meets with each family who have expressed a desire to withdraw. Families participate in an exit interview to capture reasons for leaving and complete withdraw forms. The Head of School and Board noted that the information is shared with the board anecdotally. The most common reason for withdraw is moving out of district and students choosing a different high school after 8th grade. Administrators considered programmatic changes as a result of withdraw reasons but reasons have not been consistent enough to warrant significant changes. The school recruits across Providence and strategies include encouraging word of mouth through current families, existing partnerships with community organizations,

	arts partners and outreach to middle schools. The family liaison reaches out to Providence Public School's middle school guidance counselors as well as private and parochial schools. She ensures radio ads, flyers and other advertisements are translated into Spanish. The school uses the RIDE lottery application and conducts a lottery in accordance with RIDE regulation and guidance. The school uses a manual process to conduct their lottery and the family liaison and the Assistant Head of School are responsible for implementing the lottery and enrollment procedures. The school serves Providence students and expressed a goal to ensure their student population reflects Providence. The school noted a change in the percent of their student population that qualifies for free or reduced priced lunch, attributed to an increase in the number of siblings choosing to attend TAPA. The most recent demographic data shows that Providence School District has a higher percentage of students receiving EL (29% vs. 7%), and Special Education (15% vs 10%). The school mirrors Providence in other demographic areas. The school has changed some of its programming to be more appealing to young men, including bring males of color as dance teachers and artists in residence. The school also ensures that their school serves as a welcoming option for trans and gender non-conforming students.
2.4 Dissemination	The 2016-17 school year is the first year this criterion was evaluated. The charter met expectations or exceeded expectations each year. The school implements both school-wide and teacher-led initiatives to share best practices and lessons learned. They also focus on creating partnerships and building bridges among arts education organizations. Among various participation in conferences, other initiatives include hosting a Diversity In Education Conference led by students, teachers and administrators, providing PD to teachers from various districts focused on arts-integration to assist in individualized student supports, providing coaching support to other districts and peer mentorship for new or struggling teachers, and creating partnerships with various local higher education institutions.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	The charter met expectations each year. The board currently has 14 voting members who may serve 2 three-year terms. The board operates standing committees (Executive, Finance, Development, Property, Education, and Governance) that include board members and TAPA staff members. Stakeholder interviews confirmed that committees are an important part of the decision making process. Committees meet regularly and make recommendations for decisions to the larger board. The staff members on committees help ensure the needs of the school are discussed and considered. The Board noted, and stakeholder interviews confirmed, that day-to-day operational decisions are in the purview of the school administrators and all stakeholders echoed a very collaborative process for communication and decision-making. The Head of School provides a weekly "prompt book," to the school community that acts as a newsletter and provides key information about the school for all stakeholders. To resolve complaints or issues, all

	administrators and teachers noted "nets and ladders," communication and escalation process. The Board holds the Head of School accountable through an annual goal setting and evaluation conducted by Evaluation committee. Goals are set collaboratively with the committee and the administration team. The Head of School provides a quarterly report to the board to track progress. The evaluation process each year includes progress-monitoring, self-reflection by the Head of School, feedback from the board and 360 reviews from staff. The Head of School goals address four areas: 5-year plan, fund development, charter renewal and academic goals. These high-level goals form the foundation for how the Board engages in progress monitoring and continuous improvement for the organization. The board highlighted the overlap among the Head of School goals, the Board's long-term goals and the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The administrative team uses the SIP to involve the entire school community in fostering organizational health, changing inputs and working on school culture. The school improvement team meets several times per year to plan and the Assistant Head of School reports to the board three times per year on progress. The basis for academic goal setting and progress monitoring is the STAR assessment. This assessment is administered interim assessment to set academic goals and check in on their progress. The school is in the process of recalibrating its interim assessment tools to better align to the both the RICAS and PSAT/SAT state assessments. Academic goal setting is based on growth as measured by STAR. Goals are set at the teacher leader level and are progress monitored through individual student growth. Stakeholder interviews demonstrated inconsistencies in how academic expectations are communicated among the Board, Administrative team and teachers. There is misalignment in the norming of overall academic goals, student growth goals and the tracking of academic progress.

SUSTAINABILITY INDICATOR 3

Compliance			
SY15-16	**SY16-17**	**SY17-18**	**SY18-19**
Meets Expectations	**Meets Expectations**	**Meets Expectations**	**Meets Expectations**

Summary: The charter met expectations on each criteria over the course of the term.	
Student Rights *(3.1 - 3.5)*	Over the course of the term, the charter met expectations, for each of the criteria associated with student rights, according to the various RIDE offices responsible for monitoring civil rights, special education, English learners, and Title 1. The Assistant Head of School oversees the school's RTI process and all unique student supports including special education and EL identification and progress monitoring. The charter has submitted the charter school applicant report each year and its lottery process was monitored in the 2018-19 school year.
Employee Management *(3.6 - 3.8)*	Over the course of the term, the charter met expectations for each of the criteria associated with employee management according to the various RIDE offices responsible for certification and educator evaluation. The Head of School evaluates the Assistant Head of School. Other administrators are evaluated by either the HOS or AHOS following the RIDE evaluation model and additional data from PD and coaching cycles. The employee handbook (last updated in 2015-16) codifies human resources procedures and addresses employee rights, including a process to file complaints.
Health and Safety *(3.9-3.12)*	The charter met expectations for each of the criteria associated with health and safety, according to the various RIDE offices responsible for school health services and food service. The charter provided documentation of facilities inspections and other related documentation. The school moved into a new building in early November of 2019. The student and family handbook addresses policies and procedures for student safety and behavior expectations. The Dean of Students is responsible for the school's behavior and discipline management. Students interviewed noted how safe they feel at school.
Educational Program *(3.13-3.16)*	The charter met expectations each year. As a performing arts school, a heavy focused is placed on arts integration across subjections, partnership with community arts organizations and performance as much as possible. Wrap-around social emotional support, an emphasis on college and postsecondary support are other key elements of the program. Students are offered and encouraged to take advanced coursework and students voiced that their school pushes them to be ready for life after high school, even if they are not choosing to stay with the arts. There was evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school utilizes curriculum that is aligned to statewide standards in all units, grades and core subjects. The school hired a Director of Teaching and Learning who is responsible for curriculum documentation, alignment and change, and supporting teachers in implementation. The arts curriculum is locally developed and aligned to national art

	standards in various artistic disciplines and the school is working on arts integration within the Common Core. The charter has submitted all required information via statewide data reporting tools including but not limited to TCS, enrollment and attendance. The charter's school calendar complies with the required length of school day and year.
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	The charter met expectations in each of the criteria associated with this compliance area. The school's financial policy and board manual include a conflicts of interest policy. The committee structure outlined in the bylaws is active. The board files its meeting agendas with the Secretary of State and meetings are open to the public as required by state law.
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.28)	The charter met expectations each year. The finance committee of the Board meets at least monthly and works with the Director of Finance on a day-to-day basis around monitoring costs and the budget. The Treasurer takes a very active role in the finances of the school. The budget is developed by looking at the last year's budget and the Treasurer and the Director of Finance create the first draft. They review their recommendations with the finance committee and the Head of School to make sure priorities are aligned in the budget. Recently, the Director of Finance implemented a process where he works with each department head on reviewing the past budget and provides department-specific budget line items to support the specific needs and create some autonomy. The budget is reviewed with the Head of School, Treasurer and Finance Committee before being brought to the larger board for approval. The Director of Finance also creates and updates a 5-year budget that is used by the board. Unforeseen expenses are reviewed by the finance committee and dealt with if necessary by using the reserve fund.

Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts

Artists. Scholars. Stars.

November 25, 2019

To the Members of the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education,

Twenty-one months ago the TAPA Board recognized a need for institutional change and hired a Head of School who was charged with aggressively accelerating academic growth and student achievement. TAPA has always been a place with incredible young people making award-winning artwork, but data showed that we were failing to also serve our students' academic needs. Our locally developed curriculum meant that rigor varied from classroom to classroom: student achievement was inconsistent and levels of academic growth were concerningly low. Major academic, artistic, staffing and philosophical changes were urgently necessary.

In less than two years, TAPA has transformed our leadership, teaching, curriculum and student academic outlook. We used our data to identify areas of high need, and consolidated and updated leadership roles accordingly. We added: the Director of Teaching and Learning, who works with staff to ensure world-class teaching in all classrooms; the Academic Dean, who works with students to ensure they reach their highest level of academic proficiency. With our School Counselor and Dean of Students, these roles built student stamina, classroom rigor, quality instruction, and led to stronger ELA test scores on the (P)SAT. Students' grades now reflect their proficiency as determined by outside measures (RICAS, (P)SAT, college readiness).

TAPA is proud of our strong culture, community, and focus on student voice and perspective, but equity-driven work cannot happen without high academic standards. Therefore, we took a critical look at our teaching staff and trained them to embed rigorous grade-level standards, while still ensuring cultural responsiveness. In spite of these interventions, we saw no progress in our math scores and opted to overhaul the entire math department. TAPA's current math teachers were all hired over the past year, sought for their ability to close academic gaps and accelerate learning. While a change of this magnitude may seem extreme, providing world-class math education is vital for our survival, because; in the words of the mayor Jorge Elorza, "a school like TAPA that brings arts, academics and student passions together belongs in the creative capital."

Perhaps most significantly, to close achievement gaps and make data-driven shifts towards improving academic performance, TAPA made sweeping curriculum changes. TAPA has abandoned locally developed curriculum and now meets the green-standard for Teaching and Learning schoolwide, as measured by Ed Reports:

- With the support of RIDE's Instructional Improvement Team, we updated our ELA curricula to EngageNY.
- With the support of RIDE's Math Specialists, we worked with members of EdReports and adopted Illustrative Math as our 7-12 curricula for the school and supplement its rollout with LearnZillion.
- In partnership with Providence Public Schools, we adapted our Scientific Inquiry curriculum to be aligned to the NGSS, and our Bio and Chem curriculum to be aligned to RIC, URI and CCRI's prerequisites
- Instructional Partners, through Curriculum Support Guide, is supporting us with ensuring all of our new curricular shifts are well-managed and implemented with fidelity, as is essential for student success.
- Through Brown University, daily (P)SAT prep tutoring is provided to students in grades 9-11.
- In August 2019 we changed to a block schedule, ensuring an increase of on-content time for all students.

- The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation connected with TAPA through CLEE to begin a cycle of improvement to increase 9th grade Math proficiency, which was identified as a particular area of weakness.
- Magoosh and Khan Academy were added as an additional tier of support for student learning.
- At the Commissioner's recommendation, TAPA connected with high-achieving local schools including Barrington High School, BVP, and Achievement First to adapt data-tracking procedures, intervention support, and teacher support practices, especially centered on Math improvement.

In addition to the above-mentioned initiatives, TAPA has had several recent successes, which we believe are leading indicators of future growth. These include: RIDE's "Diploma Plus" measure, which gives high schools credit for students earning college credits/industry credentials. TAPA earned two our of three on this measure based on the class of 2018, where 46% of graduates completed a college course, and this number is increasing rapidly: In 2019, 77% of students graduated with Diploma Plus, and over 80% are on track to do so in 2020. Over half of these students have completed *two or more* college courses prior to TAPA graduation, entering college significantly more prepared than their peers. TAPA was one of only 20 RI schools to be awarded a $25,000 planning grant to compete in XQ+RI, and TAPA has been robustly engaged in the design process. Our blog post was featured on the XQ website titled "No Walls: My school's journey to XQ+RI," which was shared widely. A TAPA 10th grader was one of only three Rhode Island students who were asked to attend an XQ Conference in New York City called "A Calling: the Civil Right of Education." Additionally, TAPA is beating local and national averages on First Generation College Attendance and Persistence:

Graduating Class	**2019**	**2018**	**2017**	**2016**
Enrolled in college	77%	60%	56%	46%
Working Full Time	14%	36%	33%	42%
Year Up (Job Program		4%	8%	4%
National Guard	6%		3%	8%
Trade School	3%			

Alumni Percentages	PPSD Average	**National First Generation Average**	TAPA Average
ENROLLMENT: The percent that enroll in college for their first semester	**44%**	**55%**	**70%**
RETENTION: The percent still enrolled in college for their 3rd semester	**30%**	**42%**	**56%**

TAPA's recent successes, as well as our commitment to improvement, were evident during our Ribbon Cutting Ceremony on November 22 2019, where stakeholders came together to celebrate both our physical and philosophical moves. At that event, we displayed the academic and rigorous shifts, outlined above, that are at the building blocks of our future. With a safe, clean, well-resourced, well-staffed building, with high-quality curriculum and an investment in the arts, we are confident that we will close educational gaps while doing justice by our students. In just twenty-one months, and with the support of various stakeholders, at RIDE and local and national institutes of higher learning, TAPA has transformed. We shifted from locally developed curricula, invested in data-driven best practices in teaching and learning, overhauled our teaching and leadership teams, and ensured a schoolwide focus on academic achievement.

TAPA's commitment to our students and willingness to change to meet their needs, are among our greatest strengths. With that commitment, and so many partners invested in our growth, we will achieve sustained improvement while closing achievement gaps. TAPA is proud to be building an innovative and equity-centered school for artists and academics alike, and we thank the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education for providing us with three years to show the fruits of our cycle of improvement and achievement.

Dana Borelli-Murray, TAPA Board President Elizabeth Richards-Hegnauer, TAPA Head of School

Charter School Annual Performance Report
Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts 2015-16

Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Approaches Expectations**	A.1 is rated as "Approaches." AND A.2 is rated as "Exceeds", "Meets" or "Does Not Meet."	The school's composite index score (38) is at a Warning score level under the most recent CIS designations. RIDE did not hold schools accountable to school specific goals in 2015-16.

Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Does Not Meet Expectations**	For A.2, B.2 and B.3 two or more criteria are rated as "Does Not Meet." OR B.1 is rated as "Does Not Meet."	The school received a rating of "Does Not Meet" on B.1, B.2 and B.3
1.B1 Proficiency Compared to Enrolling Districts	**Does Not Meet Expectations**	The charter school's percent of students proficient, plus the error value, is below the weighted average proficiency level of enrolling districts in math, ELA or both.	Both ELA and Math proficiency rate plus error were below the weighted average proficiency rate of enrolling districts. ELA: 9.2% error 3.9 = 13.1% Weighted Avg on Enrolling: 18.3% Math: 1.4% error 1.6 = 3% Weighted Avg on Enrolling: 11%
1.B2 Gap Closure	**Does Not Meet Expectations**	The gap between the mean scale score of the lowest quartile and proficiency for ELA and math falls within the bottom two ranges as	The school's ELA performance fell in the bottom range and Math fell in the second to bottom range

		published within the school accountability system.	
1.B3 Growth (Middle / Elementary)	**Does Not Meet Expectations**	The school's accountability growth measures for both ELA AND math fall within the bottom two ranges as published within the school accountability system. .	The school's ELA performance fell in the bottom range and Math fell in the second to bottom range.

Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
1.1 Current Ratio	**Meets Expectations**	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio was 5.94.
1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	**Meets Expectations**	School has 60 days or more of unrestricted cash on hand. OR School has between 30 and 60 days of cash and one-year trend is positive.	Unrestricted cash on hand was 41.16 and the one-year trend was positive.
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	**Meets Expectations**	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.15.

1.4 Total Margin & 3-Year Aggregate Total Margin	**Meets Expectations**	Aggregated three- year total margin is positive and the most recent year total margin is positive.	Aggregated three-year total margin was 0.04 and the most recent year's total margin was 0.03.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	**Not Rated**		Debt Service Coverage Ratio will be reported on beginning in the 16-17 school year.

Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND 2.3 is rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	**Not Rated**		**RIDE did not establish school specific goals in academic year 2015-16.**
2.2 School Environment	**Meets Expectations**	The school's attendance rate equal to or greater than the state's average attendance rate as published by RIDE. AND There is evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families. AND at least 80%	**Family engagement**: The school provided assurances of family engagement in the School-Prepared Annual Report. *Student attendance rate and student retention will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.*

		of students in non-break grades return to school the next year.	
2.3 Equity and Access	**Meets Expectations**	There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations. AND There is evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. AND There is evidence that the applicant pool is representative of its sending communities, in line with the school's charter.	**Recruitment & Lottery:** No outstanding issues were identified. The school provided lottery data; lottery monitoring was not conducted for this review cycle. *Use of attrition data & applicant pool composition will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.*
2.4 Dissemination	**Not Rated**		Dissemination efforts will be reported on beginning in the 16-17 school year.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	**Meets Expectations**	The board and school leader engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to: student academic	**Board & School Leader Continuous Improvement**: The school provided assurances of continuous improvement activities in the School-Prepared Annual Report. **Board & School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/ Communication:** The school provided assurances of decision making and communication systems in the School-Prepared

		success, priorities that are aligned with the school's mission, and educational philosophy. AND The board and school leader have and implement clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes. AND There is evidence that the Board holds the school leader accountable.	Annual Report. **Board Holds School Leader Accountable**: The school provided assurances of holding school leader(s) accountable in the School-Prepared Annual Report.

Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	All criteria associated with Federal law and regulation are rated as "Meets." AND No more than one criteria not associated with state law and regulation is rated as "Does Not Meet."	Criteria 3.19 was rated as "Does Not Meet." All other criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations"
Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in	**Office for Civil Rights:** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted.

		the Compliance Performance indicator.	**IDEA:** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. **Title III (English Language Learners):** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. **Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income):** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. **Enrollment Procedures:** The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery.
Employee Management (3.6 - 3.8)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**Educator Certification:** A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues. **HR Procedures:** The school provided assurances of documented employee rights in the employee handbook documents in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **Educator Evaluation:** A review of educator evaluation compliance identified no outstanding issues.
Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**Facility Assurances:** ***F****acility Assurances will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.* **School Health Services:** No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the Annual School Health Report. **Food Service:** *Food Service will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.* **Behavior & Safety Policies:** The school provided evidence of behavior and safety policies in the Annual School Health Report.
Educational Program	**Meets**	No unresolved material	**Educational Program:** The school provided assurances of

(3.13-3.16)	**Expectations**	violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	compliance with state, regulation and charter related educational program requirements in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **Curriculum Standards:** The school provided assurances that curriculum is aligned to state adopted standards in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **Data Reporting:** No outstanding issues were identified in educational program related reporting. **School Day/Length Policy:** The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**Open Meetings and Ethics Policy:** The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **Board Bylaws:** The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management:** The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.29)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions:** School complied with budget submissions. **Quarterly Financial Reporting:** School complied with Quarterly financial reports. **UCOA Reporting :** School complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit. **Annual Financial Audit:** The school's audit was unqualified/unmodified and did not identify any significant deficiencies or weaknesses. **Single Audit:** N/A

Charter School Annual Performance Report
Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts | 2016-17

Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	A.1 is rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND A.2 is rated as "Meets" or "Does Not Meet."	The School's composite index score was 52 and RIDE did not hold schools accountable to school specific goals in 2016-17.

Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Not Rated**		Academic Performance: School Comparison is only rated when a school receives a rating of "Approaches" or "Does Not Meet" for the Academic Performance: School Performance Annual Rating.

Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations." Calculations are determined using the results of most recently available audited financial statements. For 2016-17, the ratings reflect the information in the FY16 audit for the organization.
1.1 Current Ratio	**Meets Expectations**	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio in was 9.02.
1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	**Meets Expectations**	School has 60 days or more of unrestricted cash on hand. OR School has between 30 and 60 days of cash and one-year	Unrestricted days of cash on hand was 80.45.

		trend is positive.	
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	**Meets Expectations**	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.09.
1.4 Total Margin & 3-Year Aggregate Total Margin	**Meets Expectations**	Aggregated three- year total margin is positive and the most recent year total margin is positive.	The most recent year's total margin was 0.11. The three year aggregate margin was 0.13.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	**Meets Expectations**	School's debt service coverage ratio is greater than or equal to 1.1	The debt service coverage ratio was 201.51.

Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND 2.3 is rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	**Not Rated**		School-specific goals were not established in academic year 2016-17.
2.2 School Environment	**Exceeds Expectations**	The school's attendance rate equal to or greater than the state's average attendance rate	**Student Attendance:** The school's attendance rate was 93.1%, greater than the state middle and high school average of 92.18%

		as published by RIDE and there is evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families and at least 80% of students in non-break grades return to school the next year and the school's waitlist comprises at least 50% of available seats for the current school year.	**Family engagement**: The charter provided assurances of family engagement in the School-Prepared Annual Report. **Student Retention**: More than 80% of students enrolled at the end of the previous school year were also enrolled at the beginning of the following year. **Waitlist:** The school's waitlist comprises more than 50% of seats available.
2.3 Equity and Access	**Meets Expectations**	There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations. AND There is evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. AND There is evidence that the applicant pool is representative of its sending communities, in line with the school's charter.	**Attrition Data:** The charter provided assurances of attrition data analysis in the School-Prepared Annual Report. **Recruitment & Lottery:** No outstanding issues were identified. The school provided lottery data; lottery monitoring was not conducted for this review cycle. **Applicant Pool:** The charter's applicant pool as submitted from the CSAR from the March 1, 2017 lottery shows applicants from Providence.
2.4 Dissemination	**Meets Expectations**	There is evidence that the school shares or attempts to share curricular and/or	**Sharing and Partnership:** The charter provided assurances and descriptions of work related to sharing resources and practice.

		instructional resources and/or best practices	
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	**Meets Expectations**	The board and school leader engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to: student academic success, priorities that are aligned with the school's mission, and educational philosophy. AND The board and school leader have and implement clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes. AND There is evidence that the Board holds the school leader accountable.	**Board & School Leader Continuous Improvement**: The charter provided assurances of continuous improvement activities in the School-Prepared Annual Report. **Board & School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/ Communication:** The charter provided assurances of decision making and communication systems in the School-Prepared Annual Report. **Board Holds School Leader Accountable**: The charter provided assurances of holding school leader(s) accountable in the School-Prepared Annual Report.

Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	All criteria associated with Federal law and regulation are	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets expectations."

		rated as “Meets.” AND No more than one criterion not associated with state law and regulation is rated as "Does Not Meet."	
Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**Office for Civil Rights:** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. **IDEA:** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was conducted. **English Language Learners:** No outstanding issues were identified as reviewed online by the Office of Student, Community and Academic Support. **Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income):** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. **Enrollment Procedures:** The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery.
Employee Management (3.6 - 3.8)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**Educator Certification:** A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues. **HR Procedures:** The charter provided assurances of documented employee rights in the employee handbook documents in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **Educator Evaluation:** A review of educator evaluation compliance identified no outstanding issues. Evaluation data submitted to RIDE after deadline.

Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**Facility Documentation & Assurances:** The charter provided assurances of facilities inspections and documentation in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **School Health Services:** No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the Annual School Health Report. **Food Service:** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. **Behavior & Safety Policies:** The charter provided assurances of behavior and safety policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**Educational Program:** The charter provided assurances of compliance with state, regulation and charter related educational program requirements in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **Curriculum Standards:** The charter provided assurances that curriculum is aligned to state adopted standards in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **Data Reporting:** No outstanding issues were identified in educational program related reporting. **School Day/Length Policy:** The charter school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**Open Meetings and Ethics Policy:** The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **Board Bylaws:** The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management:** The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.

Charter School Annual Performance Report
Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts | 2016-17

Financial Management (3.20 - 3.29)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions:** The charter complied with budget submissions. **Quarterly Financial Reporting:** The charter complied with Quarterly financial reports. **UCOA Reporting:** The charter complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit. **Annual Financial Audit:** The charter's audit was unqualified/unmodified and did not identify any significant deficiencies or weaknesses. **Single Audit:** N/A

Charter School Annual Performance Report
Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts | 2017-18

Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Approaches Expectations**	1.A.1 is rated as "Approaches" and 1.A.2 is rated as "Exceeds," "Meets" or "Does Not Meet."	The School's star rating was 2-stars and the school did have RIDE-approved school specific goals in 2017-18.

Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Does Not Meet Expectations**	For A.2, B.2 and B.3 two or more criteria are rated as "Does Not Meet." OR B.1 is rated as "Does Not Meet."	The school was rated as "Does Not Meet Expectations" on criterion 1.B.1. Criterion 1.B.2 was not rated. And the school was rated "Approaches Expectations" on criterion 1.B.3.
1.B.1 Proficiency Compared to Enrolling Districts	**Does Not Meet Expectations**	The charter school's percent of students proficient, plus the error value, is below the weighted average proficiency level of enrolling districts in Math, ELA or both.	The charter school's percent of students proficient, including error, is below the weighted average proficiency of enrolling districts in Math. The weighted average proficiency of enrolling districts in ELA is within the charter school's performance range.

Subject	School's Proficiency	Margin of Error	Low Range - Margin of Error	High Range + Margin of Error	Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts
ELA	17%	5.1%	11.9%	22.1%	20.35%
Math	2%	1.9%	0.1%	3.9%	12.29%

1.B.2 English Language Proficiency	**Not Rated**		The school did not have enough EL students to make an accountability determination for this criterion
1.B.3 Growth	**Approaches Expectations**	The school earned 1 point for growth in either ELA or Math as published in the statewide school accountability system.	The school earned two points for growth in ELA, with a growth index of 0.95 out of 2 and one point for growth in Math, with a growth index of 0.76 out of 2.

Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations." Calculations are determined using the results of most recently available audited financial statements. For 2017-18, the ratings reflect the information in the FY17 audit for the organization.
1.1 Current Ratio	**Meets Expectations**	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio in was 9.00.
1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	**Meets Expectations**	School has 60 days or more of unrestricted cash on hand. OR School has between 30 and 60 days of cash and one-year trend is positive.	Unrestricted days of cash on hand was 89.40.
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	**Meets Expectations**	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.11.
1.4 Total Margin & 3-Year Aggregate Total Margin	**Meets Expectations**	Aggregated three- year total margin is positive and the most recent year total margin is positive.	The most recent year's total margin was 0.02. The three year aggregate margin was 0.055.

1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	**Meets Expectations**	School's debt service coverage ratio is greater than or equal to 1.1	The debt service coverage ratio was 1.32

Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND 2.3 is rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations" with the exception of 2.2 which was rated "Approaches Expectations."
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	**Not Rated**		School-specific goals were not established in academic year 2017-18.
2.2 School Environment	**Approaches Expectations**	One of the following is true: The school's attendance rate is lower than the state's average attendance rate as published by RIDE. --- There is no evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families --- Fewer 80% of students in non-break grades return to school the next year.	**Student Attendance:** The school's attendance rate was 92.09%, lower than the state middle and high school average of 92.18% **Family engagement**: The charter provided assurances of family engagement in the School-Prepared Annual Report. **Student Retention**: More than 80% of students enrolled at the end of the previous school year were also enrolled at the beginning of the following year.

2.3 Equity and Access	**Meets Expectations**	There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations. AND There is evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. AND There is evidence that the applicant pool is representative of its sending communities, in line with the school's charter.	**Attrition Data:** The charter provided assurances of attrition data analysis in the School-Prepared Annual Report. **Recruitment & Lottery:** No outstanding issues were identified. The school provided lottery data; lottery monitoring was not conducted for this review cycle. **Applicant Pool:** The charter's applicant pool as submitted from the CSAR from the March 1, 2018 lottery shows applicants from Providence.
2.4 Dissemination	**Meets Expectations**	There is evidence that the school shares or attempts to share curricular and/or instructional resources and/or best practices	**Sharing and Partnership:** The charter provided assurances and descriptions of work related to sharing resources and practice. Specifically, working with the Providence arts community to visit the school.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	**Meets Expectations**	The board and school leader engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to: student academic success, priorities that are aligned with the school's mission, and educational	**Board & School Leader Continuous Improvement**: The charter provided assurances of continuous improvement activities in the School-Prepared Annual Report. **Board & School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/ Communication:** The charter provided assurances of decision making and communication systems in the School-Prepared Annual Report.

		philosophy. AND The board and school leader have and implement clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes. AND There is evidence that the Board holds the school leader accountable.	**Board Holds School Leader Accountable**: The charter provided assurances of holding school leader(s) accountable in the School-Prepared Annual Report.

Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	All criteria associated with Federal law and regulation are rated as "Meets." AND No more than one criterion not associated with state law and regulation is rated as "Does Not Meet."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets expectations."
Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**3.1: Office for Civil Rights:** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. **3.2: IDEA:** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. **3.3: English Language Learners:** No outstanding issues were identified as reviewed online by the Office of Student, Community and Academic Support.

			3.4: Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income): No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. **3.5: Enrollment Procedures:** The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery.
Employee Management (3.6 - 3.8)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**3.6: Educator Certification:** A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues. **3.7: HR Procedures:** The charter provided assurances of documented employee rights in the employee handbook documents in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **3.8: Educator Evaluation:** A review of educator evaluation data identified discrepancies in evaluated personnel compared to reported personnel in the personnel assignment submission (PAS). While there are no unresolved materials violations, the discrepancies will be corrected in the following year.
Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**3.9: Facility Documentation & Assurances:** The charter provided assurances of facilities inspections and documentation in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **3.10: School Health Services:** No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the Annual School Health Report. **3.11: Food Service:** No outstanding issues were identified in the National School Lunch Program and the RI Nutritional Requirements. Per agency practice a formal was not conducted. **3.12: Behavior & Safety Policies:** The charter provided assurances of behavior and safety policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule	**3.13: Educational Program:** The charter provided assurances of compliance with state, regulation and charter related educational

		or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	program requirements in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **3.14: Curriculum Standards:** The charter provided assurances that curriculum is aligned to state adopted standards in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **3.15: Data Reporting:** No outstanding issues were identified in educational program related reporting. **3.16: School Day/Length Policy:** The charter school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**3.17: Open Meetings and Ethics Policy:** The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **3.18: Board Bylaws:** The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report. **3.19: Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management:** The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.28)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**3.20: Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions:** The charter complied with budget submissions. **3.21: Quarterly Financial Reporting:** The charter complied with Quarterly financial reports. **3.22-3.23: UCOA Reporting:** The charter complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit. **3.24-3.27: Annual Financial Audit:** The charter's audit was unqualified/unmodified and did not identify any significant deficiencies or weaknesses. **3.28: Single Audit:** N/A

Charter School Annual Performance Report
Trinity Academy for the Performing Arts | 2018-19

Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Approaches Expectations**	1.A.1 is rated as "Approaches" and 1.A.2 is rated as "Exceeds," "Meets" or "Does Not Meet."	The School's star rating was 2-stars and the school did have RIDE-approved school specific goals in 2018-19.

Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Does Not Meet Expectations**	For A.2, B.2 and B.3 two or more criteria are rated as "Does Not Meet." OR B.1 is rated as "Does Not Meet."	The school was rated as "Does Not Meet Expectations" on criterion 1.B.1 and 1.B.2.
1.B.1 Proficiency Compared to Enrolling Districts	**Does Not Meet Expectations**	The charter school's percent of students proficient, plus the error value, is below the weighted average proficiency level of enrolling districts in Math, ELA or both.	The charter school's percent of students proficient on the high school assessment, including error, is below the weighted average proficiency of enrolling districts in Math. In ELA, the percent of students proficient, including error, is above the weighted average proficiency of enrolling districts

SAT Subject	School's % Proficient	Margin of Error	Low Range - Margin of Error	High Range + Margin of Error	Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts
ELA	34.38	8.01	26.4	42.39	25.51

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Math</td><td>9.38</td><td>4.92</td><td>4.46</td><td>14.30</td><td>14.81</td></tr>
</table>
The charter school's percent of students proficient, including error, is below the weighted average proficiency of enrolling districts in Math. The weighted average proficiency of enrolling districts in ELA is within the charter school's performance range.
<table>
<tr><th>RICAS Subject</th><th>School's % Proficient</th><th>Margin of Error</th><th>Low Range - Margin of Error</th><th>High Range + Margin of Error</th><th>Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts</th></tr>
<tr><td>ELA</td><td>15.28</td><td>8.09</td><td>7.19</td><td>23.37</td><td>17.22</td></tr>
<tr><td>Math</td><td>5.63</td><td>5.18</td><td>0.45</td><td>10.81</td><td>11.92</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.B.2 English Language Proficiency</td><td>Does Not Meet Expectations</td><td>The school earned 1 ELP Progress point as measured by school index score published in the statewide school accountability.</td><td>The school earned one ELP point as measured by the statewide accountability system. The school's ELP index score was 52 out of 110.</td></tr>
<tr><td>1.B.3 Growth</td><td>Approaches Expectations</td><td>The school earned 1 point for growth in either ELA or Math as published in the statewide school accountability system.</td><td>The school earned two points for growth in ELA, with a growth index of 1.04 and one point for growth in math, with a growth index of 0.78.</td></tr>
</table>

Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations." Calculations are determined using the results of most recently available audited financial statements. For 2018-19, the ratings

		others are rated as "Meets."	reflect the information in the FY18 audit for the organization.
1.1 Current Ratio	**Meets Expectations**	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio in was 16.67.
1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash	**Meets Expectations**	School has 60 days or more of unrestricted cash on hand. OR School has between 30 and 60 days of cash and one-year trend is positive.	Unrestricted days of cash on hand was 84.29.
1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	**Meets Expectations**	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.06.
1.4 Total Margin & 3-Year Aggregate Total Margin	**Meets Expectations**	Aggregated three- year total margin is positive and the most recent year total margin is positive.	The most recent year's total margin was 0.028. The three-year aggregate margin was 0.052.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	**Meets Expectations**	School's debt service coverage ratio is greater than or equal to 1.1	The debt service coverage ratio was 1.40

Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND 2.3 is rated as	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets or Exceeds Expectations."

		"Meets."	
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	**Not Rated**		School-specific goals were not established in 2018-19
2.2 School Environment	**Exceeds Expectations**	The school's attendance rate equal to or greater than the state's average attendance rate as published by RIDE and there is evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families and at least 80% of students in non-break grades return to school the next year and the school's waitlist comprises at least 50% of available seats for the current school year.	**Student Attendance:** The school's attendance rate was 95.03%, greater than the state middle and high school average of 92.11% **Family engagement**: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school engages parents and families. **Student Retention**: More than 80% of students enrolled at the end of the previous school year were also enrolled at the beginning of the following year. **Waitlist:** The school's waitlist comprises more than 50% of seats available.
2.3 Equity and Access	**Meets Expectations**	There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations. AND There is evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. AND There is evidence that the	**Attrition Data:** There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school tracks attrition data and uses it to make programmatic changes. **Recruitment & Lottery:** There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school has established recruitment, lottery and retention policies. The March 1, 2019 lottery was monitored. **Applicant Pool:** The charter's applicant pool as submitted from the CSAR from the March 1, 2019 lottery shows applicants from Providence.

		applicant pool is representative of its sending communities, in line with the school's charter.	
2.4 Dissemination	**Exceeds Expectations**	There is evidence that the school shares curricular and instructional resources and best practices with multiple partners through multiple modalities.	**Sharing and Partnership:** Document review and the renewal site visit documented both school-wide and teacher-led to share best practices and lessons learned as well as creating partnerships among arts education organizations. Among various participation in conferences, other initiatives include the school hosting a Diversity In Education Conference, providing PD to teachers from various districts focused on arts-integration to assist in individualized student supports, providing coaching support to other districts and peer mentorship for new or struggling teachers, and creating partnerships with various local higher education institutions.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	**Meets Expectations**	The board and school leader engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to: student academic success, priorities that are aligned with the school's mission, and educational philosophy. AND The board and school leader have and implement clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes. AND There is evidence that the Board holds the school leader	**Board & School Leader Continuous Improvement**: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board and school leader are regularly monitoring progress related to student's academic achievement and charter's long term-facility plans, among other priorities. **Board & School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/ Communication:** There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board and school leadership team share and implement a transparent communication process. The board delegates day-to-day operations the leadership team and utilizes an active committee structure to make decisions and set policy. **Board Holds School Leader Accountable**: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board holds the Head of School accountable through a designated committee utilizing an annual goal setting/monitoring process and annual 360 reviews that include all staff.

		accountable.	

Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
Annual Rating	**Meets Expectations**	All criteria associated with Federal law and regulation are rated as "Meets." AND No more than one criterion not associated with state law and regulation is rated as "Does Not Meet."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets expectations."
Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**3.1: Office for Civil Rights:** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. **3.2: IDEA:** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. **3.3: English Language Learners:** No outstanding issues were identified as reviewed online by the Office of Student, Community and Academic Support. **3.4: Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income):** No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. **3.5: Enrollment Procedures:** The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery.

Employee Management (3.6 - 3.8)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**3.6: Educator Certification:** A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues. **3.7: HR Procedures:** There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit of documented employee rights and procedures in the staff handbook. **3.8: Educator Evaluation:** A review of educator evaluation data identified no outstanding issues.
Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**3.9: Facility Documentation & Assurances:** The charter provided documentation of facilities inspections, certificate of occupancy and other related documentation. The school is moving to a new building in early November of 2019, and updated documentation will be provided. **3.10: School Health Services:** No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the Annual School Health Report. **3.11: Food Service:** No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the school's National School Lunch Program and affiliated requirements. **3.12: Behavior & Safety Policies:** There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit of student and staff handbooks with documented safety procedures and discipline policies.
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**3.13: Educational Program:** There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school is practicing the essential educational program components defined by its charter and following state and federal requirements. **3.14: Curriculum Standards:** There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that curricula is aligned to statewide standards. **3.15: Data Reporting:** No outstanding issues were identified in education related reporting.

			3.16: School Day/Length Policy: There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school has adopted and implemented these policies.
School Leadership (3.17-3.19)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**3.17: Open Meetings and Ethics Policy:** There is evidence from school assurances, document review, and the renewal site visit that the board complied with posting agendas and minutes for public meetings, public record requests and the Code of Ethics. **3.18: Board Bylaws:** There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board maintains and implements its bylaws. **3.19: Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management:** There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board has established policies and procedures for addressing conflicts of interest and complaints.
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.28)	**Meets Expectations**	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	**3.20: Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions:** The charter complied with budget submissions. **3.21: Quarterly Financial Reporting:** The charter complied with Quarterly financial reports. **3.22-3.23: UCOA Reporting:** The charter complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit. **3.24-3.27: Annual Financial Audit:** The charter's audit was unqualified/unmodified and the school's auditors did not identify signification deficiencies or material weaknesses. **3.28: Single Audit:** N/A