

City Schools Operator Renewal Rubric
Elementary/Middle School
SY 2019/20

Category		Total	Whole	Rubric				
1	Is the school an academic success? (min 50% weight)	100	50.00%	Data Source	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Not Effective
1.1	Absolute Performance on PARCC							
	Absolute: Mean Scale Score PARCC - Reading (grades 3-5)	5	2.5%	City Schools Data System	School's 2019 value is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage	School's 2019 value is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage	School's 2019 value is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage	School's 2019 value is < 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage
	Absolute: Mean School Score PARCC - Math (grades 3-5)	5	2.5%	City Schools Data System	School's 2019 value is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage	School's 2019 value is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage	School's 2019 value is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage	School's 2019 value is < 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage
	Absolute: Mean Scale Score PARCC - Reading (grades 6-8)	5	2.5%	City Schools Data System	School's 2019 value is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage	School's 2019 value is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage	School's 2019 value is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage	School's 2019 value is < 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage
	Absolute: Mean Scale Score PARCC - Math (grades 6-8)	5	2.5%	City Schools Data System	School's 2019 value is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage	School's 2019 value is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage	School's 2019 value is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage	School's 2019 value is < 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band and rate of economic disadvantage
1.2	Trend on PARCC (Not used for schools opting for NWEA)							
	Trend in Mean Scale Score on PARCC - Reading (grades 3-5)	6.25	3.125%	City Schools Data System	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is < 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band
	Trend in Mean Scale Score on PARCC - Math (grades 3-5)	6.25	3.125%	City Schools Data System	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is < 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band
	Trend in Mean Scale Score on PARCC - Reading (grades 6-8)	6.25	3.125%	City Schools Data System	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is < 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band
	Trend in Mean Scale Score on PARCC - Math (grades 6-8)	6.25	3.125%	City Schools Data System	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's change in trend in mean scale score on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is < 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band
1.3	Multi-Year Growth on PARCC							
	Growth in Mean Scale Score on PARCC - Reading (grades 3-5)	8.75 / 0	4.375%	City Schools Data System	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is < 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band
	Growth in Mean Scale Score on PARCC - Math (grades 3-5)	8.75 / 0	4.375%	City Schools Data System	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is < 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band
	Growth in Mean Scale Score on PARCC - Reading (grades 6-8)	8.75 / 0	4.375%	City Schools Data System	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is < 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band
	Growth in Mean Scale Score on PARCC - Math (grades 6-8)	8.75 / 0	4.375%	City Schools Data System	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band	School's median student growth percentile on PARCC from 2016 to 2019 is < 50th percentile of all schools in District based on grade band
1.3	Multi-Year Growth on NWEA assessment (Optional and in lieu of Growth on PARCC)							
	School's Virtual Comparison Scores on the NWEA over time- Reading (Grades 3-8)	0 / 17.5	8.75%	School Provided Data	School's average student score over time on the NWEA VCG 0.51 to 1	School's average score over time on the NWEA VCG -.20 to 0.5	School's average student score over time on the NWEA VCG -.021 to -.050	School's average student score over time on the NWEA VCG-.51 to -1
	School's Virtual Comparison Scores on the NWEA over time- Math (Grades 3-8)	0 / 17.5	8.75%	School Provided Data	School's average student score over time on the NWEA VCG 0.51 to 1	School's average score over time on the NWEA VCG -.20 to 0.5	School's average student score over time on the NWEA VCG -.021 to -.050	School's average student score over time on the NWEA VCG-.51 to -1
1.4	Fidelity to Charter/Application Overall	20 / 10	10% / 5%	SER/ Renewal Application/ City Schools Data System	Evidence that the school has fully implemented the mission expressed in its charter application and this mission is clear to all stakeholders. Evidence that the school has delivered high quality programming for all students. Evidence that the school is gathering data to assess its efficacy and has effectively addressed any challenges evident in the data, particularly in the areas of enrollment, student attendance, dropout rates, attrition and student choice data/school demand.	Evidence that the school has implemented the mission expressed in its charter application and the mission is clear to most stakeholders. Evidence that the school has delivered quality programming for all students. Evidence that the school has made a good to fair effort to gather data to assess its efficacy and has implemented effective strategies to address any challenges evident in the data, particularly in the areas of enrollment, student attendance, dropout rates, attrition and student choice data/school demand.	Evidence that the school is beginning or attempting to implement the mission expressed in its charter application but the mission is not clear to most stakeholders. Evidence that the school is making progress on delivering quality programming for all students. Evidence that the school has begun to gather data to assess its efficacy and has begun to develop and implement strategies to address any challenges evident in the data, particularly in the areas of enrollment, student attendance, dropout rates, attrition and student choice data/school demand, but these strategies have not yet been proven effective.	Little or no evidence found that the school has implemented the mission expressed in its charter application. Little to no evidence that the school has delivered or made progress on delivering quality programming for all students. Little to no evidence that the school is gathering data to assess its efficacy and has developed strategies to address any challenges in response to data, particularly in the areas of enrollment, student attendance, drop-out rates, attrition and student choice data/school demand.

1.5	Effective Programming for All Student Racial/Ethnic Groups (For schools with diverse student bodies, splits rubric weight with Fidelity to Charter/Application Overall)	0 / 10	0 / 5%	SER/ Renewal Application/ City Schools Data System	Evidence that the school has provided high quality programming for students in all racial/ethnic groups and is aware of its performance data for all groups. The school has a myriad of instructional approaches, processes and practices in place that seek to ensure that all student groups achieve and to prevent gaps between student groups from appearing. If gaps are present for student groups of 10 or more, the gaps are minimal and the school has implemented effective strategies that have kept the lower performing groups' performance high, being in the 80th percentile or higher in the district.	Evidence that the school has delivered quality programming for students in all racial/ethnic groups and is aware of its data for each student group. While there may be achievement gaps between student groups of 10 or more students, the school has varied instructional approaches, processes and practices in place to identify these gaps and has implemented effective strategies that have kept the lower performing group's performance between the 65th to 80th percentile in the district.	Evidence that the school is making progress in delivering quality programming for all student racial/ethnic groups and is aware of its data of all student groups. There may be achievement gaps between student groups of 10 or more, but the school has implemented some instructional approaches, processes and practices that the school believes will decrease these gaps. However, these strategies have not yet been proven effective as shown in the school's data for different student groups .	Little or no evidence found that the school has delivered or made progress in delivering quality programming for students in all racial/ethnic groups, is aware of its data for all groups or has implemented instructional approaches, processes or practices in response to achievement gaps between student groups of 10 or more.
2	Does the school have a strong school climate?	100	25.00%		Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Not Effective
2.1	Highly Effective Instruction	16.67	4.17%	SER	Evidence indicates that the key action (including all indicators) is a practice or system that has been fully adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that has had a strong, significant or sustainable impact on the school's effectiveness.	Evidence indicates that the key action (including most indicators) is a practice or system that has been adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that is improving the school's effectiveness.	Evidence indicates that the key action (including some indicators) is a practice or system that is emerging at the school, but that it has not yet been implemented at a level that has begun to improve the school's effectiveness, OR that the impact of the key action on the effectiveness of the school cannot yet be fully determined.	Evidence indicates that the key action is not a practice or system that has been adopted and/or implemented at the school, or the level of adoption/implementation does not improve the school's effectiveness
2.2	Talented People	16.67	4.17%	SER	Evidence indicates that the key action (including all indicators) is a practice or system that has been fully adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that has had a strong, significant or sustainable impact on the school's effectiveness.	Evidence indicates that the key action (including most indicators) is a practice or system that has been adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that is improving the school's effectiveness.	Evidence indicates that the key action (including some indicators) is a practice or system that is emerging at the school, but that it has not yet been implemented at a level that has begun to improve the school's effectiveness, OR that the impact of the key action on the effectiveness of the school cannot yet be fully determined.	Evidence indicates that the key action is not a practice or system that has been adopted and/or implemented at the school, or the level of adoption/implementation does not improve the school's effectiveness
2.3	Vision and Engagement	16.67	4.17%	SER	Evidence indicates that the key action (including all indicators) is a practice or system that has been fully adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that has had a strong, significant or sustainable impact on the school's effectiveness.	Evidence indicates that the key action (including most indicators) is a practice or system that has been adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that is improving the school's effectiveness.	Evidence indicates that the key action (including some indicators) is a practice or system that is emerging at the school, but that it has not yet been implemented at a level that has begun to improve the school's effectiveness, OR that the impact of the key action on the effectiveness of the school cannot yet be fully determined.	Evidence indicates that the key action is not a practice or system that has been adopted and/or implemented at the school, or the level of adoption/implementation does not improve the school's effectiveness
2.4	Parent, Teacher and Student Satisfaction							
	Teachers: School Survey: Overall Satisfaction (% positive responses)	3.33	0.8325%	City Schools Data System	School's 3-yr average from SY14/15 to SY16/17 value is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band	School's 3-yr average from SY14/15 to SY16/17 value is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band	School's 3-yr average from SY14/15 to SY16/17 value is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band	School's 3-yr average from SY14/15 to SY16/17 value is < 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band
	Students: School Survey: Overall Satisfaction (% positive responses)	3.33	0.8325%	City Schools Data System	School's 3-yr average from SY14/15 to SY16/17 value is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band	School's 3-yr average from SY14/15 to SY16/17 value is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band	School's 3-yr average from SY14/15 to SY16/17 value is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band	School's 3-yr average from SY14/15 to SY16/17 value is < 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band
	Parents: School Survey: Overall Satisfaction (% positive responses)	3.33	0.8325%	City Schools Data System	School's 5-yr average satisfaction from SY14/15 to SY18/19 value is ≥ 90%	School's 5-yr average satisfaction from SY14/15 to SY18/19 value is ≥ 80%	School's 5-yr average satisfaction from SY14/15 to SY18/19 value is ≥ 70%	School's 5-yr average satisfaction from SY14/15 to SY18/19 value is < 70%
2.5	Cohort Retention	10	2.50%	City Schools Data System	School's student cohort retention 2 years after entry is ≥ 80th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band	School's student cohort retention 2 years after entry is ≥ 65th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band	School's student cohort retention 2 years after entry is ≥ 50th percentile of all schools in the District based on grade band	School's student cohort retention 2 years after entry is < 50th percentile of all schools in the District
2.6	Student Attendance: Chronic Absence	10	2.50%	City Schools Data System/ Renewal Application	Evidence that the school is aware of its chronic absence data, has strong processes in place to identify root causes and provide supports to families, and has implemented effective strategies that have kept chronic absence low over the course of the contract or have made significant reductions in chronic absence rates over time.	Evidence that the school is aware of its chronic absence data, has processes in place to identify root causes and provide supports to families and has implemented effective strategies that have decreased chronic absence rates.	Evidence that the school is aware of its chronic absence data, has attempted to identify root causes, and has implemented strategies that the school believes will decrease chronic absence but these strategies have not yet been proven effective.	Little or no evidence found that the school is aware of its chronic absence data or has attempted to identify root causes, or has implemented strategies in response to chronic absence data or .
2.7	Suspensions	10	2.50%	City Schools Data System/ Renewal Application	Evidence that the school is aware of its suspension data, has positive behavior interventions in place, and has implemented effective strategies that have kept suspensions low over the course of the contract or has resulted in significant decreases over time.	Evidence that the school is aware of its suspension data, has positive behavior interventions in place, and has implemented effective strategies that have decreased suspensions.	Evidence that the school is aware of its suspension data, has positive behavior interventions in place, and has implemented strategies that the school believes will decrease suspensions but these strategies have not yet been proven effective.	Little or no evidence found that the school is aware of its suspension data or that the school implemented strategies in response to suspension data or no evidence that the school has positive behavior interventions.
2.8	Effective Academic Programming for Students with Disabilities	10	2.50%	City Schools Data System/ Renewal Application/ Compliance & Best Practice Monitoring Tool	Evidence that school has a demonstrated a strong trajectory of growth, is aware of its data and responsibilities to students with disabilities, does not have any gaps or has decreased gaps in the data as it relates to performance and climate metrics for students with disabilities over time, and has effectively and consistently implemented processes, interventions and strategies to support student outcomes over the course of the contract.	Evidence that school has a demonstrated a trajectory of growth, is aware of its data and responsibilities to students with disabilities, has minimum gaps or has decreased gaps in the data as it relates to performance and climate metrics for students with disabilities over time, and has generally implemented appropriate processes, interventions and strategies to support student outcomes over the course of the contract. The school has taken prompt and appropriate steps to address any shortcomings.	Evidence that school is working towards a trajectory of growth, is aware of its data and responsibilities to students with disabilities, and has implemented processes, interventions and strategies to support student outcomes including to address any gaps in the data as it relates to performance and climate metrics for students with disabilities over time over the course of the contract but in some instances has struggled to take measures that are appropriate and sufficient. The school has taken steps to remedy such shortcomings.	Little or no evidence that school is working towards a trajectory of growth and is aware of its data and responsibilities to students with disabilities. School has failed to sufficiently implement processes, interventions and strategies to support student outcomes including to address any gaps in the data as it relates to performance and climate metrics for students with disabilities over time over the course of the contract.

3	Has the school followed sufficient financial management and governance practices?	100	25.00%		Meets Expectations	Developing	Does Not Meet Expectations	
3.1	Audit Content, Internal Controls	33.33	8.33%	City Schools/ Renewal Application/ Audits	The Independent Auditor's Reports offer unqualified opinions and no management points were found in each of the years of the charter term. The statements of cash flow and ratio of assets to liabilities indicate that the operator has strong performance on their short term liquidity measure.	The Independent Auditor's Reports offer qualified opinions and any management points took multiple years to resolve or are still unresolved. Or, the statements of cash flow and ratio of assets to liabilities indicate that the operator has fair performance on their short term liquidity measure.	The Independent Auditor's Reports offer qualified opinions with multiple unresolved management points or material weaknesses identified. Or, the statements of cash flow and ratio of assets to liabilities indicate that the operator has poor performance on their short term liquidity measure.	
					Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Not Effective
3.2	Operator Capacity	33.33	8.33%	City Schools/ Renewal Application	Evidence indicates that in each year of the charter or contract term, the school has operated effectively and the operator has consistently met all state, and federal reporting requirements, critical District or federal obligations, has effectively managed grants and has not received any Notices of Concern or Notices of Reprimand during the contract period. (Evidence that may be considered includes compliance with critical District, state or federal reporting requirements, timely audit and budget submissions, monitoring reports, quarterly reports, whether school has been able to meet financial obligations or needed loans/advances from the district to meet obligations, the school's ability to meet key contractual requirements, and the relative number, frequency and severity of Notices of Concern or Notices of Reprimand.)	Evidence indicates that, overall, during the charter or contract term, the school has operated effectively and the operator has met all state and federal reporting requirements, critical District or federal obligations, has appropriately managed grants and has received limited or no Notices of Concern and not received any Notices of Reprimand during the contract period. (Evidence that may be considered includes compliance with critical District, state or federal reporting requirements, timely audit and budget submissions, monitoring reports, quarterly reports, whether school has been able to meet financial obligations or needed loans/advances from the district to meet obligations, the school's ability to meet key contractual requirements, and the relative number, frequency and severity of Notices of Concern or Notices of Reprimand.)	Evidence indicates that during the charter or contract term the school has increasingly operated effectively, the operator has met all state and federal reporting requirements. The operator has not consistently met all critical District obligations but has demonstrated progress in complying with all requirements. The school has demonstrated progress in its management of grants. During the charter or contract term the operator has received some Notices of Concern and limited or no Notices of Reprimand but the number, frequency and severity of such notices has decreased over time. (Evidence that may be considered includes compliance with critical District, state or federal reporting requirements, timeliness of audit and budget submissions, whether school has been able to meet financial obligations or needed loans/advances from the district to meet obligations, monitoring reports, quarterly reports, the school's ability to meet key contractual requirements, and the relative number, frequency and severity of Notices of Concern or Notices of Reprimand.)	Evidence indicates that throughout the charter or contract term the school has generally operated ineffectively as evidenced by the fact that the operator does not meet state or federal reporting requirements, or critical District or federal obligations or has ineffectively management grants. During the charter or contract term the operator has received some Notices of Concern and Notices of Reprimand with the number, frequency and severity of such notices indicative of consistent challenges with operations and compliance. (Evidence that may be considered includes compliance with critical District, state or federal reporting requirements, timeliness of audit or budget submissions, whether school has been able to meet financial obligations or needed loans/advances from the district to meet obligations, and monitoring reports, quarterly reports, the school's ability to meet key contractual requirements, and the relative number, frequency and severity of Notices of Concern or Notices of Reprimand.)
3.3	Strategic Leadership/Governance	33.33	8.33%	SER	Evidence indicates that the key action (including all indicators) is a practice or system that has been fully adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that has had a strong, significant or sustainable impact on the school's effectiveness.	Evidence indicates that the key action (including most indicators) is a practice or system that has been adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that is improving the school's effectiveness	Evidence indicates that the key action (including some indicators) is a practice or system that is emerging at the school, but that it has not yet been implemented at a level that has begun to improve the school's effectiveness, OR that the impact of the key action on the effectiveness of the school cannot yet be fully determined.	Evidence indicates that the key action is not a practice or system that has been adopted and/or implemented at the school, or the level of adoption/implementation does not improve the school's effectiveness