

GRADUATE ARKANSAS QUALITY OF PRACTICE RENEWAL ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

CATEGORY	4 — Exemplary	3 — Effective	2 — Developing	1 — Needs Improvement	Score
	Practice was consistent cross the term and produced stronger, sustained results.	Effective: Practice was generally reliable but with some gaps in consistency or impact.	Practice existed but was uneven, with limited effect on outcomes.	Practice was weak or absent across much of the term.	
Standard 1.1 (Curriculum Coherence)	<p>Standard: The school implements an aligned curriculum with shared unit plans and pacing across grades.</p> <p>Element: The taught curriculum is aligned across grades and subjects, supported by common unit plans, clear pacing, and a scheduled review cycle that refines materials and tasks based on evidence from classrooms and assessments.</p>				
	<p>Common unit plans and pacing guides are used in every grade with clear non-negotiables, so teachers plan from the same playbook each unit.</p> <p>A documented review cycle— fed by teacher input, student work, and interim results—updates tasks, texts, and scaffolds on a predictable schedule.</p> <p>Reviewers will see current maps, vertically aligned expectations, exemplar tasks with rubrics, and meeting notes showing what changed and why.</p>	<p>Most grades implement common units and pacing with periodic alignment checks, and materials generally reflect the intended rigor.</p> <p>Gaps appear in a few courses or teams, but leaders monitor usage and address drift during planning meetings.</p> <p>Reviewers will see shared plans in most rooms, some recent refinements, and occasional variance in task quality or pacing fidelity. –</p>	<p>A written curriculum exists but varies notably by grade or teacher, yielding uneven rigor and missed opportunities for coherence.</p> <p>There is no reliable review rhythm; updates happen only when issues surface, and vertical alignment is inconsistent.</p> <p>Reviewers will find mismatched pacing, outdated or teacher-created units without shared expectations, and limited evidence of cross-grade alignment.</p>	<p>There are no common expectations for what is taught and when; teachers assemble materials independently with unclear links to standards.</p> <p>Pacing is ad hoc, resulting in unfinished content and low cognitive demand across many classrooms.</p> <p>Reviewers will see few or no shared unit plans, missing pacing guides, and tasks that do not reflect grade-level standards.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p>

Standard 1.2 (Instructional Core & Cognitive Demand)	Standard: Daily instruction requires all students to engage in grade-level discourse, problem-solving, and writing, with in-the-moment adjustments.			
	Element: Lessons feature clear objectives, frequent checks for understanding, and responsive adjustments; students regularly explain their thinking, write, and solve problems at the appropriate level of rigor.			
<p>Walkthroughs consistently show posted objectives, modeled success criteria, and multiple checks for understanding that teachers use to adjust instruction in real time.</p> <p>Students speak, write, and solve at grade level in whole-group and small-group formats, and their work shows reasoning and application, not just recall.</p> <p>Reviewers will see exit tickets, cold-call or turn-and-talk routines, and annotated student work evidencing feedback and revision.</p>	<p>Most lessons include clear learning targets and at least one reliable check for understanding, and students regularly engage in discourse and problem-solving.</p> <p>Cognitive demand is generally appropriate but varies by classroom or part of the lesson, and adjustments sometimes come a day later rather than in the moment.</p> <p>Reviewers will see generally strong tasks, some uneven opportunities for student talk, and feedback that is present but inconsistent in quality.</p>	<p>Some classes post objectives and use occasional checks, but many lessons rely on teacher talk, note-taking, or recall-level worksheets. Opportunities for students to explain reasoning or write are infrequent, and teachers rarely pivot instruction based on live evidence.</p> <p>Reviewers will find limited student discourse, minimal use of success criteria, and work samples reflecting surface understanding.</p>	<p>Objectives are unclear or absent, and instruction emphasizes coverage over understanding.</p> <p>There are few checks for understanding and tasks rarely require students to think, talk, write, or solve at grade level.</p> <p>Reviewers will see primarily lecture or low-level worksheets and little to no evidence of feedback or adjustment.</p>	<p style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">4</p> <p style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">3</p> <p style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">2</p> <p style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">1</p>

Standard 1.3 (Assessment for Learning)	Standard: Teams use formative and interim evidence to reteach, regroup, and extend learning quickly.			
	Element: Assessment is planned in advance, aligned to priority standards, and analyzed promptly; teams use item-level evidence and student work to adjust instruction within days.			
	<p>— Common formatives and interims are scheduled on a published calendar, and teams analyze results within 48–72 hours.</p> <p>Item analyses lead to specific reteach plans, regrouping, and extensions, and feedback appears in student work within the week.</p> <p>Reviewers will see PLC notes with action steps, updated small-group rosters, revised lesson materials, and evidence of impact on the next cycle.</p>	<p>Teams administer aligned assessments regularly and review results to plan reteach and extension, although the speed and depth of analysis vary by grade or subject.</p> <p>Adjustments usually occur the following week, and feedback to students is present but inconsistent in precision.</p> <p>Reviewers will see calendars, basic item summaries, and reteach plans that are implemented with minor delays.</p>	<p>Assessments are given but are not consistently common or aligned, and team analyses are sporadic.</p> <p>Reteach decisions are informal, often left to individual teachers, and student feedback is general or delayed.</p> <p>Reviewers will find gradebooks without analysis artifacts, limited evidence of small-group regrouping, and unchanged lesson plans.</p>	<p>— Assessment is used mainly for grades and reporting, not to change instruction. Teams rarely examine student work or items together, and there is little evidence of intentional reteach or extension.</p> <p>Reviewers will see isolated tests, minimal feedback, and no documented instructional response.</p>

4
3
2
1

Standard 1.4 (Targeted Support & Acceleration)	Standard: Tiered supports and enrichment follow clear entry/exit criteria and receive progress checks every 2–4 weeks.			
	Element: Intervention and enrichment are scheduled, criteria-driven, and tightly monitored so students get the right help or challenge at the right time.			
<p>The master schedule protects intervention and enrichment blocks, and students enter and exit based on published criteria tied to recent evidence.</p> <p>Progress is checked every 2–4 weeks, and schedules, materials, and staffing shift quickly when students meet goals or need different supports.</p> <p>Reviewers will see placement rules, up-to-date rosters, progress charts, and work samples that show targeted instruction and extension.</p>	<p>Supports are scheduled and generally follow entry/exit expectations, with monthly or unit-level progress checks. Most students receive appropriate help, though regrouping or materials sometimes lag behind the data by a week or two.</p> <p>Reviewers will find rosters, criteria documents, and evidence of adjustments that happen, albeit not always immediately.</p>	<p>Supports occur but are often ad hoc or dependent on individual teacher’s decisions; criteria are unclear or inconsistently applied.</p> <p>Progress monitoring is infrequent, so student placement does not change quickly when needs shift.</p> <p>Reviewers will see static rosters, generic materials, and few documented checks or placement updates.</p>	<p>Intervention time is irregular or absorbed by other activities, and enrichment is rare.</p> <p>There are no clear entry/exit rules or progress checks, so students remain misplaced for long periods.</p> <p>Reviewers will see schedules without protected blocks and little evidence of targeted instruction.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p>

Standard 1.5 (Professional Learning & Coaching)	Standard: PLCs and coaching lead to observable changes in classroom practice. Element: Leaders run coaching cycles with specific action steps and verify implementation; PLCs analyze student work and align with classroom look-fors so adult learning changes student learning.			
	<p>Observation and feedback follow a published cadence, and each cycle includes one or two precise action steps that are verified within two weeks.</p> <p>PLCs regularly study student work using protocols and connect findings to look-fors used in walkthroughs.</p> <p>Reviewers will see coaching logs with follow-ups, implementation evidence in classrooms, and before/after student work showing improvement.</p>	<p>Coaching and PLCs occur on schedule and produce actionable next steps for most staff, though verification of implementation is uneven across teams.</p> <p>Some cycles result in visible classroom shifts, while others stall at planning.</p> <p>Reviewers will find observation notes with action steps and intermittent evidence that those steps were executed.</p>	<p>— Professional learning is offered but is not reliably tied to classroom feedback and follow-up.</p> <p>Action steps are generic or too broad, and leaders seldom return to confirm changes or examine student work for impact.</p> <p>Reviewers will see agendas without artifacts of implementation and walkthrough notes that repeat the same focus areas.</p>	<p>Coaching is minimal or reactive, PLC time lacks a clear purpose, and professional development is disconnected from classroom expectations.</p> <p>There is no system to verify whether adult learning changes practice.</p> <p>Reviewers will see scarce observation records and no evidence of implementation checks.</p>

Standard 2.1 (Safe & Orderly Environment)	Standard: Routines and adult responses consistently maintain a safe, focused learning environment. Element: Common expectations are taught and practiced, supervision is visible, and safety procedures are current; learning time is protected by predictable routines.			
	<p>Transitions are brisk and predictable across the building, expectations are posted and practiced, and adults respond consistently to misbehavior.</p> <p>Safety drills and logs are current, and students and staff can describe procedures confidently.</p> <p>Reviewers will observe calm hallways, timely supervision, and complete safety documentation.</p>	<p>Most spaces use common routines, and safety documentation is in order with only minor lapses that leaders address promptly.</p> <p>Occasional disruptions occur but are resolved quickly without significant loss of learning time.</p> <p>Reviewers will see generally orderly transitions and a few areas needing reinforcement.</p>	<p>Routines vary by teacher or location, and adult responses are inconsistent, producing uneven expectations for students.</p> <p>Some safety documentation is incomplete or out of date, and supervision gaps lead to lost time.</p> <p>Reviewers will encounter noisy transitions, unclear consequences, and missing or expired records.</p>	<p>Frequent disruptions and unclear expectations undermine safety and focus, and drills or safety logs are missing or outdated.</p> <p>Students receive mixed signals from adults, and instructional time is routinely lost.</p> <p>Reviewers will see chaotic transitions, inadequate supervision, and significant documentation gaps.</p>

Performance Standard 2.2 (Behavior & Attendance Systems)	Standard: Behavior and attendance systems protect instructional time through timely, tiered action.				
	Element: Data is reviewed routinely; early, escalating supports engage students and families; the aim is fewer removals and more learning time.				
	<p>Behavior and attendance data are reviewed weekly by grade/teacher, and tiered interventions begin early with documented family contact.</p> <p>Leaders track follow-through and measure impact, reducing repeat incidents and chronic absence.</p> <p>Reviewers will see dashboards, intervention logs, and evidence that time-on-task remains high.</p>	<p>Monitoring occurs on a regular cadence, and most interventions are implemented, though follow-through or escalation is inconsistent in some cohorts.</p> <p>Patterns are identified and addressed, but not always quickly enough to prevent recurrence.</p> <p>Reviewers will see data reviews and action steps with variable completion.</p>	<p>Data are captured but not used predictably to trigger interventions, and responses vary by teacher or team.</p> <p>Chronic absence or repeated behaviors are often addressed late, after significant learning time is lost.</p> <p>Reviewers will find tracking spreadsheets without consistent next steps or outcome checks.</p>	<p>Little monitoring or follow-up occurs, and students cycle through issues without targeted support.</p> <p>Attendance outreach is sporadic and consequences are inconsistent.</p> <p>Reviewers will see few records of contact, missing plans, and persistent time loss.</p>	<div style="font-size: 48pt; font-weight: bold; margin-bottom: 10px;">4</div> <div style="font-size: 36pt; font-weight: bold; margin-bottom: 10px;">3</div> <div style="font-size: 36pt; font-weight: bold; margin-bottom: 10px;">2</div> <div style="font-size: 36pt; font-weight: bold;">1</div>

<p>Standard 2.3</p> <p>(Family Partnership & Communication)</p>	<p>Standard: Communication with families is predictable, two-way, and useful in supporting student learning.</p> <p>Element: A communication calendar and multiple channels share progress and next steps; schools gather feedback and adjust accordingly.</p>			
<p>Families receive timely updates that include clear next steps for support, and multiple channels make communication accessible.</p> <p>Feedback loops—surveys, forums, or advisory groups—lead to documented changes that families can see.</p> <p>Reviewers will find a published calendar, examples of two-way communication, and evidence of adjustments made in response.</p>	<p>Families receive regular updates and some opportunities to provide input, though the specificity of next steps varies by grade or teacher.</p> <p>Feedback is acknowledged and occasionally prompts adjustments.</p> <p>Reviewers will see consistent newsletters or portal posts and periodic engagement artifacts.</p>	<p>Communication is intermittent or heavily one-way, and families are unsure how to help at home.</p> <p>Opportunities to provide input are limited or not well publicized.</p> <p>Reviewers will find irregular messaging and minimal evidence that feedback informs practice.</p>	<p>Communication is ad hoc and reactive, often triggered by problems rather than planned updates.</p> <p>Families lack clarity on progress, expectations, and whom to contact.</p> <p>Reviewers will see sparse records, outdated channels, and little engagement.</p>	<p style="text-align: center; font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold;">4 3 2 1</p>

Performance Standard 2.4 (Access, Enrollment & Retention)	Standard: Outreach and retention practices provide fair access and sustain enrollment.			
	Element: Processes are transparent and predictable; onboarding sets clear expectations; retention and exit analyses inform targeted improvements.			
<p>Outreach and lottery materials are transparent and easy to understand, and onboarding helps families grasp expectations before day one.</p> <p>Retention and exit data are analyzed by cohort, and targeted actions strengthen fit and persistence.</p> <p>Reviewers will see public notices, onboarding agendas, and annual analyses that led to visible changes.</p>	<p>Outreach and onboarding occur reliably, and the school reviews retention annually to identify a few adjustments.</p> <p>Families understand processes, with occasional confusion addressed as it arises.</p> <p>Reviewers will see consistent procedures and basic retention reports.</p>	<p>Outreach and onboarding are minimal and exit reasons are not routinely analyzed to inform changes.</p> <p>Families report confusion about steps or timelines, and persistence varies widely by grade.</p> <p>Reviewers will find limited materials and no coherent retention plan.</p>	<p>Processes are unclear or inconsistently applied, and transparency is limited.</p> <p>Declining retention is not addressed with a plan.</p> <p>Reviewers will see missing notices, inconsistent onboarding, and no analysis of exits.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p>

Standard 3.1 (Recruitment & Hiring)	Standard: Hiring practices identify candidates who match the school’s instructional model through performance-based selection.			
	Element: An annual calendar, multiple pipelines, structured interviews, demo lessons, and reference checks ensure fit to instructional expectations.			
	Hiring follows a published calendar with proactive cultivation of candidates, including pipelines like residencies and referrals. Structured interviews, demo lessons with rubrics, and reference checks tied to core expectations ensure strong fit. Reviewers will see artifacts for each step, ratings summaries, and consistent selection against clear criteria.	Hiring is generally calendarized and rubric-based, and most finalists complete a performance task such as a demo lesson. References are checked, though alignment to specific expectations are sometimes broad. Reviewers will find structured guides and some variability in performance evidence.	Hiring is reactive and relies on resumes and conversational interviews with limited performance checks. Screening criteria are inconsistent, increasing variability in classroom quality. Reviewers will see ad hoc notes and few artifacts beyond resumes.	Hiring is ad hoc and rushed, with weak screening for instructional fit. Demo lessons or rubrics are rarely used, and references are generic or omitted. Reviewers will see minimal documentation and frequent misalignment in hires.
				<div style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">4</div> <div style="font-size: 3em; margin: 0;">3</div> <div style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">2</div> <div style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">1</div>

Standard 3.2 (Evaluation, Coaching & Growth)	Standard: Leaders observe, give actionable feedback, and verify changes in practice. Element: Observation schedules are met; feedback includes specific action steps; leaders verify implementation and complete growth plans.			
	<p>Leaders meet observation schedules and give precise, bite-sized action steps that are verified within two weeks through follow-up visits or artifacts.</p> <p>Growth plans are active documents connected to student work and are reviewed each term.</p> <p>Reviewers will find observation logs with timestamps, implementation evidence, and trend data showing practice improvement.</p>	<p>Most observations occur on time with actionable feedback, and verification happens in many cases though not all.</p> <p>Growth plans exist and are referenced during check-ins.</p> <p>Reviewers will see feedback aligned to look-for's and periodic follow-ups.</p>	<p>Observations are irregular, feedback is general, and action steps are too broad to execute.</p> <p>Leaders seldom return to confirm changes, and growth plans are incomplete or static.</p> <p>Reviewers will see long gaps between visits and repeated notes without implementation evidence.</p>	<p>Little observation or coaching occurs, and teachers lack clear guidance for improvement.</p> <p>There are no active growth plans or verification processes.</p> <p>Reviewers will find sparse records and limited awareness of instructional look-for's.</p>

<p>Standard 3.3 (Collaboration & Time Use)</p>	<p>Standard: Time and schedules support collaboration and core learning.</p> <p>Element: Weekly PLCs focus on student work and decisions; notes list next steps and owners; the master schedule protects core instruction and intervention.</p>			
	<p>PLCs meet weekly with agendas centered on student work and result in decisions recorded with owners and dates.</p> <p>The master schedule protects core and intervention minutes, and coverage plans safeguard collaboration time.</p> <p>Reviewers will see decision trackers, evidence of follow-through, and schedules aligned to priorities.</p>	<p>PLCs occur regularly with generally aligned agendas, and the schedule mostly supports instructional priorities.</p> <p>Time conflicts or coverage gaps occur occasionally but are addressed.</p> <p>Reviewers will find notes that include next steps and a schedule that largely protects key blocks.</p>	<p>— PLCs are sporadic or focus more on logistics than student work, and schedules frequently conflict with intervention or collaboration.</p> <p>Decisions are not tracked, so follow-through is uneven.</p> <p>Reviewers will see missing notes, last-minute cancellations, and eroded intervention minutes.</p>	<p>Collaboration time is not protected, and daily schedules work against instructional priorities.</p> <p>Intervention minutes are routinely lost to other tasks.</p> <p>Reviewers will find little formal collaboration and schedules misaligned to the program.</p>

Performance Standard 3.4 (Leadership Pipeline & Succession)	Standard: The organization sustains quality through role clarity, cross-training, and succession planning.			
	Element: Roles are defined; deputies and cross-training are in place; written succession plans ensure smooth transitions that protect momentum.			
<p>Key roles have documented responsibilities, deputies, and cross-training plans so that work continues smoothly during absences or transitions.</p> <p>A written succession plan names interim coverage and onboarding steps for each critical function.</p> <p>Reviewers will see role guides, coverage matrices, and evidence of executed transitions without loss of quality.</p>	<p>Roles are generally clear with some cross-training and informal succession expectations.</p> <p>Most transitions are managed with limited disruption.</p> <p>Reviewers will find org charts, role descriptions, and informal coverage notes.</p>	<p>Role clarity is partial and cross-training is limited, leading to service gaps when staff change.</p> <p>Succession planning is ad hoc and depends on individuals.</p> <p>Reviewers will see bottlenecks, unassigned tasks, and reactive coverage.</p>	<p>The school depends on single individuals for key functions and lacks a plan for continuity.</p> <p>Transitions routinely disrupt core work.</p> <p>Reviewers will find no deputies, no written plans, and repeated delays during absences.</p>	<div style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; margin-bottom: 10px;">4</div> <div style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; margin-bottom: 10px;">3</div> <div style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; margin-bottom: 10px;">2</div> <div style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold;">1</div>

Standard 4.1 (Financial Planning & Monitoring)	Standard: Financial planning and monitoring support program needs and long-term stability. Element: Monthly dashboards and multi-year projections guide strategic choices; audit findings are resolved on schedule; finance informs staffing and curriculum decisions.			
	<p>Leaders and the board review dashboard report monthly and use multi-year projections to make timely adjustments that protect program quality.</p> <p>Audit findings, if any, are corrected on schedule with documentation, and resourcing choices visibly align to academic priorities.</p> <p>Reviewers will see board minutes linking financial decisions to strategy, current dashboards, and projection models.</p>	<p>Regular monitoring and projections inform decisions, though some adjustments lag behind emerging needs or are revisited later.</p> <p>Audit follow-up occurs with minor delays.</p> <p>Reviewers will see monthly statements, basic projections, and records of adjustments made within the quarter.</p>	<p>Monitoring occurs without consistent projections or clear links to strategic priorities, and responses to issues are delayed.</p> <p>Audit items linger or recur.</p> <p>Reviewers will find statements without a projection view and few memos tying dollars to program impact.</p>	<p>Financial monitoring is limited or infrequent, surprises are common, and there is no plan to sustain the program over time.</p> <p>Audit issues are unresolved.</p> <p>Reviewers will see outdated reports and minimal evidence of decision-making.</p>

Standard 4.2 (Internal Controls & Compliance)	Standard: Internal controls protect funds and ensure compliance. Element: Current policies, segregation of duties, procurement controls, and prompt corrective actions are documented and followed.				
	<p>Finance policies are current and used, duties are segregated with clear signatory limits, and procurement logs are up to date.</p> <p>Internal checks catch errors early, and corrective actions are documented and closed on time.</p> <p>Reviewers will see policy manuals, control matrices, and a tracker showing resolved items.</p>	<p>Policies are in place and generally followed, with minor documentation or segregation gaps addressed when identified.</p> <p>Corrective actions close out with occasional delays.</p> <p>Reviewers will find current policies and routine monitoring artifacts.</p>	<p>Policies are outdated or inconsistently applied, and records such as procurement logs are incomplete.</p> <p>Corrective actions proceed slowly and recur.</p> <p>Reviewers will see gaps in documentation and unclear approval paths.</p>	<p>Controls are weak or missing, exposing public funds to risk.</p> <p>Findings repeat, and leaders cannot show how controls are monitored.</p> <p>Reviewers will see absent policies, unchecked access, and unresolved findings.</p>	4 3 2 1

Performance Standard 4.3 (Facilities, Safety & Operations)	Standard: Operations consistently enable teaching and learning.				
	Element: Preventive maintenance and inspections are current; work orders are resolved promptly; transportation and food service meet program needs.				
<p>A preventive maintenance plan is executed on schedule, inspections are current, and work orders are closed quickly with communication to staff.</p> <p>Transportation, food service, and materials delivery support learning without recurring issues.</p> <p>Reviewers will see maintenance schedules, inspection certificates, and response-time reports.</p>	<p>Maintenance and inspections are generally current with occasional delays, and core operational needs are met.</p> <p>Work-order backlogs are addressed within reasonable time frames.</p> <p>Reviewers will find logs showing steady closure and only isolated lapses.</p>	<p>Maintenance is largely reactive, some inspections are expired, and operational gaps regularly disrupt instruction.</p> <p>Work-order response times are slow.</p> <p>Reviewers will see frequent complaints and documentation gaps.</p>	<p>Operational failures and safety risks are common and unresolved, impeding teaching and learning.</p> <p>There is no reliable plan for maintenance or compliance.</p> <p>Reviewers will see expired certificates, persistent issues, and inadequate follow-up.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p>	

Standard 4.4 (Data Quality & Reporting)	Standard: Core data processes are trustworthy and timely. Element: A written data calendar and procedures guide accurate, on time submissions; internal spot checks verify quality across enrollment, attendance, and course data.			
<p>A data calendar lists deadlines, owners, and checks, and procedures for each system are documented and followed.</p> <p>Spot checks validate accuracy before submission, and corrections are rare and quickly resolved.</p> <p>Reviewers will see calendars, SOPs, audit logs, and submission confirmations.</p>	<p>Procedures exist and most submissions are timely and accurate, with minor corrections made after review.</p> <p>Some spot checks occur, though not uniformly.</p> <p>Reviewers will find procedure documents and on time history with occasional fixes.</p>	<p>Processes are informal and rely on individual knowhow, leading to frequent corrections after submission.</p> <p>Quality assurance is limited or undocumented.</p> <p>Reviewers will see later changes, inconsistent ownership, and few written procedures.</p>	<p>Submissions are often late or inaccurate and there is no documented process to ensure data quality.</p> <p>Errors repeat and undermine trust in reports.</p> <p>Reviewers will see missing calendars and a pattern of resubmissions.</p>	<p style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">4</p> <p style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">3</p> <p style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">2</p> <p style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">1</p>

Standard 5.1 (Strategic Plan & Progress Monitoring)	Standard: The school sets a few priorities and monitors them to drive decisions.			
	Element: A concise plan with measures and public dashboards anchors meetings; adjustments are documented and resourced.			
<p>The plan names a few measurable aims, and dashboards anchor each leadership and board meeting.</p> <p>Course corrections are recorded with owners, timelines, and resource shifts that align with priorities.</p> <p>Reviewers will see one-page plans, current dashboards, and minutes linking evidence to decisions.</p>	<p>A plan and measures guide periodic reviews, and documented adjustments occur, though not at every meeting.</p> <p>Resource shifts follow, but sometimes later than ideal.</p> <p>Reviewers will see a concise plan, dashboards, and several examples of data-driven changes.</p>	<p>The plan is lengthy or vague, and reviews are infrequent or informational only.</p> <p>Action items are unclear and rarely resourced.</p> <p>Reviewers will find long documents, outdated metrics, and minimal evidence of follow-through.</p>	<p>Priorities are unclear or numerous, and meetings do not use evidence to guide decisions.</p> <p>There is little record of course-corrections.</p> <p>Reviewers will see agendas without metrics and budgets disconnected from priorities.</p>	<div style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; margin-bottom: 10px;">4</div> <div style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; margin-bottom: 10px;">3</div> <div style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold; margin-bottom: 10px;">2</div> <div style="font-size: 2em; font-weight: bold;">1</div>

Standard 5.2 (Board Operations & Oversight)	Standard: The board governs for results and fulfills core responsibilities. Element: Standing committees, leader evaluation, board self-evaluation, and current policies structure meetings where academic and financial monitoring leads to follow-up actions.			
	<p>Committees meet with clear charters and bring analyses to the board, the leader is evaluated annually against agreed metrics, and the board self-evaluates and updates policies on schedule.</p> <p>Meetings focus on outcomes and document follow-up actions with deadlines.</p> <p>Reviewers will see committee reports, evaluation artifacts, and minutes with assigned next steps.</p>	<p>The board meets regularly, conducts required evaluations, and monitors academics and finance, though depth of analysis and follow-up varies by meeting.</p> <p>Policies are current with minor gaps.</p> <p>Reviewers will see agendas and minutes with some clear actions.</p>	<p>Oversight is irregular, some required evaluations are late or informal, and minutes seldom capture actionable follow-up.</p> <p>Policies are outdated in places.</p> <p>Reviewers will see perfunctory monitoring and unclear accountability for actions.</p>	<p>Meetings focus on operations rather than outcomes, and core oversight duties are not fulfilled.</p> <p>There is little documented monitoring or evaluation.</p> <p>Reviewers will find sparse records and missing policies.</p>

Standard 5.3 (Mission & Program Coherence)	Standard: The charter’s design is implemented faithfully across the school. Element: Key design elements are visible in classrooms and culture; budget and staffing choices reflect the model; fidelity checks inform timely adjustments.			
<p>Design elements are evident in schedules, staffing, and classroom routines, and leaders use fidelity checks to refine implementation.</p> <p>Budget choices and hiring reflect the model’s non-negotiables.</p> <p>Reviewers will see artifacts and observations that match the charter’s design described.</p>	<p>Most design elements are implemented with occasional drift that leaders address through targeted refinements.</p> <p>Resource decisions generally align to the model.</p> <p>Reviewers will see strong alignment with a few areas needing attention.</p>	<p>Implementation is uneven, and some resource choices work against the stated model.</p> <p>Fidelity checks are rare or informal, so drift persists.</p> <p>Reviewers will see mixed evidence across grades or programs.</p>	<p>The program does not reflect the charter design and implementation is scattered without a plan to restore alignment.</p> <p>Resources are not aligned to the model.</p> <p>Reviewers will see little connection between the design on paper and daily practice.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p>

Standard 5.4 (Continuous Improvement Discipline)	Standard: Leadership runs a simple Plan–Do–Study–Act cycle that is visible to staff and families.			
	Element: Each term, leaders define specific problems, run small tests of change, review evidence openly, and communicate next steps.			
Leaders run termly cycles that start with a precise problem statement, include a small test of change, and use evidence to decide whether to adopt, adapt, or abandon the approach.	Improvement cycles occur and include data reviews, though the problem statements or tests of change are sometimes broad and documentation is uneven.	Efforts are ad hoc and seldom tied to clear hypotheses or measurable evidence, so lessons do not carry forward.	There is no coherent improvement process, and initiatives start and stop without analysis.	4
Progress and next steps are communicated to staff and families.	Communication of findings happens but not every term.	Communication is sporadic and impact is unclear.	Staff and families lack visibility into priorities and progress.	
Reviewers will see cycle templates, impact reviews, and communications tied to results.	Reviewers will find cycle artifacts with some gaps in clarity or cadence.	Reviewers will see plans without follow-through and few records of results.	Reviewers will find limited documentation and shifting focus areas.	3
				2
				1

GRADUATE