

Evaluation Rubric 2026

Hiawatha Academies

SECTION 1 – IS THE LEARNING PROGRAM A SUCCESS?

1.1 MCA Reading Proficiency: Are students in Grade 4 increasing in proficiency from Grade 3 in Reading?	
1 = Does not meet standard	Proficiency has increased less than 3 percentage points
2 = Approaching standard	Proficiency has increased by 3.1 to 6 percentage points
3 = Meets standard	Proficiency has increased by 6.1 to 10 percentage points
4 = Exceeds standard	Proficiency has increased by more than 10 percentage points
SY25 Rating: 1 Comments: In SY23, Grade 3 proficiency in reading was 4.4%. In Grade 4, proficiency in reading decreased to 3.0%.	
SY26 Rating: 2 Comments: In SY24, reading proficiency in Grade 3 was 3.9%. In Grade 4 in SY 25, proficiency in reading increased to 8.5% which is an increase of 4.6%.	
SY27 Rating: Comments:	
Data Sources: Annual report, Minnesota Department of Education School Report Card	

1.2 MCA Proficiency: Are students performing as well as or better than the state, the resident district and demographic comparison group on MCA Math and Reading exams? 1.2a Reading 1.2b Math				
1 = Does not meet standard	More than 10 percentage points below comparison groups			
2 = Approaching standard	6 – 10 percentage points below comparison groups			
3 = Meets standard	Within 5 percentage points of comparison groups			
4 = Exceeds standard	Exceeds comparison group by more than 5 percentage points			
	Reading Proficiency	Score	Weight	Points earned
Charter School	14.7%			
Average of demographic match schools	20.9%	2	45%	.9
Resident district	40.1%	1	30%	.3

State	47.3%	1	25%	.25
			100%	Total: 1.45
	Math Proficiency	Score	Weight	Points earned
Charter School	15.7%			
Average of demographic match schools	12.6%	3	45%	1.35
Resident district	33.18%	1	30%	.3
State	43.6%	1	25%	.25
			100%	Total: 1.9

SY25

1.2a Reading: 1.45

1.2b Math: 1.9

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1.7

Comments: The math proficiency decreased slightly from the previous year and the reading proficiency increased. Both scores are on par with the demographic match schools but are well below the scores for the resident district and state.

2026	Reading Proficiency	Score	Weight	Points earned
Charter School	18.1%			
Average of demographic match schools	22.17%	3	45%	1.35
Resident district	41.9%	1	30%	.3
State	49.6%	1	25%	.25
			100%	Total: 1.9
	Math Proficiency	Score	Weight	Points earned
Charter School	13.2%			
Average of demographic match schools	17.03%	3	45%	1.35
Resident district	35.5%	1	30%	.3
State	45.2%	1	25%	.25
			100%	Total: 1.9

SY26

1.2a Reading: 1.9

1.2b Math: 1.9

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1.9

Comments: The following shows the breakdown of the three campuses:

High School	Hiawatha Acad.	Demo. Match	Minneapolis	State
Math	19% (+3.3)	17.04%	31.2%	35%

Reading	32.8% (+15.8)	29.5%	46.3%	51.3%
Middle School	Hiawatha Acad.	Demo. Match	Minneapolis	State
Math	10.3% (+2.1)	11.64%	31.7%	41.45%
Reading	14.5% (-3.6)	25.06%	40.4%	50.3%
Elementary	Hiawatha Acad.	Demo. Match	Minneapolis	State
Math	14.45% (+1.35)	22.4%	43.65%	56.75%
Reading	8.75% (+4.25)	11.97%	39.15%	46.2%
As can be seen in the chart above, all but one score increased. There were significant gains in reading in high school. The overall proficiency scores improved for both math and reading with a 2% gain in math and a 3.4% gain in reading.				
2027	Reading Proficiency	Score	Weight	Points earned
Charter School				
Average of demographic match schools			45%	
Resident district			30%	
State			25%	
			100%	Total:
	Math Proficiency	Score	Weight	Points earned
Charter School				
Average of demographic match schools			45%	
Resident district			30%	
State			25%	
			100%	Total:
SY27 1.2a Reading: 1.2b Math: Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: Comments:				

Data Sources: MCA data available on MDE website or school self-report, Test data spreadsheets

1.3 MCA Proficiency, State Demographic Comparison by Race/Ethnicity and FRL: Are student demographic groups (with tested cell sizes greater than 10) performing as well as or better than the statewide average for that student group? Note that for schools with greater than 70% of students qualifying for FRL, demographic categories will also be filtered by FRL status and not displayed separately. All relevant demographic groups will be individually scored per the rubric targets below and averaged to produce a score for each subject area (math/reading). The overall score for the metric is then produced by averaging the subject area scores.

1.3a Reading

1.3b Math

1 = Does not meet standard	Demographic group falls more than 10 percentage points below state average for that group
2 = Approaching standard	Demographic group falls 6 – 10 percentage points below the state average for that group
3 = Meets standard	Demographic group falls within 5 percentage points of the state average for that group
4 = Exceeds standard	Demographic group is exceeding statewide performance for that group by more than 5 percentage points

	Reading Proficiency	State Proficiency	% of Charter Student Population	Points earned
Charter School	14.7%			
Black	13.0%	31.1%		1
Hispanic	14.4%	28.7%		1

Average of math scores for each demographic group: 1

	Math Proficiency	State Proficiency	% of Charter Student Population	Points earned
Charter School	15.7%			
Black	6.2%	21.9%		1
Hispanic	11.7%	22.4%		1

Average of math scores for each demographic group: 1

SY25

1.3a Reading: 1

1.3b Math: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1

Comments: Both reading and math scores for the Black and Hispanic subgroups fall below the state.

2026	Reading Proficiency	State Proficiency	% of Charter Student Population	Points earned
Charter School	18.1%			
Black	20.4%	31.0%		1
Hispanic	16.6%	28.7%		1
Average of reading scores for each demographic group:				1
	Math Proficiency	State Proficiency	% of Charter Student Population	Points earned
Charter School	13.2%			
Black	11.4%	22.5%		1
Hispanic	12.9%	22.4%		1
Average of math scores for each demographic group:				1

SY26

1.3a Reading: 1

1.3b Math: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1

Comments: While each demographic group fell below state proficiency levels, there was an increase in proficiency in both groups in reading and math. The table below shows the increase for each group in both subjects.

Reading	
Black	+7.4%
Hispanic	+2.2%
Math	
Black	+5.2%
Hispanic	+1.2%

2027	Reading Proficiency	State Proficiency	% of Charter Student Population	Points earned
Charter School				
Black				
Hispanic				
Average of math scores for each demographic group:				
	Math Proficiency	State Proficiency	% of Charter Student Population	Points earned
Charter School				
Black				

Hispanic				

SY27

1.3a Reading:
1.3b Math:
Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores:

Comments:

Data Sources: MCA data available on MDE Minnesota Report Card

1.4 MCA Progress: Are students maintaining or moving toward proficiency? Note: Maintaining proficiency is defined as students who were proficient (meeting or exceeding) remaining in either the meeting or exceeding category. Moving toward proficiency is defined as a student moving up on or more “levels” (does not meet to partially meets; partially meets to proficient, etc.) 1.4a Reading 1.4b Math	
1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 35% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency
2 = Approaching standard	35 – 49.9% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency
3 = Meets standard	50 – 64.9% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency
4 = Exceeds standard	More than 65% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency

SY25

1.4a Reading: 1
1.4b Math: 1
Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1

Comments: In reading, 15.9% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency and in math, 11.3%. The percentages are well below the state averages of 42.8% in math and 47.8% in reading.

SY26

1.4a Reading: 1
1.4b Math: 1
Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1

Comments: 18.6% of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency in reading and 13.3% in math. In reading, there was an increase of 2.7% of students moving toward proficiency and a 2% increase in math. The percentages remain well below the state

averages, but increases are being made in both subjects.

SY27

1.4a Reading:

1.4b Math:

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores:

Comments:

Data Sources: Annual report, Minnesota Department of Education School Report Card

1.5 MCA Progress (Comparison Groups): Are students making progress at the same or better rate as the state and resident district? Note that this measure uses the Minnesota Department of Education’s definition of growth as a student maintaining at a level above “Does Not Meet” or increasing their proficiency level on the MCAs from the more recent prior year of testing data to the current year of testing data.

1.5a Reading

1.5b Math

1 = Does not meet standard	More than 10 percentage points below comparison groups
2 = Approaching standard	6 – 10 percentage points below comparison groups
3 = Meets standard	Within 5 percentage points of comparison groups
4 = Exceeds standard	Exceeds comparison group by more than 5 percentage points

2025

	Reading Growth	Score	Points earned
Charter School	29.3%		
Resident district	48.8%	1	1
State	61%	1	1
			Total: 1

	Math Growth		
Charter School	28%		
Resident district	42.5%	1	1
State	56.4%	1	1
			Total: 1

SY25

1.5a Reading: 1

1.5b Math: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1

Comments: Progress on the MCA for Hiawatha fell below the level of the state but has increased from the previous year.

2026	Reading Growth	Score	Points earned
Charter School	29.2%		
Resident district	51.2%	1	1
State	60.6%	1	1
			Total: 1
	Math Growth		
Charter School	28.7%		
Resident district	43.3%	1	1
State	55.9%	1	1

			Total: 1
--	--	--	-----------------

SY26

1.5a Reading: 1

1.5b Math: 1

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1

Comment: There were very slight increases in progress scores for both reading and math. The scores remain well below both the resident district and the state.

2027	Reading Growth	Score	Points earned
Charter School			
Resident district			
State			
			Total:
	Math Growth		
Charter School			
Resident district			
State			
			Total:

SY27

1.5a Reading:

1.5b Math:

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores:

Comments:

Data Sources: MCA data available on MDE website or school self-report, Test data spreadsheets

1.6 School Selected Assessment: Are students performing at or above target levels, as measured using the school's selected standardized assessments?

1.6a Reading

1.6b Mathematics

Reading: For students in grades K - 12, Hiawatha Academies has elected to use the Fastbridge Assessment with the target level being students performing at or above the 70th percentile.

Math: For students in grades K-12, Hiawatha Academies has elected to use the Fastbridge Assessment with the target level being students performing at or above the 70th percentile.

1 = Does not meet standard	Assessments indicate that less than 20% of tested students performed at or above the 70 th percentile.
2 = Approaching standard	Assessments indicate that 21 – 35% of tested students performed at or above the 70 th percentile.
3 = Meets standard	Assessments indicate that 36 – 50% of tested students performed at or above the 70 th percentile.
4 = Exceeds standard	Assessments indicate that more than 51% of tested students performed at or above the 70 th percentile.

SY25

1.6a: 2

1.6b: 2

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 2

Comments: 21.9% of students performed at or above the 70th percentile in Reading and 23.8% in Math.

SY26

1.6a: 1

1.6b: 2

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1.5

Comments: In reading 15% of students performed at or above the 70th percentile, which is a decrease from the previous year. In Math, 22% of students performed at or above the 70th percentile.

SY27

1.6a:

1.6b:

Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores:

Comments:

Data Sources: Annual report, End of year report, Test data spreadsheets

1.7 School Selected Assessment: What proportion of students meet their individual growth goal?	
1.7a Reading	
1.7b Mathematics	
Reading / Math SY2025: Using the Fastbridge Assessment, 55% of K-12 students grow such that their rate of improvement percentile rank is the same or greater than the national average by Spring 2025 SY2026: Using the Fastbridge Assessment, 60% of K-12 students grow such that their rate of improvement percentile rank is the same or greater than the national average by Spring 2026 SY2027: Using the Fastbridge Assessment, 65% of K-12 students grow such that their rate of improvement percentile rank is the same or greater than the national average by Spring 2027	
1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 40% of students have made expected gains
2 = Approaching standard	41- 49% of students have made expected gains
3 = Meets standard	50 – 54% of students have made expected gains
4 = Exceeds standard	SY25: More than 55% of students have made expected gains SY26: More than 60% of students have made expected gains SY27: More than 65% of students have made expected gains
SY25 1.7a: 1 1.7b: 1 Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1 Comments: In reading, 31% of students made expected gains and in math, 38% made expected gains.	
SY26 1.7a: 4 1.7b: 4 Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 4 Comments: There were dramatic increases in growth on the Fastbridge assessment in both reading and math. In reading, growth scores increased from 31% to 68% and in math, the scores increased from 38% to 62%.	
SY27 1.7a: 1.7b: Enter the overall score produced by the average of these two scores: Comments:	
Data Sources: Annual report, End of year report, Test data spreadsheets	

1.8 Is the school exceeding the state average for graduation rate?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The school's graduation rate is more than 10% lower than the State
2 = Approaching standard	The school's graduation rate is less than 10% lower than the State
3 = Meets standard	The school's graduation rate is at or 5% above than the State
4 = Exceeds standard	The school's graduation rate is more than 6% above the State
SY25 Rating: 3 Comments: Hiawatha's graduation rate was 87.4% which exceeds the state average of 84.2%.	
SY26 Rating: 2 Comments: Hiawatha's graduation percentage decreased from 87.4% to 80.7% and fell below the state percentage of 84.9%.	
SY27 Rating: Comments:	
Data Sources: Annual report, Minnesota Department of Education School Report Card	

1.9 Post-secondary Assessment: Does the school's performance on the ACT reflect college and career readiness?	
1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 25% of students scored at a college readiness score of 18 or higher on the ACT
2 = Approaching standard	26% – 50% scored at a college readiness score of 18 or higher on the ACT
3 = Meets standard	51 - 64% scored at a college readiness score of 18 or higher on the ACT
4 = Exceeds standard	More than 65% scored at a college readiness score of 18 or higher on the ACT of students demonstrated readiness
SY25 Rating: 1 Comments: 23.7% of students scored at a college readiness score of 18 or higher on the ACT. Hiawatha students achieved a median score of 15 which is up from 14 in 2023.	

SY26

Rating: 1

Comments: 22% of students scored at a college readiness score of 18 or higher on the ACT. The median score was 14.6 which is a slight decline from the previous year.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Annual report, Minnesota Department of Education School Report Card

1.10 School-specific goal: Teachers will be coached to increase student discourse, K-12 through student engagement strategies as observed in walkthroughs by leaders at least quarterly.

1 = Does not meet standard

In more than 65% of classroom observation walkthroughs students are engaging in academic discourse 0 times in 20 minutes.

2 = Approaching standard

In more than 65% of classroom observation walkthroughs students are engaging in academic discourse 1 time in 20 minutes.

3 = Meets standard

In more than 65% of classroom observation walkthroughs students are engaging in academic discourse 2 times in 20 minutes.

4 = Exceeds standard

In more than 65% of classroom observation walkthroughs students are engaging in academic discourse 3 or more times in 20 minutes.

SY25

Rating: N/A

Comments: Hiawatha has not started this practice yet and will be starting in the 2025-26 school year.

SY26

Rating: 2

Comments: Per 93 recorded classroom observations walkthroughs, students were engaging in academic discourse 1 time in 20 minutes in more than 65% of the walkthroughs.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, strategic plan or other documentation

1.11 Are students learning English (English Learners / EL students) performing at or above the state average for English Learners as measured by the ACCESS assessment. Note that for schools with greater than 70% of students qualifying for FRL, demographic categories will be filtered by FRL status.

1 = Does not meet standard	SY25: Less than 29% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming will achieve their ACCESS target goals by Spring 2025. SY26: Less than 37% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming will achieve their ACCESS target goals by Spring 2026. SY27: Less than 44% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming will achieve their ACCESS target goals by Spring 2027.
2 = Approaching standard	SY25: Between 30-34% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming will achieve their ACCESS target goals by Spring 2025. SY26: 38-42% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming will achieve their ACCESS target goals by Spring 2026. SY27: Between 45-49% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming will achieve their ACCESS target goals by Spring 2027.
3 = Meets standard	SY25: Between 35-38% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming will achieve their ACCESS target goals by Spring 2025.. SY26: 43-46% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming will achieve their ACCESS target goals by Spring 2026. SY27: 50-54% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming will achieve their ACCESS target goals by Spring 2027.

4 = Exceeds standard	SY25: Over 39% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming will achieve their ACCESS target goals by Spring 2025. SY26: Over 47% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming will achieve their ACCESS target goals by Spring 2026. SY27: Over 55% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming will achieve their ACCESS target goals by Spring 2025.
SY25 Rating: 1 Comments: 20.6% of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming met their ACCESS target goals.	
SY26 Rating: 3 Comments: There was significant improvement in the number of students who have completed six or fewer years of EL programming who met the ACCESS target goal with 43.5% of students achieving their target goals. This is more than double the percentage from the previous year. The percentage is slightly below the state percentage of 46.2%.	
SY27 Rating: Comments:	
Data Sources: Annual report, Minnesota Department of Education School Report Card	

1.12 Are students receiving special education services reaching individual growth goals as measured by the Fastbridge Assessment?	
1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 35% of students receiving special education services are reaching individual growth goals.
2 = Approaching standard	36-40% of students receiving special education services are reaching individual growth goals.
3 = Meets standard	41-45% of students receiving special education services are reaching individual growth goals.
4 = Exceeds standard	More than 46% of students receiving special education services are reaching individual growth goals.
SY25 Math: 1 Reading: 2 Overall Reading: 1.5 Comments: 37.6% of students receiving special education services reached their individual growth goals on the Fastbridge Assessment and 24.9% met growth goals in math.	

SY26

Math: 3

Reading: 4

Overall Rating: 3.5

Comments: There was good improvement in the number of students on IEPs reaching individual goals in both reading and math. In reading, there was an increase of 27.1% with 64.7% reaching individual goals. In math, 43.1% met individual goals for an increase of 18.2% from the previous school year.

SY27

Math:

Reading:

Overall Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Annual report, School-reported data

1.13 Early Learning: Are preschool and/or prekindergarten students performing at or above target levels on their final assessment, as measured using the school's selected preK and/or kindergarten readiness assessments?

Hiawatha Academies will administer the Fastbridge Assessment.

1 = Does not meet standard	Assessments indicate that less than 40% of tested students performed at or above target levels
2 = Approaching standard	Assessments indicate that less than 40% - 50% of tested students performed at or above target levels
3 = Meets standard	Assessments indicate that 50.1% - 65% of tested students performed at or above target levels
4 = Exceeds standard	Assessments indicate that more than 65% of tested students performed at or above target levels

Rating: NOT APPLICABLE

Comments:

Data Sources: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, strategic plan or other documentation

1.14 Does the school's learning program exemplify the mission and vision of the school?

1 = Does not meet standard	The learning program does not exemplify the mission and vision of the school in policy and practice, and school leadership and/or the Board do not recognize the need to synchronize the two.
----------------------------	---

2 = Approaching standard	The learning program does not exemplify the mission and vision of the school. School leadership and the Board recognize the need to synchronize the two.
3 = Meets standard	The learning program exemplifies the mission and vision of the school. Staff can articulate this through daily teaching.
4 = Exceeds standard	The learning program exemplifies the mission and vision of the school. Staff can articulate this through daily teaching. Board, academic and operational decisions are made with the school's mission in mind.

SY25

Rating: 3

Comments: Hiawatha Academies is returning to the mission and vision of the school and this has been a focus this school year. This was clearly articulated from staff, students, parents and leadership in various focus group interviews. A great deal of time was spent on the creation of a strategic plan and this plan was used to drive all discussions throughout the school year. Each member of the leadership team was clear as to which piece of the strategic plan was their focal point and meetings were directed toward the progress on the goals of the plan. It was clear during site visits that a more positive working environment has been created at the school and parents were very positive about the changes they have seen.

SY26

Rating: 3

Comments: Hiawatha Academies continues to focus on the mission and vision of the school. This was clearly observed during site visits in the focus groups with all of the stakeholders. Board documents, communication with school leaders and board members, and quarterly reports also reflect the school's commitment towards its mission and vision. When visiting the school, the commitment of students, teachers, staff, and leadership is observable and reinforced in discussions with students, teachers, and leadership. Classroom observations showed students engaged in the lessons and expressed feeling challenged by their classes and supported when they encountered challenges. The adherence to the strategic plan remains strong and is the driving force behind the initiatives at the school. Some examples of this were the thoughtful approach to PD, the updating of their curriculum, and the careful tracking and use of data to support students. The introduction of PBIS and the requisite trainings have been seen to be useful by staff. The appreciation of the continued clear and transparent communication from leadership and the network team is something that was highlighted in conversations at all campuses and this remains a goal for the administrative team. It has been refreshing to see all of the stakeholders at Hiawatha Academies continue to work at returning to a strong sense of identity and to be seen as taking pride in this identity.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, strategic plan or other documentation	
1.15 Are students accepted to and enrolling in post-secondary programs at a high rate? Note: Post-secondary programs can include training in the trades, accredited internships or apprenticeships, military, vocational programs and 2 and 4 year programs. 1.13a: Acceptance 1.13b: Enrollment	
1 = Does not meet standard	a. Less than 59% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program b. Less than 59% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program
2 = Approaching standard	a. Between 59.9% - 79.9% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program b. Between 59.9% - 79.9% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program
3 = Meets standard	a. Between 80%-94.9% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program. b. Between 80%-94.9% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program.
4 = Exceeds standard	a. Over 95% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program b. Over 95% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program
SY25 1.13a: 4 1.13b: 2 Overall rating: 3 Comments: 64% of students in the graduating class were enrolled in a post-secondary program within 16 months of graduating. 100% of student who applied were accepted into a post-secondary program.	
SY26 1.13a: 4 1.13b: 2 Overall rating: 3 Comments: 100% of students who applied were accepted into at least one post-secondary program. 70% of students were enrolled in a program within 16 months of graduating.	

SY27 1.13a 1.13b: Overall rating: Comments:	
Data Sources: School reported data, annual report	
1.16 Are students accessing rigorous coursework (AP, PSEO, Honors) at high rates?	
1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 30% of all students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year
2 = Approaching standard	30-45% of all students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year
3 = Meets standard	45-60% of all students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year
4 = Exceeds standard	Over 60% of all students accessed one or more rigorous courses in the past year.
SY25 Rating: 1 Comments: Per the MDE Report Card, 4% of students at Hiawatha are accessing rigorous coursework. However, Hiawatha has added 5 College in the Schools courses and have just started recording concurrent enrollment in FY26.	
SY26 Rating: 1 Comments: Approximately 11% of students are enrolling in AP courses and approximately 13% in Honors courses. 2% of students are enrolled in PSEO. The roll-out of the College in the Schools courses is continuing.	
SY27 Rating: Comments:	
Data Sources: MDE Data, School reported data, Interview data	

SECTION 2: FINANCIAL VIABILITY: DOES THE SCHOOL EXHIBIT STRONG FISCAL HEALTH?

2.1 Does the school have an active finance committee that meets regularly and reports to the full board?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The school has no active finance committee

2 = Approaching standard	The school's finance committee meets only as needed and only to review financials and/or the finance committee does not report its findings to the full board
3 = Meets standard	The finance committee meets monthly, examines financial statements and provides a thorough report of its findings to the full board
4 = Exceeds standard	The finance committee meets at least monthly and examines financial statements, as well as short and long-range financial issues. Thorough reports of findings are provided to the board.

SY25

Rating: 4

Comments: The finance committee meets at least monthly and presents to the board each month.

SY26

Rating: 4

Comments: The Finance and Facilities committee meets at least monthly and consists of at least 2 current board members including the treasurers, the school leader and a representative from Creative Planning. A report of the school's finances is included in each monthly meeting.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Monthly board packets, Site visits

2.2 Does the board have a fund balance policy that includes fund balance goals over time?

1 = Does not meet standard	The school board does not have a fund balance policy
2 = Approaching standard	The school board has a fund balance policy but it does not include established goals over time
3 = Meets standard	The school board has a fund balance policy including goals over time
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY25

Rating: 3

Comments: The school has a fund balance policy that stipulates maintaining 12 – 20% fund balance. The policy includes goals over time.

SY26

Rating: 3

Comments: Hiawatha Academies has a fund balance policy that stipulates maintaining a 12-20% fund balance. Goals over time are included in the policy.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Monthly board packets, Board policy manual

2.3 Does the school have a clean audit with no major findings?

1 = Does not meet standard	The audit is not “clean” OR has at least one of the following: 1) a material weakness on internal controls; 2) a finding on compliance with state law; 3) three or more other findings
2 = Approaching standard	The audit has two findings, other than internal controls or compliance, but is considered “clean”
3 = Meets standard	The audit is “clean” and has one finding, other than internal controls or compliance
4 = Exceeds standard	The audit has no findings and is “clean”

SY25

Rating: 2

Comments: The audit included 2 internal controls findings – late submission of audit and late payment of claims. There was also a finding for not meeting the minimum requirements for cash on hand.

SY26

Rating: 2

Comments: An internal control finding of late payment of claims was cited in the current audit as well as a finding for payment registers not being included in the board packet. There was also a finding for cash on hand as the school had 10 days cash on hand and the requirement is 30 days.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Annual financial audit

2.4 Does the school establish and maintain a balanced budget? • Budget is approved and provided to UST before June 30; • Includes a cash flow projection for the year showing positive cash flow; • Is adjusted in a timely fashion when needed; • Meets established fund balance policy goals; and • Does not require “major” program cuts* *Major program cuts are defined as cuts that impact a school’s ability to deliver its core programming to students in a way that negatively impacts student experience.	
1 = Does not meet standard	A budget is not approved by June 30; the budget is not adequately detailed; no cash flow projection is established; lower than expected enrollment requires major budget adjustments; or the budget does not meet the fund balance policy goals set forth by the board
2 = Approaching standard	A detailed budget is approved before June 30 but may not include a cash flow projection for the year; established budget may require adjustment due to lower than expected enrollment; budget meets the fund balance policy goals set forth by the board.
3 = Meets standard	The detailed budget is approved before June 30 and includes a cash flow projection for the year; established budget is based on realistic enrollment and is adjusted if needed. The budget meets the fund balance policy goals set forth by the board and allows for maintenance of core programming.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
SY25 Rating: 3 Comments: The budget is approved prior to June 30 and includes a cash flow projection and is based on a realistic enrollment projection.	
SY26 Rating: 2 Comments: The budget was approved prior to June 30, but due to a myriad of factors, the school did not meet the fund balance policy goals and numerous staffing cuts were made throughout the school year.	
SY27 Rating: Comments:	
Data Sources: Monthly board packets, UST site visits, UST meetings with business manager	

2.5 Budgeted Enrollment Realization: Does the school’s target ADM (as established by initial board-approved budget) match its actual ADM?	
1 = Does not meet standard	Enrollment realization is 90% or less

2 = Approaching standard	Enrollment realization is 90-95%
3 = Meets standard	Enrollment realization is greater than 95%
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
SY25	
Rating: 3	
Comments: The target ADM for the year was 1593 and the actual enrollment was 1591 for an enrollment realization of 99%.	
SY26	
Rating: 3	
Comments: The projected ADM for the year was 1571 and the actual enrollment was 1561 for an enrollment realization of 99%.	
SY27	
Rating:	
Comments:	
Data Sources: Monthly board packets, Site visits	

2.6 Does the school have sufficient cash on hand to meet its near-term obligations?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The school has fewer than 30 days cash on hand.
2 = Approaching standard	The school maintains 30 - 44 days cash on hand.
3 = Meets standard	The school maintains a minimum of 45 days cash on hand or is meeting the cash on hand requirements of its bond covenants, whichever is greater
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
SY25	
Rating: 3	
Comments: The school has maintained 54 days cash on hand which meets the bond covenants.	
SY26	
Rating: 1	
Comments: Per the financial audit, the school maintained an average of 10 days cash on hand which fell short of the bond covenants requiring a minimum of 30 days cash on hand.	
SY27	
Rating:	
Comments:	
Data Sources: Annual report, auditor report, financial statements, board policies	

2.7 For established schools (in operation for at least 4 years) does the school have a sufficient fund balance?
--

1 = Does not meet standard	The school's fund balance is less than 10% of annual expenditures
2 = Approaching standard	The school's fund balance is between 10-15% of annual expenditures
3 = Meets standard	The school's fund balance is more than 15% of annual expenditures
4 = Exceeds standard	The school's fund balance is more than 20% of annual expenditures AND overall academic outcomes fall within the "meets standard" range
SY25 Rating: 3 Comments: The school has a 15% fund balance.	
SY26 Rating: 2 Comments: Per the financial audit, the fund balance for the school decreased to 11.5%.	
SY27 Rating: Comments:	
Data Sources: Annual report, auditor report, financial statements, board policies	

2.8 Is the school meeting bond covenants (if applicable)?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The school is not meeting one or more bond covenants
2 = Approaching standard	The school is meeting all bond covenants in the current year, but has been out of compliance with one or more covenants in the past three years
3 = Meets standard	The school has consistently met all bond covenants
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
SY25 Rating: 1 Comments: The school is not meeting the bond covenant of cash on hand.	
SY26 Rating: 1 Comments: Per the financial audit, the school received a bond covenant violation as the cash on hand of 10 days fell short of the minimum requirements set in bond covenants of 30 days.	
SY27 Rating: Comments:	

Data Sources: Annual report, auditor report, financial statements, board policies

SECTION 3: IS THE ORGANIZATION EFFECTIVE AND WELL RUN?

3.1 Do all board members meet the statutory requirements for initial and ongoing training on board roles and responsibilities, governance, finance and employment practices?

1 = Does not meet standard	Three or more board members are/have been out of compliance during the school year
2 = Approaching standard	Two or fewer board members are/have been out of compliance during the school year
3 = Meets standard	All board members meet training requirements
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY25

Rating: 3

Comments: Board members have undergone annual training and are in compliance.

SY26

Rating: 3

Comments: Per the Annual Report, all board members have undergone the requisite trainings and are in compliance with updated statutes. The board has also undergone additional trainings based on the strategic plan and other needs that are determined throughout the course of the school year.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Monthly board packets, Site visits, statement of compliance sheet

3.2 Does the board understand and comply with the Open Meeting Law and maintain orderly records including its bylaws, policies, board/committee minutes and board packets?

1 = Does not meet standard	The board does not understand the requirements of the Open Meeting Law and has been out of compliance more than once in the last year and/or the board does not maintain its records in an orderly fashion
2 = Approaching standard	The board exhibits working knowledge of the requirements of the Open Meeting Law and has been out of compliance no more than once in the last year and maintains its records properly, with minor exceptions
3 = Meets standard	The board understands and meets the requirements of the Open Meeting Law and maintains its records in an orderly fashion
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY25

Rating: 3

Comments: The school board understands and abides by Open Meeting law. BoardEffect is used to maintain all records.

SY26

Rating: 3

Comments: The Board continues to use BoardEffect to maintain all records. All board members have a good understanding of Open Meeting Law and abide by the laws in statute.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Board minutes, ongoing correspondence, UST site visits

3.3 Are all the school's educational staff appropriately licensed?

1 = Does not meet standard	At least one educational staff is not appropriately licensed or does not hold appropriate and current waivers or variances
2 = Approaching standard	At least one educational staff has been on a waiver or variance for more than one year
3 = Meets standard	All educational staff are appropriately licensed
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY25

Rating: 3

Comments: All staff are appropriately licensed.

SY26

Rating: 3

Comments: Per the STAR Report and the annual report cross-checked with PELSB, all staff are appropriately licensed.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: MDE STAR Discrepancy Reports (self-reported data, crosscheck with licensure file checks)

3.4 Does the school complete criminal background checks in accordance with MN Statute and UST expectations?

1 = Does not meet standard	The school cannot certify that it completes criminal background checks of staff and the board
2 = Approaching standard	The school certifies that it completes criminal background checks of the staff but not the board
3 = Meets standard	The school certifies that it completes criminal background checks of staff and the board, as required by school policy
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
SY25 Rating: 3 Comments: The school completes background checks for staff, board members and volunteers who have contact with students.	
SY26 Rating: 3 Comments: The school completes all background checks per their policy. All new staff, board members and volunteers are included in the background checks.	
SY27 Rating: Comments:	
Data Sources: UST site visits, board chair interview, background check policy	

3.5 Is the school compliant with other applicable law? Note that this measure includes, but is not limited to: • Meeting admissions and enrollment practice/policy requirements • Meeting governance model requirements	
1 = Does not meet standard	The school is not in compliance with other applicable law
2 = Approaching standard	NOT APPLICABLE
3 = Meets standard	The school is in compliance with other applicable law
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
SY25 Rating: 3 Comments: The school is compliant with all applicable laws.	
SY26 Rating: 3 Comments: The school is compliant with all applicable laws including governance model requirements, admissions and enrollment policy requirements and Title IX requirements.	

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: UST site visit, board chair interview, annual report, school website

3.6 Do all board members exhibit understanding of the role of the board and utilize nonprofit governance best practices including:

- understanding of board and school leader roles (governance vs. management)
- annual board self-evaluation
- annual school-leader evaluation
- annual approval of professional development plan for school leader (if applicable)
- annual evaluation of Educational Service Provider if applicable
- orientation process for new members
- regular strategic planning (at least once every five years)

1 = Does not meet standard

At least some board members do not understand the role of the board and the role of the school leader. Board policies and practices are not transparent or not present. Board meetings often address issues not central to the role of the board and/or fail to address core functions such as leader evaluation and school financial/academic health.

2 = Approaching standard

Some board members, but not all, exhibit understanding of their roles as board members and the role of the school leader. Board policies and practices are not always transparent and/or are not fully developed. The board inconsistently addresses issues central to its role such as leader evaluation, leader professional development plan approval (if applicable), and school financial/academic health.

3 = Meets standard	The Board exhibits understanding of its role and the role of the school leader. The board policies and practices are generally transparent and systems are in place to maximize effectiveness of the board, including an orientation process for new members, annual board self-evaluation, annual leader (and EMO/CMO if applicable) evaluation, annual approval of leader development plan (if applicable) and a plan for conducting and tracking initial and ongoing training. The board engages in regular strategic planning. The board is able to adequately sustain its membership through recruitment efforts.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY25

Rating: 3

Comments: The school board and the school leader have a good relationship and both know their roles as they apply to the management of the school. The strategic plan is very specific and is a document that all are familiar with and drives the running of the school. Board members undergo necessary training and strategic planning as necessary.

SY26

Rating: 3

Comments: The board demonstrates a strong understanding of its governance responsibilities and consistently utilizes nonprofit governance best practices. Board members clearly distinguish between governance and management functions, maintaining appropriate oversight while delegating day-to-day operations to the school leader. The board conducts an annual self-evaluation and completes an annual evaluation of the school leader. In addition, the board annually reviews and approves the school leader's professional development plan. The board maintains a formal orientation process for new members to ensure they understand their roles and responsibilities and engages in regular strategic planning, with comprehensive strategic planning occurring at least once every five years. Evaluation of an Educational Service Provider is not applicable, as the school does not utilize an Educational Service Provider. Based on the evidence reviewed, the board is compliant with all applicable governance expectations in this area.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, board minutes, interview with board chair

3.7 Does the board regularly review, update and approve its bylaws and policies such that they maintain compliance with state law and current best practices?

1 = Does not meet standard	Board policies and/or bylaws are outdated and not reviewed regularly.
2 = Approaching standard	Board policies and/or bylaws are reviewed and approved as needed, but are not comprehensively reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis.

3 = Meets standard	Board policies and bylaws are reviewed for content and legal compliance, updated, and approved on a regularly scheduled basis, no less than once every three years.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
SY25 Rating: 3 Comments: Bylaws and policies are updated and are maintained to be in compliance.	
SY26 Rating: 3 Comments: Policies are updated on a rotating basis or as needed. The bylaws have been recently updated and are legally and statutorily compliant.	
SY27 Rating: Comments:	
Data Sources: Board minutes, board policies, governance binder, Site visits	

3.8 Does the board submit a complete board packet (including agenda, minutes, director report, other relevant documents, check register, cash flow sheet, enrollment report, balance sheet and income and expense report), to be received by all members of the board, school leadership, and UST at least three days prior to all board meetings?	
1 = Does not meet standard	Board packets are not submitted on time AND are incomplete
2 = Approaching standard	Board packets are submitted on time (more than 75
	percent of the time) but incomplete OR not submitted on time (less than 75 percent of the time) but complete
3 = Meets standard	Board packets are submitted on time (more than 75 percent of the time) and complete
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
SY25 Rating: 3 Comments: The board submits complete packets on time consistently.	
SY26 Rating: 2 Comments: The board submits packets on time. However, per the financial audit, payment registers are not always included with the board packet, making the packets incomplete.	
SY27 Rating: Comments:	

Data Sources: Monthly board packets, Site visits, board materials tracking document

3.9 Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to English Learners (ELs)? This includes maintaining an established EL program with a written plan for service at all grade and proficiency levels, securing appropriate staffing, supplying relevant professional development to all staff, ensuring that information on student EL status is available to all classroom teachers, and following MN Standardized Statewide EL Procedures for identification, entrance, and exit. The school ensures that staff have appropriate training, hold appropriate licenses, and are familiar with current legislation and research related to best practices for serving EL students.

1 = Does not meet standard	The school is <u>not</u> fulfilling its legal obligations regarding ELs and requires substantial improvement
2 = Approaching standard	The school is fulfilling all of its legal obligations regarding ELs but requires some improvements
3 = Meets standard	The school is fulfilling its legal obligations regarding ELs and requires no considerable improvements
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY25

Rating: 3

Comments: 67% of students enrolled at Hiawatha Academies qualify for EL services with 27% being new to country. The breakdown per school: HLA-N: 87%; HCP-N: 68%; HCHS – 56%. Programming for students who qualify is based on the results of the WIDA screener, guidance from the ELD teachers and any other relevant information. The number of teachers in the program include: HLA-N: 5; HCP-N: 5 plus one paraprofessional; HCHS: 6. The ELD program emphasizes learning language through content instruction as well as co-teaching and sheltered courses.

SY26

Rating: 3

Comments: Hiawatha Academies operates a comprehensive K–12 English Language Development (ELD) program designed to meet the needs of a highly multilingual student population. Approximately 65% of Hiawatha scholars qualify for ELD services, with 87.3% of students identifying as multilingual. The program utilizes Minnesota-compliant identification procedures, including the Minnesota Language Survey and WIDA Screener assessments, to determine eligibility and appropriate service levels. Hiawatha employs a substantial team of licensed ELD teachers and bilingual support staff across its campuses and provides services through sheltered, co-taught, push-in, and pull-out instructional models. Students receive differentiated support based on WIDA proficiency levels, with intensive language instruction for newcomers and students in the early stages of English acquisition. The network recently strengthened its programming through the adoption of Language Launch curriculum and Speakable, tools designed to accelerate development in reading, writing, speaking, and listening. The program also includes specialized supports for newcomers and Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE), emphasizing asset-based practices, cultural responsiveness, and academic inclusion. The ELD program is further supported by ongoing staff professional development, high expectations for multilingual learners, and instructional practices that recognize students' languages and cultures as assets in the learning process. The following chart indicates the percentage of ELD students per campus:

	Percentage of ELD students	Percentage New to Country
--	----------------------------	---------------------------

Northrup Leadership Academy	80%	86%
Northrup College Prep	65%	49%
Collegiate High School	58%	58%
Overall	65%	64%

--

SY27

Rating:
Comments:
Data Sources: MDE website, annual report

3.10 Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to students with individual education plans (IEPs)? (i.e. The school has a TSES manual that is school-specific and board-approved; has a special education director actively involved in working with special education staff and school leadership; effectively contracts with entities to provide services to students when necessary; completes annual IEP meetings on time; has been subject to no investigations related to special needs students; and has received a clean audit by MDE in the last audited school year. The school ensures that staff have appropriate training and are familiar with current legislation and research related to best practices for serving students with IEPs.)	
1 = Does not meet standard	The school is not fulfilling its legal obligations regarding students with special needs and requires substantial improvement
2 = Approaching standard	The school is fulfilling all of its legal obligations regarding students with special needs but requires some improvements
3 = Meets standard	The school is fulfilling its legal obligations regarding students with special needs and requires no considerable improvements
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY25**Rating: 3**

Comments: 14.5% of students enrolled at Hiawatha Academies qualify for special education services. The breakdown per school: HLA-N: 13%; HCP-N: 17%; HCHS: 14%. The school employs a full time special education director, 5 evaluation and operation facilitators, 2.5 due process facilitators, 1.2 due process paraeducators, 2.4 dean of special education, 19.5 special education teachers and 23.5 paraeducators. Also part of the special education department are 3 behavioral support coaches, 3 full-time social workers, 1.45 special education interpreters and .5 school nurse dedicated to special education. There has been difficulty in filling all of the positions, especially teachers and paraprofessionals. Contracted services include speech/language, occupational therapy, deaf/hard of hearing, audiology and DAPE.

SY26**Rating: 3**

Comments: Hiawatha Academies provides a comprehensive special education program designed to meet the unique needs of scholars with disabilities through a continuum of services delivered in the least restrictive environment. 255 scholars, representing 15.3% of the student population, were identified for special education services. The network utilizes a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and data-driven referral process to identify students who may require special education evaluations while also providing tiered academic, behavioral, and social-emotional interventions for struggling learners. Services are delivered through a variety of models, including push-in, pull-out, co-teaching, small-group instruction, consultation, and individualized support. The program is supported by a dedicated team of special education teachers, paraprofessionals, social workers, evaluators, and specialized service providers, as well as contracted experts for low-incidence disabilities. Hiawatha emphasizes inclusion, family engagement, and collaboration across campuses to ensure consistency in programming, staffing, training, and compliance. The network also provides mental health supports, 504 accommodations, and related services such as occupational therapy, speech-language services, and specialized disability supports. Student outcomes are closely monitored through individualized progress reporting, and the network reports that 96% of special education scholars made adequate or better progress on their IEP goals during the first quarter of the 2025–26 school year.

SY27**Rating:****Comments:**

Data Sources: Monthly board packets, Site visits

3.11 Does the school have a high attendance rate ?

1 = Does not meet standard	The attendance rate is less than 85 percent
2 = Approaching standard	The attendance rate is between 85 and 89.9 percent
3 = Meets standard	The attendance rate is 90-94.9 percent
4 = Exceeds standard	The attendance rate is more than 95 percent

SY25

Rating: 3

Comments: The attendance rate was 91.3% which is an increase from the previous year rate of 90.1%.

SY26

Rating: 3

Comments: The overall attendance rate was 89.7% which is a slight decrease from the previous year. The following is a breakdown of attendance per campus:

Campus	Attendance rate
Northrup Leadership Academy	92.9%
Northrup College Prep	93.2%
Collegiate High School	85.9%

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Annual reports, MDE website (data downloads)

3.12 Is the school able to maintain a high percentage of teacher retention?	
1 = Does not meet standard	Fewer than 70 percent of teachers remained at the school last year (excluding retirements)
2 = Approaching standard	Between 70 and 84 percent of teachers remained at the school last year (excluding retirements).
3 = Meets standard	More than 85 percent of teachers remained at the school last year (excluding retirements).
4 = Exceeds standard	Over the course of the contract (or at least 3 years) teacher retention has consistently remained high (>85 percent)
SY25 Rating: 2 Comments: The teacher retention rate was 72%.	
SY26 Rating: 2 Comments: The teacher retention rate was 76%.	
SY27 Rating: Comments:	
Data Sources: Annual report	

3.13 Does the school generally retain its students from October 1st through the close of the school year?	
1 = Does not meet standard	Student retention rates are more than 10% below the school's agreed-upon target rates.
2 = Approaching standard	Student retention rates are 5-10% below the school's agreed-upon target rates.
3 = Meets standard	Student retention rates are within 5% or above the school's agreed-upon target rates
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
SY25 Rating: 3 Comments: 1646 students were enrolled on or before October 1 and 1347 remained for the full year for a retention rate of 81%.	
SY26 Rating: 3 Comments: 1590 students were enrolled on or before October 1 and 1460 students remained for the full year. The retention rate is 91%.	

SY27
Rating:
Comments:
Data Sources: Annual report, renewal application

3.14 Does the school exhibit a high level of parent satisfaction?	
1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 75% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school OR the school failed to achieve a response rate greater than 35%.
2 = Approaching standard	More than 75% but less than 85% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school and the school achieved a response rate greater than 35%.
3 = Meets standard	More than 85% but less than 95% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school and the school achieved a response rate greater than 35%.
4 = Exceeds standard	At least 95% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school and the school achieved a response rate greater than 35%.

SY25
Rating: 3
Comments: 92% of respondents to the family survey indicated that they would recommend Hiawatha Academies to a family of friend.

SY26
Rating: 3
Comments: More than 85% of parents surveyed indicated they are satisfied with the school and with the academic programming and the culture. The response rate for the survey was 8%.

SY27
Rating:
Comments:
Data Sources: Annual report, School parent satisfaction survey--overall satisfaction indicator

3.15 Is the school's physical facility safe and conducive to learning?

1 = Does not meet standard	The facility requires much improvement in order to provide a safe environment that is conducive to learning. Significant health and safety requirements have not been met OR the school lacks many conditions such as the following: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students.
2 = Approaching standard	Significant health and safety requirements are being met, but the facility needs some improvement in order to provide a safe environment that is conducive to learning. It partially – but not fully – provides conditions such as the following: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students.
3 = Meets standard	Significant health and safety code requirements are being met AND the facility generally provides a safe environment that is conducive to learning, based on conditions such as: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students.
4 = Exceeds standard	All health and safety code requirements are being met AND the facility generally provides a safe environment that is conducive to learning, based on conditions such as: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students. Additionally, the facility meets the mission of the school.

SY25

Rating: 3

Comments: The school provides a safe learning environment and this year has made a priority of making the buildings more representative of the students which has included student-created murals and other art work throughout the buildings.

SY26

Rating: 3

Comments: The school facility provides a safe, secure, and effective learning environment that meets significant health and safety code requirements. The facility is well-designed to support the curricular, social, and developmental needs of students while also accommodating faculty, staff, and community activities. Classroom and common spaces are appropriately sized for the school's enrollment and student-teacher ratios, allowing for effective instruction and student engagement. The building and grounds are adequately maintained, and appropriate security measures are in place to promote student and staff safety. Equipment, furnishings, and instructional resources are well maintained and aligned with the educational program and needs of students. Additionally, the facility is accessible to all students and supports equitable participation in school programs and activities. Based on the evidence reviewed, the school is compliant with expectations related to facility safety, suitability, maintenance, and accessibility.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Authorizer observation

3.16 Does the school have appropriate structures in place to effectively identify and support students needing academic accommodations (either acceleration or remediation), mental health supports or other supports in a timely fashion?

1 = Does not meet standard

The school does not have adequate systems to identify students needing support. When students are identified the systems in place move slowly, taking weeks or months to execute the eventual support. Communication within systems is poor and internal/external stakeholders (teachers, school staff, parents, students) do not always receive timely or adequate communication.

2 = Approaching standard

The school has systems to identify students needing support, but they may not always work as designed. When students are identified the systems in place move at a moderate pace, taking several weeks to a month to execute the eventual support. Communication within systems is patchy and internal/external stakeholders (teachers, school staff, parents, students) receive communication, but it may not always be timely or adequate.

3 = Meets standard	The school has systems to identify students needing support, which work reliably and are used regularly by individuals throughout the system (teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators, counselors, parents, etc.). When students are identified the systems in place move efficiently, taking days or weeks to execute the needed support. Communication within systems is reliable and internal/external stakeholders (teachers, school staff, parents, students) receive all necessary communication in a clear and timely fashion.
4 = Exceeds standard	The school has systems with built in redundancies
	(multiple opportunities for reporting) to identify students needing support. The systems work reliably and are used regularly by individuals throughout the system (teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators, counselors, parents, etc.). When students are identified the systems in place move efficiently, taking hours or days to execute the needed support unless mandated timelines are longer. Communication within systems is reliable and internal/external stakeholders (teachers, school staff, parents, students) receive all necessary communication in a clear and timely fashion.

SY25

Rating: 3

Comments: The implementation and building of a strong MTSS program has been a priority of the network this year. There is a strong focus on the development of a vigorous Tier 2 and Tier 3 system. Data-based interventions are employed and the school is also working on strengthening social-emotional support for students. Professional development is intentional to ensure that

teachers have what they need to implement effective interventions.

SY26

Rating: 3

Comments: The school has established comprehensive structures and processes to effectively identify and support students requiring academic interventions, accommodations, mental health services, and other specialized supports. Through the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), regular screening and progress monitoring, data-informed Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), and campus-based intervention teams, the school identifies students in need of additional support. Teachers, administrators, special education staff, counselors, social workers, and families all play active roles in the identification and referral process, ensuring that concerns are recognized and addressed promptly. Once students are identified, interventions and services are implemented through clearly defined procedures that include tiered academic supports, English Learner services, special education evaluations, 504 accommodations, behavioral interventions, and mental health services. Communication among staff, families, and other stakeholders is consistent and timely, supported by established protocols, regular team meetings, and progress monitoring systems. Support is adjusted based on ongoing data review. The

school's commitment to proactive identification, coordinated service delivery, and continuous monitoring demonstrates that appropriate structures are in place to ensure students receive needed supports in a timely and effective manner.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews

3.17 Is the school committed to anti-racism and equity by engaging in/ providing the following:

- **Representative/ Culturally relevant curriculum**
- **Specific staff/ board trainings**
- **Board and staff composition**
- **Opportunities for members of the school community to provide feedback on the school's diversity, equity, and inclusion practices and policies**

1 = Does not meet standard

Staff do not engage in cultural competency training. The board/ staff are not representative of the students the school serves and there is no plan to engage the school's broader community.

2 = Approaching standard

Staff/ Board members inconsistently engage in cultural competency training. The school is committed to recruiting staff/ board members who are representative of their school's community as evident by recruitment practices.

3 = Meets standard

Students/ families of all backgrounds report that the school feels welcoming and accepting. Staff/ Board members regularly engage in cultural competency training, and equity is included in the school's strategic plan. The school routinely engages the school's broader community, as evidenced by staff/ board composition. And the school utilizes a curriculum that is not only representative of the student's it serves; it also represents a multitude of backgrounds and perspectives.

4 = Exceeds standard

NOT APPLICABLE

SY25

Rating: 3

Comments: The school has added apps and programs to help all families engage with the school and staff. Family liaisons help teachers and families connect. Cultural competency is included in the strategic plan and helping all students understand academic language is a school goal.

SY26

Rating: 3

Comments: The school demonstrates a strong commitment to anti-racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion through its policies, practices, and culture. Students and families from diverse

backgrounds report that the school is welcoming, inclusive, and respectful of all members of the community. The school utilizes a representative and culturally relevant curriculum that reflects the identities, experiences, and perspectives of its students while also exposing them to a broad range of cultures, histories, and viewpoints. Staff and board members participate in regular professional development and cultural competency training to strengthen their understanding of equity, inclusion, and culturally responsive practices. The school's commitment to equity is further reflected in its strategic plan, which includes goals and initiatives focused on creating equitable opportunities and outcomes for all students. The school actively seeks to engage its broader community and values diverse representation among its staff and board membership. Additionally, the school provides meaningful opportunities for students, families, staff, and other stakeholders to offer feedback regarding the school's diversity, equity, and inclusion practices and policies, using that feedback to inform continuous improvement efforts. Based on the evidence reviewed, the school is compliant with expectations related to anti-racism, equity, and inclusive educational practices.

SY27

Rating:

Comments:

Data Sources: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews

3.18 Is the school committed to creating a welcoming and inclusive environment that is open to all students? This is evidenced by the following:

- **Marketing/outreach targets socioeconomically and racially diverse populations**
- **Materials available in multiple languages**
- **Enacting policies that reduce enrollment barriers available in multiple languages**
- **Robust EL/ SPED Programming**

1 = Does not meet standard	The school's marketing strategy marginalizes or ignores students from diverse backgrounds and/or those who are low income. Materials are only available in English. The school has an undeveloped EL or SPED program. Additionally, school policies and practices are not transparent and/or result in accessibility barriers for low income students and students of color.
2 = Approaching standard	The school's marketing strategy includes a plan to recruit students from diverse backgrounds and/or those who are low income. However, materials are only available in English. The school has an underdeveloped EL or SPED program. School policies and practices are generally transparent and do not create accessibility barriers for low income students or students of color.
3 = Meets standard	The school's marketing strategy includes an actionable plan to recruit students from diverse backgrounds and/or those who are low income. The plan is actively utilized.

	Materials are available in multiple languages and the school has robust EL and SPED programs. Additionally, school policies and practices are clear, transparent, and do not have negative impacts on low income students or students of color.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
SY25 Rating: 3 Comments: Hiawatha has been focusing on marketing especially to low income students and have materials in various languages. The school also employs family liaisons to help them navigate the application process.	
SY26 Rating: 3 Comments: The school demonstrates a strong commitment to creating a welcoming, inclusive, and accessible environment for all students. The school's marketing and outreach strategy includes a deliberate and actionable plan to recruit and enroll students from diverse racial, ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds, including students from low-income households. Evidence indicates that this plan is actively implemented and monitored to ensure broad community engagement. Enrollment, outreach, and communication materials are available in multiple languages, helping to ensure that families can access information and participate fully in the school community. The school has established robust English Learner (EL) and Special Education (SPED) programs that provide appropriate supports and services to meet the needs of diverse learners. Furthermore, school policies and practices are transparent, equitable, and designed to minimize barriers to enrollment and participation. There is no evidence that school policies disproportionately impact low-income students or students of color. Based on the evidence reviewed, the school is compliant with expectations related to equitable access, inclusivity, and support for diverse student populations.	
SY27 Rating: Comments:	
Data Sources: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews	