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# Introduction

Idaho’s charter school legislation requires each public charter school authorizer to develop a Performance Framework on which the provisions of the Performance Certificate will be based. Performance Frameworks must clearly set forth the academic and operational performance indicators, measures, and metrics that will guide the authorizer’s evaluations of each public charter school, and must contain the following:

* Indicators, measures, and metrics for student academic proficiency;
* Indicators, measures, and metrics for student academic growth;
* Indicators, measures, and metrics for college and career readiness (for high schools); and
* Indicators, measures, and metrics for board performance and stewardship, including compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and terms of the performance certificate.

The measurable performance targets contained within the framework must require, at a minimum, that each school meet applicable federal, state, and authorizer goals for student achievement. This Performance Framework was adopted by the Public Charter School Commission (PCSC) on [date] and is intended for use with non‐ alternative public charter schools authorized by the PCSC.

# Performance Framework Structure

The Performance Framework is divided into four sections: Academic, Mission‐Specific, Operational, and Financial. The Academic and Mission‐Specific sections comprise the primary indicators on which most renewal or non‐renewal decisions will be based. The Operational and Financial sections contribute additional indicators that will, except in cases of egregious failure to meet standards, be considered secondary.

## Academic:

A high percentage (60%) of a school’s total score for the Academic & Mission Specific Accountability Designation reflects the school’s performance on a set of academic measures. These measures are the same for all non‐alternative schools. The “Meets Standard” rating for each measure is designed to align closely with state minimum standards as established in Idaho’s ESEA waiver and Star Rating System.

## Mission‐Specific:

A significant portion (40%) of a school’s total score for the Academic & Mission Specific Accountability Designation reflects the school’s performance on a set of mission‐specific measures. These measures may be academic or non‐academic in nature, but must be objective and data‐driven. The number and weighting of mission‐specific measures should be established during one‐on‐one negotiations between the school and authorizer.

*During their first Performance Certificate term only, schools authorized to open in or before Fall 2014 may choose to opt‐out of the Mission‐Specific section of the framework. Schools choosing to opt out of Mission‐Specific measures for their first term agree that the weight of those measures will be placed instead on the Academic section, which then becomes the single, primary factor considered for purposes of renewal or non‐renewal.*

## Operational:

Operational indicators comprise a secondary element for consideration during the renewal process. While each school will receive a score in the operational section, this score should not be used as the primary rationale for non‐renewal unless the non‐compliance with organizational expectations is severe or systemic. Particularly for a school whose academic performance meets or exceeds standards, poor results in this area are more likely to lead to a conditional renewal decision than to non‐renewal.

## Financial:

Financial indicators comprise a secondary element for consideration during the renewal process. While each school will receive a score in the financial section, this score should not be used as the primary rationale for non‐renewal unless the school’s financial state at the time of renewal is dire. Particularly for a school whose academic performance meets or exceeds standards, poor results in this area are more likely to lead to a conditional renewal decision than to non‐renewal. The PCSC may also elect to renew a financially troubled school that is clearly providing a high quality education, but notify the SDE of the situation so that the payment schedule may be modified in order to safeguard taxpayer dollars.

# Accountability Designations

Calculation of the percentage of eligible points earned for each school will guide the determination of that school’s accountability designation: Honor, Good Standing, Remediation, or Critical. The accountability designation will, in turn, guide the PCSC’s renewal or non‐renewal decision‐making. Measures for which a school lacks data due to factors such as grade configuration or small size will not contribute to that school’s accountability designation. The PCSC will consider contextual factors affecting a school’s accountability designation when making renewal or non‐renewal decisions.

## Honor:

Schools achieving at this level in all categories (academic, mission‐specific, operational, and financial) are eligible for special recognition and will be recommended for renewal. Replication and expansion proposals are likely to succeed. The Framework places schools that earn 75‐100% of the combined academic and mission‐specific points possible in this accountability designation. It is possible for 5‐star schools, high‐range 4‐star schools with solid mission‐ specific outcomes, and mid‐range 4‐star schools with strong mission‐specific outcomes to receive an honor designation. Schools that fall into this point‐ percentage category but have poor operational and/or financial outcomes will not be eligible for an honor designation.

## Good Standing:

Schools achieving at this level will be recommended for renewal; however, conditional renewal may be recommended if operational and/or financial outcomes are poor. Replication and expansion proposals will be considered. To be placed in this category, schools much receive the appropriate percentage of the combined academic and mission‐specific points possible and have at least a 3‐star rating. The Framework places schools that earn 55‐74% of the combined academic and mission‐specific points possible in this accountability designation. It is possible for 3‐star or 4‐star schools with solid mission‐specific outcomes, or 5‐star schools with poor mission‐specific, financial, and/or operational outcomes to receive a good standing designation. Although 2‐star schools with strong mission‐specific outcomes could fall into this point‐percentage range, they would not be eligible to receive a good standing designation due to their star ratings; the Framework is drafted thus in recognition of Idaho’s statutory provision that the performance framework shall, at a minimum, require that each school meet applicable federal and state goals for student achievement.

## Remediation:

Schools achieving at this level may be recommended for non‐renewal or conditional renewal, particularly if operational and/or financial outcomes are poor. Replication and expansion proposals are unlikely to succeed. The Framework places schools that earn 31‐54% of the combined academic and mission‐specific points possible in this accountability designation. It is possible for 3‐star schools with poor mission‐specific outcomes, 2‐star schools, or 1‐star schools with strong mission‐specific outcomes to receive a remediation designation.

## Critical:

Schools achieving at this level face a strong likelihood of non‐renewal, particularly if operational and/or financial outcomes are also poor. Replication and expansion proposals should not be considered. The Framework places schools that earn less than 30% of the combined academic and mission‐specific points possible in this accountability designation. It is possible for 1‐star schools or 2‐star schools with poor mission‐specific outcomes to receive a Critical designation.