

Accountability System
For
Charter Schools
Authorized by
The Illinois State Charter
School Commission



Illinois State Charter School Commission

*Amended December 2019
Effective 2020-2021*

Illinois State Charter School Commission

Dr. Catherine Burns

Melissa Connelly

William Farmer

David Feinberg

Carlos Perez

Troy Ratliff

Lisa Schuchart

DeRonda Williams, Chair

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
COMPLIANCE REPORTING AND MONITORING	2
Data Submission.....	2
Reports.....	2
Site Visits.....	2
ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN	3
Alignment with State Board Academic Accountability.....	4
Accountability Actions.....	4
RENEWAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM	5
Renewal Evaluation Team.....	5
Renewal Site Visit.....	5
Renewal Public Hearing, Community Forum and/or Focus Groups.....	6
Renewal Comprehensive Evaluation Team Interview.....	6
Additional Requests for Information.....	6
Draft Recommendation Regarding Renewal.....	6
Commission Decision on Renewal.....	6
After the Renewal Decision.....	6
FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK	12
ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK	16
ACCOUNTABILITY ACTIONS	24
CONCLUSION AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	26

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Illinois State Charter School Commission is to serve as an independent body with “statewide chartering jurisdiction and authority.” (Illinois Charter Schools Law, 105 ILCS 5/27A7.5) To fulfill its responsibilities as a charter school authorizer, the Commission has established a clear and objective Accountability System, which formalizes how the Commission will support the autonomy of the charter schools it oversees, while ensuring accountability and transparency by evaluating and publicly reporting school performance.

The Commission first adopted its Accountability System for Commission-Authorized Schools in June 2013, amended in November 2017 and again in December 2019. The Commission’s Accountability System is incorporated in the Charter School Agreement and is guided by both the Illinois Charter Schools Law and by national best practices in charter school authorizing as codified by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers. The Accountability System considers all relevant state and federal law, and Commission schools have helped to inform amendments to the System.

The Commission recognizes the importance of obtaining a comprehensive view of each school’s performance outcomes; therefore, the Accountability System provides a multi-layered approach to understanding overall school performance including multiple touchpoints to support and encourage continued improvement. The Commission’s Accountability System consists of the performance measures and standards set forth in the **Accountability Plan** for all charter schools, the Commission’s **Compliance Reporting and Monitoring Practices, Accountability Actions** taken to support best practices or improve performance, **Annual Performance Reviews**, the **Renewal Process** and the Commission’s **School Closure Policy**.

- A. The **Accountability Plan** is composed of three **Performance Frameworks** – *Academic, Financial, and Organizational* – which include a set of standard goals and outcome measures that enable the Commission to assess the performance of each school in its portfolio in a uniform, objective manner.
- B. Annually, the Commission assesses school performance on the basis of a comprehensive set of data, including each school’s academic assessment data, public record review, data submissions, reports, and school site visits, as applicable. This assessment is compiled into an **Annual Performance Review Report** which delineates the school’s performance across the three key dimensions of charter school performance set forth in the **Accountability Plan**: academic success, financial health, and organizational compliance.
- C. A school consistently meeting or exceeding the standards established in the **Accountability Plan** will be recognized as a school in Good Standing and will be invited to share best practices with other schools in the Commission’s portfolio. Schools demonstrating performance below or far below the standards will receive intensive support or may be subject to probation, revocation, or non-renewal.
- D. The **Renewal Process** is differentiated based on a school’s performance over the term of the charter. In addition to reviewing the school’s 4-year performance record, the Commission, its staff, and independent expert evaluators with expertise in all areas of charter school operations and in school evaluation will gather and analyze additional data from each school’s renewal application, interviews, hearings, public forums and/or focus groups, and site visits. This collective body of evidence forms the basis for merit-based charter renewal decisions.
- E. The purpose of the Commission’s **School Closure Policy** is to set forth governing principles and procedures, pursuant to the Illinois Charter Schools Law and national best practices, for charter schools that close as a result of revocation, nonrenewal, or voluntary surrender of the charter.

COMPLIANCE REPORTING AND MONITORING

Data Submission

Each Commission-authorized school is required under its Charter Agreement, Illinois laws, and Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) regulations to regularly submit data pertaining to student attendance, attrition, academic achievement and growth, student discipline, school finances, legal compliance, or other matters. To help both the schools and the Commission track data submission obligations, the Commission uses a Compliance Checklist and Calendar which is updated and disseminated to schools annually. These submissions enable Commission staff to monitor schools through objective data.

Reports

Reports allow schools to respond to questions arising from data submissions and to offer an analysis regarding the facts and figures collected via public record or through data submissions, providing necessary context for objective facts and figures. At various times throughout the year, Commission schools are required to submit data pertaining to school finances, discipline, 5 Essential Surveys, and attendance. Full reporting requirements are outlined in the Compliance Calendar.

Site Visits

In order to develop a comprehensive understanding of an individual school, the Commission conducts school site visits to evaluate implementation of the school's model and policies. These visits allow the Commission to engage with school staff, governing board members, students, parents, and other stakeholders of the school community. In addition, site visits enable the Commission to compare observations of practice to data and reports submitted by the school. The Commission conducts several types of site visits during each school's charter term: pre-opening site visits, annual monitoring site visits, and renewal site visits. Site visits are scheduled at the discretion of Commission staff.

Pre-Opening Site Visits

Schools will receive at least one pre-opening site visit from Commission staff and/or independent evaluators:

- before a school begins its first year of operation,
- if the school changes location during the charter term, or
- if the school modifies or expands its facility

Pre-opening visit(s) generally take place during the summer, prior to the first day of student attendance. During the pre-opening period, schools should be prepared to answer questions and submit evidence regarding compliance with any requirements of the Charter Agreement. Where relocation, new construction, or renovation is present, special inquiries will be made regarding financing and construction timelines to ensure readiness for student occupancy and organizational stability. If necessary, compliance is not observed on the scheduled pre-opening visit, follow up visits will be scheduled.

Monitoring Site Visits

In accordance with best practices in charter school authorizing, the Commission conducts regular site visits throughout a school's charter term as part of ongoing monitoring and at renewal. Site visits are scheduled according to the school's respective Accountability Status and are not intended to disrupt the school day or school operations. Annual monitoring site visits may include a tour of the school facility, culture and climate assessments, observations of teaching and learning, discussions with school leaders and staff, board meeting observations, record and compliance audits, stakeholder focus groups or forums.

Follow-up visits are sometimes necessary to observe professional development sessions, document school improvement practice strategies, and to investigate certain complaints. The Commission reserves the right to conduct unscheduled monitoring visits at any time if needed to ensure that schools are in compliance with applicable law and regulation and the Charter Agreement.

ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN

The Accountability Plan has three sections, focused on evaluating the Academic, Financial, and Organizational performance of each charter school. It is designed to answer three guiding questions:

- Is the school’s academic program a success?
- Is the school financially sound and demonstrating responsible stewardship?
- Is the school meeting its legal and ethical requirements?

The Commission is committed to authorizing charter schools that provide high-quality educational options to serve the diverse needs of Illinois students, and to holding its portfolio of schools accountable to high standards of performance. To communicate transparent performance expectations for schools, the Commission’s Performance Frameworks are based upon and aligned with the recommendations of the National Association of Charter School Authorizers. The Frameworks establish a common set of academic, financial, and organizational measures and targets to be applied uniformly to all Commission-authorized charter schools; is the basis for the Accountability Plan which is incorporated in the Charter Agreement; and provides the basis for renewal findings and annual school performance reviews.

Each section of the Accountability Plan is composed of indicators, measures, metrics, and targets.

Component	Definition	Example
Indicators	General categories of performance	Student Academic Achievement
Measures	General means to evaluate an aspect of an indicator	Proficiency on state assessments
Metrics	Method of quantifying a measure	Percentage of students meeting or exceeding proficiency on state assessments
Targets	Thresholds that signify success for a specific measure	School proficiency meets or exceeds the state average

Performance targets allow the Commission to rate schools separately on each measure and establish an overall rating for each Performance Framework. The ratings established are as follows:

- **Exceeds Standard**– *(Used only in the Academic Performance Framework)* Recognizes the performance of the most successful schools.
- **Meets Standard** – Indicates that a school meets the Commission’s expectations for performance.
- **Below Standard** – Identifies a school that is not meeting performance expectations and may invoke a need for intensive support and Accountability Actions.
- **Far Below Standard** – Identifies need for high-stakes review, intensive support, and possible non-renewal or revocation.

The four ratings allow the Commission to distinguish performance levels across schools and may be used by the Commission to set requirements for replication or expedited renewal. The Financial and Organizational Performance Frameworks offer only three performance ratings; the rating of “Exceeds Standard” applies only to academic performance.

Alignment with State Board Academic Accountability

Like all public schools in Illinois, charter schools are subject to the state accountability system implemented by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) independent of the Commission's Accountability Plan. It is possible for a school to rate well according to the [ISBE Summative Designations](#) but fall short of the Commission's high standards across other areas of performance. This is the essential basis of the Charter Agreement: greater autonomy in operations in exchange for higher performance expectations.

The majority of academic measures in the Accountability Plan use results of student assessments administered statewide. Though certain districts and schools administer additional assessments, the Commission must be able to equitably and consistently evaluate charter schools throughout the state. While schools may submit supplemental performance data to the Commission, the majority of the academic measures in the Accountability Plan are based on assessment results available from the State Board.

The Illinois Assessment of Readiness (IAR) is the state assessment and accountability measure for Illinois students enrolled in a public school district. IAR assessments in English Language Arts and Mathematics are administered to all students in grades 3-8. IAR assesses the Illinois Learning Standards incorporating the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). High school students in the 9th, 10th, and 11th grades are assessed using the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), which include Mathematics and English Language Arts with a writing component. The SAT also aligns with the Illinois Learning Standards and provides a college-reportable score for admissions purposes.

Annual Performance Reviews and Reports

Annual Performance Reports provide indisputable transparency for both the charter school and the Commission. The Commission's focus on overall annual performance is the natural outcome of the "autonomy for accountability" bargain that every charter school makes with its authorizer. The Commission will prepare and share with each school its Annual Performance Report based on its performance in the previous academic year and will publish a summary of Annual Performance Reports for all schools on its website. Annual Performance Reports present results based upon the most current available data. Commission staff will collect the data required to assess each school's performance against the Commission's Academic, Financial, and Organizational Performance Frameworks. Individual metric ratings as well as overall measure ratings will determine the school's annual accountability status.

Accountability Actions

The Charter Agreement between the Commission and its schools is structured so that a charter school can and will be closed if the school is not achieving the academic, financial, and organizational outcomes to which it has committed. A school learns its *accountability status* each year after the annual performance review. Accountability status designations range from "Good Standing," "Concern," "Deficiency," "Probation," or identification for "Revocation or NonRenewal." Schools that receive an annual review rating of:

- ***Far Below Standard*** on the Academic Performance Framework; or
- ***Far Below Standard*** on two or more performance measures in the Organizational Performance Framework;
or
- ***Far Below Standard*** on two or more financial performance measures; or
- Schools not achieving growth equivalent to the Assigned School Composite

will be subject to Revocation or NonRenewal as set forth in the Accountability Actions. The indicators, measures, metrics, and targets for each section of the Accountability Actions Framework are presented on page 25.

RENEWAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

In most cases, charter schools receive a five-year charter agreement. In the fifth academic year, charter schools seeking renewal of the Charter School Agreement shall respond to the Renewal Application (See Attachment B) published by the Commission. The Commission will make a merit-based renewal decision on each school following a rigorous and transparent process. This process typically begins nine months to one year before a school's contract is set to expire. The following describes the Renewal Process a school will engage in, should it submit a request to renew its Charter School Agreement.

Initial Renewal Findings Report

The first stage of the renewal evaluation process is the preparation by Commission staff of school-specific Initial Renewal Findings. This report includes the record of the charter school's academic, financial, and organizational performance in relation to the criteria for renewal as set forth in the Accountability Plan and the Charter School Agreement. The Commission is responsible for reviewing and analyzing all the evidence submitted by the school for previous years, as well as other public data gathered by the Commission, to prepare the Initial Renewal Findings, which the Commission staff typically provides to the school in the late summer or early fall of the final year of the school's five-year term.

The Initial Renewal Findings Report, while a substantial and significant undertaking and body of evidence, does not produce or imply an evaluative renewal decision based on those findings, for several reasons. The Initial Renewal Findings are "initial" only, developed by Commission staff and may be informed, changed, or supplemented following the comprehensive review conducted by the Commission, its staff, and the Renewal Evaluation Team over the evaluation period.

Renewal Application by the School

After the Commission provides the school with its Initial Renewal Findings, the school must, usually within thirty (30) days (in accordance with a timeline established by the Commission), file its formal request for renewal by completing and submitting the Charter School Renewal Application. The school's Renewal Application responses will include: an overview of the current school model; a discussion of the school's record of performance (confirming, supplementing, or clarifying information in the Initial Renewal Findings); and an outline of future plans, priorities, and potential modifications to the school model for the renewal term.

Renewal Evaluation Team

Commission staff has delegated authority to retain a Renewal Evaluation Team (RET), to provide independent analysis of important factors in the renewal decision. The RET consists of traditional district and charter school experts in the domains of curriculum, instruction and assessment, special education; finances; facilities; legal and organizational compliance, and any other specialty area related to the school design or special student populations. The RET members may participate in the renewal site visits, conduct independent visits for specific purposes, prepare and/or review the Initial Renewal Findings, evaluate the Renewal Application, or participate in the Renewal Application Interview, among other activities.

Commission staff and the RET have the responsibility and authority to review, analyze, and present findings and recommendations to the Commissioners. Commissioners review and analyze this information, and ONLY the Commissioners decide, by majority vote, on the renewal or non-renewal of the charter.

Renewal Site Visit

Commission staff and members of the RET team will conduct at least one scheduled Renewal Site Visit after the school submits its Renewal Application. The purpose of the Renewal Visit is to conduct further due diligence to verify and supplement the Renewal Findings and the Renewal Application through classroom observations; meetings with staff, parents, students, and other stakeholders; and inspection of facilities and documents on site. The evaluators seek to determine, in part, whether the practices described in the Renewal Application and historical record of the school are in evident practice at the school. Information obtained through the Renewal Visit will be considered with all other evidence at the time of the renewal decision by the Commission.

Renewal Public Hearing, Community Forum and/or Focus Groups

The Commission will conduct at least one public hearing during the renewal period, usually at the school, for the purpose of allowing members of the public and all school stakeholders to speak directly to Commissioners regarding their support for or questions concerning the school, the Commission, or the renewal process. The Commission will publish notice of this hearing well in advance to support open attendance. A record will be kept of the proceedings and becomes part of the evidence considered by the Commission in making the renewal decision. Where appropriate, the Commission may convene additional hearings, forums or focus groups at its discretion. Each school in the last year of its charter is encouraged to convene and host a Community Forum in advance of the public hearing to have an open dialogue with the school community and stakeholders about the school's plans to seek or not seek renewal.

Renewal Comprehensive Evaluation Team Interview

As part of the renewal process, Commission staff and members of the RET conduct a closed interview with members of the school's governing board and leadership team to investigate, confirm, or clarify any questions remaining after the preparation of the Initial Renewal Findings, evaluation of the school's Renewal Application, and assessments conducted through the Renewal Visit and Forum. The interview provides additional due diligence to assess the school's progress, performance, and future plans. Evidence collected in the interview is vetted and incorporated in the overall renewal evaluation.

Additional Requests for Information

At any time during the Commission's renewal process, the Commission may request additional information from the school in an effort to fully inform the renewal decision.

Draft Recommendation Regarding Renewal

The Commission staff will prepare Recommendations regarding Renewal once the above activities are completed and will inform the school before the matter is put to a vote by the Commission.

Commission Decision on Renewal

The Commission will deliberate and vote in an open, public meeting on the renewal decision of each school and will thereafter issue a written statement to the school and the public regarding its decision on renewal. Commission meetings are open to the public, with public comment allowed from registered speakers. Typically, the Commission will vote on renewal between December and February of the year in which the school's contract ends.

After the Renewal Decision

Where renewal is granted by the Commission, the Commission staff and the school then negotiates and executes a contract for the new term, which is then submitted to ISBE for certification during the April to June period, so the new contract will be certified before the July 1 termination of the previous contract.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

The Academic Performance Framework evaluates schools based on student proficiency, student growth, performance of student subgroups, and college and career readiness (for high schools). Schools also have the opportunity to request additional school- or mission-specific academic measures when negotiating their Charter School Agreements. The results of the Academic Performance Framework give the Commission a balanced assessment of school academic quality, based on multiple outcome measures of student performance.

The results of the Academic Framework are aggregated to create an overall academic rating – **Exceeds Standards, Meets Standards, Below Standards, or Far Below Standards**. The overall rating is calculated using a weighted average of the results of the individual academic measures. The weights are presented in the table below. For more information on the weighting methodology, refer to the Commission’s Academic Framework Methodology Guidance. (See Attachment C.)

For each academic performance measure, a school receives one of four ratings:

- **Exceeds Standard**– Acknowledges the performance of the most successful schools.
- **Meets standard** – Communicates the Commission’s expectations for academic performance.
- **Below standard** – Highlights schools that are not meeting performance expectations.
- **Far below standard** – Indicates need for high-stakes review and possible non-renewal or revocation.

Indicator	Measure	Weight	
		K-8	9-12
1. Student Achievement (Proficiency) - ELA and Math	a. Proficiency – Statewide Comparison – ELA	4.5%	0%
	a. Proficiency – Statewide Comparison – Math	4.5%	0%
	b. Proficiency – Assigned School Comparison – ELA	8.5%	0%
	b. Proficiency – Assigned School Comparison – Math	8.5%	0%
2. Student Progress Over Time (Growth) - ELA and Math	a. Student Growth – Statewide Comparison – ELA	4.5%	0%
	a. Student Growth – Statewide Comparison – Math	4.5%	0%
	b. Student Growth – Assigned School Comparison – ELA	8.5%	0%
	b. Student Growth – Assigned School Comparison – Math	8.5%	0%
3. Performance of Subgroups - ELA and Math	a.1. Subgroup Proficiency – Statewide Comparison– ELA	5%	0%
	a.1. Subgroup Proficiency – Statewide Comparison– Math	5%	0%
	a.2. Subgroup Proficiency – Assigned School Comparison – ELA	7%	0%
	a.2. Subgroup Proficiency – Assigned School Comparison – Math	7%	0%
	b.1. Subgroup Growth – Statewide Comparison - ELA	5%	0%
	b.1. Subgroup Growth – Statewide Comparison - Math	5%	0%
	b.2. Subgroup Growth – Assigned School Comparison - ELA	7%	0%
	b.2. Subgroup Growth – Assigned School Comparison - Math	7%	0%
4. Mission-Specific Goals	a. School-Specific Academic Goals (Renewal only)	--	--
5. Postsecondary Readiness and Success	a.1. SAT – Statewide Comparison	NA	15%
	a.2. SAT – Assigned School Comparison	NA	30%
	b.1. High School Graduation – 4- and 5-year rates	NA	20%
	b.2. Graduation Rate – Assigned School Comparison	NA	25%
	c. College Attendance	NA	10%

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

1a. Proficiency Statewide Comparison: Are students meeting or exceeding proficiency in state assessments in ELA and Math?

Exceeds Standard

School Proficiency rates are in the top 10 percent for schools statewide serving the same grades.

Meets Standard

School Proficiency rates meet or exceed the state average for schools serving the same grades, but are below the top 10 percent of schools statewide.

Below Standard

School Proficiency rates are below the state average for schools serving the same grades, but are above the bottom 20 percent of schools statewide.

Far Below Standard

School Proficiency rates are in the lowest 20 percent of schools statewide serving the same grades.

1b. Proficiency— Assigned School Composite (ASC) Comparison: How are students performing in ELA and Math compared to the schools they would otherwise attend?

Exceeds Standard

School Proficiency rates exceed the ASC by 10 or more percentage points and meet or exceed the state average proficiency rate for schools serving the same grades, OR the school and ASC rates are both above 90% and the school rate meets or exceeds the ASC rate.

Meets Standard

School Proficiency rates meet or exceed the ASC by up to 9 percentage points, OR the school and ASC rates are both above 90% and the school rate is lower than the ASC rate.

Below Standard

School Proficiency rates are below the ASC by up to 9 percentage points.

Far Below Standard

School Proficiency rates are below the ASC by 10 or more percentage points.

Note: The ASC is an index determined by the average proficiency rate of the schools that students would otherwise be assigned to attend, weighted by the percentage of charter students assigned to each school by grade.

2a. Student Growth Statewide Comparison: Are students meeting or exceeding expectations for growth in state assessments in ELA and Math?

Exceeds Standard

School mean student growth percentiles (SGP) are in the top 10 percent for schools statewide.

Meets Standard

School mean SGPs meet or exceed the state average but are below the top 10 percent of schools statewide.

Below Standard

School mean SGPs are below the state average but are above the bottom 20 percent of schools statewide.

Far Below Standard

School mean SGPs are in the lowest 20 percent of schools statewide.

2b. Student Growth— Assigned School Composite (ASC) Comparison: Are students meeting or exceeding student growth at the traditional schools that students would otherwise attend, using an Assigned School Composite (ASC)?

Exceeds Standard School mean student growth percentiles (SGPs) exceed the ASC by 9 or more points and meet or exceed the state average SGP values.
Meets Standard School mean SGP values meet or exceed the ASC by up to 8 points.
Below Standard School mean SGPs are below the ASC by up to 8 percentage points.
Far Below Standard School mean SGPs are below the ASC by 9 or more percentage points.

3a.1. Subgroup Proficiency—State Comparison: Are student subgroups meeting or exceeding proficiency in ELA and Math? (Applied to all eligible ISBE subgroups with 10 or more students tested schoolwide.)

Exceeds Standard Average school subgroup proficiency rate is in the top 10 percent of statewide subgroup performance in schools serving the same grades.
Meets Standard Average school subgroup proficiency rate meets or exceeds the statewide average subgroup performance of schools serving the same grades but is below the top 10 percent.
Below Standard Average school subgroup proficiency rate is below the statewide average subgroup performance of schools serving the same grades but is above the bottom 20 percent.
Far Below Standard Average school subgroup proficiency rate is in the bottom 20 percent of statewide subgroup performance of schools serving the same grades.

3a.2. Subgroup Proficiency — Assigned School Composite (ASC) Comparison: Are student subgroups meeting or exceeding the ELA and Math proficiency rates of student subgroups in the schools that students would otherwise attend? (Applied to all eligible State Board subgroups with 10 or more students tested schoolwide)

Exceeds Standard School subgroup proficiency rate exceeds the ASC subgroup rate by 10 or more percentage points and meets or exceeds the state average subgroup proficiency rate for schools serving the same grades, OR the school and ASC subgroup rates are both above 90% and the school rate meets or exceeds the ASC rate.
Meets Standard School subgroup proficiency rate meets or exceeds the ASC subgroup rate by up to 9 percentage points, OR the school and ASC subgroup rates are both above 90% and the school rate is below the ASC rate.
Below Standard Schools subgroup proficiency rate is below the subgroup ASC rate by up to 9 percentage points.
Far Below Standard School subgroup proficiency rate is below the subgroup ASC rate by 10 or more percentage points.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

3b.1. Subgroup Growth—State Comparison: What percentage of students in subgroups is making expected growth in ELA and math according to the Illinois Growth Model?

Exceeds Standard

School subgroup mean SGPs are in the top 10 percent for schools serving that subgroup statewide.

Meets Standard

School subgroup mean SGPs meet or exceed the state average but are below the top 10 percent of schools serving that subgroup statewide.

Below Standard

School subgroup mean SGPs are below the state average but are above the bottom 20 percent of schools serving that subgroup statewide.

Far Below Standard

School subgroup mean SGPs are in the lowest 20 percent for schools serving that subgroup statewide.

3b.2. Subgroup Growth—Assigned School Composite (ASC) Comparison: How are students performing in ELA and math compared to the schools they would otherwise attend—Assigned School Composite (ASC)?

Exceeds Standard

School subgroup mean student growth percentiles (SGP) exceed the ASC by 9 or more points and meet or exceed the state mean SGP values.

Meets Standard

School subgroup mean SGPs meet or exceed the ASC by up to 8 percentage points.

Below Standard

School subgroup mean SGPs are below the ASC by up to 8 percentage points.

Far Below Standard

School subgroup mean SGPs are below the ASC by 9 or more percentage points.

4a. School-Specific Academic Goals *If applicable*

To be determined by mutual agreement between individual charter schools and the Commission.

5a.1. SAT Performance: Does student performance reflect college readiness?

Exceeds Standard

An average of at least 55% of 11th graders met state standards in ELA and Math on the SAT.

Meets Standard

An average of between 35% and 54% of 11th graders met state standards in ELA and Math on the SAT.

Below Standard

An average of between 20% and 34% of 11th graders met state standards in ELA and Math on the SAT.

Far Below Standard

An average of less than 20% of 11th graders met state standards in ELA and Math on the SAT.

5a.2. SAT Performance— Assigned School Composite (ASC) Comparison: How does average students' performance on the SAT compare to the schools students would otherwise attend?

Exceeds Standard

The school total average SAT score exceeds the ASC average SAT score by 80 or more points OR the school and ASC average scores are both above 1080 and the school meets or exceeds the ASC score.

Meets Standard

The school total average SAT score meets or exceeds the ASC average SAT score by up to 79 points OR the school and ASC average scores are both above 1080 and the school is below the ASC score.

Below Standard

The school total average SAT score is up to 79 points below the ASC average SAT score.

Far Below Standard

The school total average SAT score is 80 or more points below the ASC average SAT score.

5b.1. Graduation Rate: Are students successfully graduating from high school based on either four-year or five-year cohort graduation rates?

Exceeds Standard

At least 90% of students graduated based on a four-year cohort method, OR
At least 92% of students graduated based on a five-year cohort method.

Meets Standard

80% to 89% of students graduated based on a four-year cohort method, OR
82% to 91% of students graduated based on a five-year cohort method.

Below Standard

70% to 79% of students graduated based on a four-year cohort method, OR
72% to 81% of students graduated based on a five-year cohort method.

Far Below Standard

Less than 70% of students graduated based on a four-year cohort method, OR less than 72% of students graduated based on a five-year cohort method.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

5b.2. Graduation Rate—Assigned School Composite Comparison: Assigned School Comparison (ASC): How does the school graduation rate compare to the schools students would otherwise attend—Assigned School Composite (ASC)?

Exceeds Standard

The school graduation rate exceeds the ASC graduation rate by 10 or more percentage points OR
The school and ASC rates are both above 90% and the school meets or exceeds the ASC rate.

Meets Standard

The school graduation rate meets or exceeds the ASC graduation rate by up to 9 percentage points OR
The school and ASC rates are both above 90% and the school is below the ASC rate.

Below Standard

The school graduation rate is 1 to 9 percentage points below the ASC rate.

Far Below Standard

The school graduation rate is 10 or more percentage points below the ASC rate.

Notes: Measure 5b.2 will be evaluated and reported in the Initial Renewal Findings using both 4-year and 5-year cohort graduation rates. Schools will receive the higher rating, based either on the 4-year or 5-year rate comparison.

5c. College Enrollment: Are charter school graduates enrolling in college? (Includes both 2- and 4-year institutions)

Exceeds Standard

At least 80% of graduates were enrolled in college in the fall after high school graduation.

Meets Standard

60% to 79% of graduates were enrolled in college in the fall after high school graduation.

Below Standard

40% to 59% of graduates were enrolled in college in the fall after high school graduation.

Far Below Standard

Less than 40% of graduates were enrolled in college in the fall after high school graduation.

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

The Financial Performance Framework evaluates a school’s financial viability in both the near- and long-term. It also provides the Commission a tool to identify schools that are currently in or are trending toward financial difficulty. To that end, the Financial Performance Framework uses eight interconnected measures to assess a school’s financial position from both a cash basis and an accrual basis. These measures are organized under Near Term and Sustainability Indicators, respectively.

Near Term

The part of the framework that assesses a school’s near-term financial health is designed to depict the school’s current financial position and its viability. Schools meeting these standards demonstrate a low risk of financial distress. Schools that fail to meet these standards may currently be experiencing financial difficulties or are at high risk of financial hardship in the near term.

Sustainability

The framework also includes longer-term financial sustainability measures that are designed to assess a school’s financial position and viability over time. Schools that meet the desired standards demonstrate a low risk of financial distress in the future. Schools that fail to meet the standards may be at high risk of financial hardship in the future.

The Commission will apply the Financial Performance Framework annually to proactively monitor school finances and identify any areas of concern.

For each financial performance measure, a school receives one of three ratings:

- **Meets Standard:** The school’s performance on the given measure does not signal a financial risk to the school and meets the authorizer’s standard.
- **Below Standard:** The school’s performance on the given measure signals a possible financial risk to the school and does not meet the authorizer’s standard.
- **Far Below Standard:** The school’s performance on the given measure signals a significant financial risk to the school and does not meet the authorizer’s standard.

Indicator	Measure	School Rating	CMO Rating, If applicable
Near Term	1a. Current Ratio		
	1b. Unrestricted Days Cash		
	1c. Enrollment Variance		
	1d. Debt Default		
Sustainability	2a. Total Margin & Aggregate		
	2b. Debt to Asset Ratio		
	2c. Cash Flow & Aggregate		
	2d. Debt Service Coverage Ratio		
	2e. Financial Reporting and Compliance		

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

1a. Current Ratio: Current Assets divided by Current Liabilities

Meets Standard

Current Ratio is greater than or equal to 1.1, OR

Current Ratio is between 1.0 and 1.1 and one-year trend is positive (current-year ratio is higher than last year's).

Note: For schools in their first or second year of operation, the current ratio must be greater than or equal to 1.1.

Below Standard

Current Ratio is between 0.9 and 1.0 or equals 1.0, OR

Current Ratio is between 1.0 and 1.1 and one-year trend is negative.

Far Below Standard

Current ratio is less than or equal to 0.9.

1b. Unrestricted Days Cash: Unrestricted Cash divided by $([\text{Total Expenses minus Depreciation Expense}]/365)$

Meets Standard

60 Days Cash, OR Between 30 and 60 Days Cash and one-year trend is positive.

Note: Schools in their first or second year of operation must have a minimum of 30 Days Cash.

Below Standard

Days Cash is between 15 and 30 days, OR

Days Cash is between 30 and 60 days, and one-year trend is negative.

Far Below Standard

Fewer than 15 Days Cash.

1c. Enrollment Variance: Actual Enrollment divided by Enrollment Projection in Charter School Board-Approved Budget

Meets Standard

Enrollment Variance equals or exceeds 95 percent in the most recent year.

Below Standard

Enrollment Variance is between 85 and 95 percent in the most recent year.

Far Below Standard

Enrollment Variance is less than 85 percent in the most recent year.

1d. Debt Default

Meets Standard

School is not in default of loan covenant(s) and is not delinquent with debt service payments.

Below Standard

Not applicable.

Far Below Standard

School is in default of loan covenant(s) and/or is delinquent with debt service payments.

2a. Total Margin: Net Income divided by Total Revenue; Aggregated Total Margin: Total Three-Year Net Income divided by Total Three-Year Revenues

Meets Standard

Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is positive, and the most recent year Total Margin is positive, OR Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is greater than -1.5 percent, the trend is positive for the last two years, and the most recent year Total Margin is positive.

Note: For schools in their first or second year of operation, the cumulative Total Margin must be positive.

Below Standard

Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is greater than -1.5 percent, but the trend is not positive for last two years.

Far Below Standard

Aggregated Three-Year Total Margin is less than or equal to -1.5 percent, OR The most recent year Total Margin is less than -10 percent.

2b. Debt to Asset Ratio: Total Liabilities divided by Total Assets

Meets Standard

Debt to Asset Ratio is less than 0.9.

Below Standard

Debt to Asset Ratio is between 0.9 and 1.0.

Far Below Standard

Debt to Asset Ratio is greater than 1.0.

2c. Cash Flow

Meets Standard

Multi-Year Cumulative Cash Flow is positive, and Cash Flow is positive each year, OR Multi-Year Cumulative Cash Flow is positive, Cash Flow is positive in one of two years, and Cash Flow in the most recent year is positive.

Note: Schools in their first or second year of operation must have positive cash flow.

Below Standard

Multi-Year Cumulative Cash Flow is positive, but the trend does not "Meet Standard."

Far Below Standard

Multi-Year Cumulative Cash Flow is negative.

2d. Debt Service Coverage Ratio: (Net Income + Depreciation + Interest Expense)/ (Annual Principal, Interest, and Lease Payments)

Meets Standard

Debt Service Coverage Ratio is equal to or exceeds 1.1.

Below Standard

Debt Service Coverage Ratio is less than 1.1.

Far Below Standard

Not applicable.

2e. Financial Reporting and Compliance Requirements: Is the school meeting financial reporting and compliance requirements?

Meets Standard

The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract relating to financial reporting requirements, including but not limited to:

- Complete and on-time submission of financial reports, including annual budget, revised budgets (if applicable), periodic financial reports as required by the authorizer, and any reporting requirements if the board contracts with an Education Service Provider (ESP)
- On-time submission and completion of the annual independent audit and corrective action plans, if applicable
- All reporting requirements related to the use of public funds

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

The purpose of the Organizational Performance Framework is to protect the public interest by assessing each school’s fulfillment of legal and ethical obligations, including respecting the rights of students, staff, and families. The Organizational Performance Framework measures hold all schools to the same standards for meeting legal and ethical requirements and responsibilities. Expectations are derived from state and federal law and operating terms outlined in the Charter Agreement.

The Organizational Performance Framework consists of six major categories, or Indicators. These Indicators allow the authorizer and the public to comprehensively analyze the extent to which a school is meeting its various legal and ethical responsibilities. Each Indicator is composed of several measures pertaining to specific school responsibilities, duties, or obligations.

For each organizational performance measure, a school receives one of three ratings:

- **Meets Standard:** The school materially meets the expectations outlined for the measure.
- **Below Standard:** The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.
- **Far Below Standard:** The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Indicator	Measure
1. Student Rights	1a. Rights of Students with Disabilities
	1b. Rights of English Language Learner (ELL) Students
	1c. Protection of Student Rights
	1d. Admissions and Enrollment Practices
	1e. Discipline Policy and Practices
2. Governance and Management	2a. Governance Requirements
	2b. Management Accountability
	2c. Employee Rights, Retention and Evaluation
3. Reporting and Compliance	3a. Reporting Requirements
	3b. Health and Safety Compliance
	3c. Compliance with Additional Obligations
4. School Environment	4a. Attendance Goals
	4b. Attrition Rates & Enrollment Stability
	4c. 5 Essential Survey

1a. Rights of Students with Disabilities: Is the school protecting the rights of students with disabilities?

Meets Standard

Consistent with the school's status and responsibilities as an LEA, the school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract (including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and State Board regulations) relating to the treatment of students with identified disabilities and those suspected of having a disability, including but not limited to:

- Equitable access and opportunity to enroll
- Identification and referral
- Appropriate development and implementation of Individualized Education Plans and Section 504 plans
- Operational compliance, including provision of services in the least restrictive environment and appropriate inclusion in the school's academic program, assessments, and extracurricular activities
- Discipline, including due process protections, manifestation determinations, and behavioral intervention plans
- Access to the school's facility and program provided to students in a lawful manner and consistent with students' IEPs or Section 504 plans

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

1b. Rights of English Language Learner (ELL) Students: Is the school protecting the rights of English Language Learner (ELL) students?

Meets Standard

The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract (including Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA] and U.S. Department of Education authorities) relating to requirements regarding English Language Learners (ELLs), including but not limited to:

- Equitable access and opportunity to enroll
- Required policies related to the service of ELL students
- Compliance with native-language communication requirements
- Proper steps for identification of students in need of ELL services
- Appropriate and equitable delivery of services to identified students
- Appropriate accommodations on assessments
- Annual administration of ACCESS to determine students eligible to exit ELL services
- Ongoing monitoring of exited students

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

1c. Protection of Student Rights: Is the school protecting the rights of all students?

Meets Standard

The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract relating to relevant reporting requirements to the Commission, the State Board, and/or federal authorities, including but not limited to:

- Accountability tracking
- Attendance and enrollment reporting
- Compliance and oversight
- Additional information requested by the authorizer

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

1d. Admissions & Enrollment Practices: Are the school's admissions and enrollment practices fair and equitable, as required by law?

Meets Standard

Policies and practices related to admissions, lottery, waiting lists, fair and open recruitment, and enrollment are fair and equitable, as required by law. The school does not discriminate in its admission policies or practices on the basis of intellectual or athletic ability, measures of achievement or aptitude, disability, proficiency in the English language, or any other basis that would be illegal if used by a school district, either by policy or any other means. The school is committed to serving all students, as demonstrated by its recruiting efforts and making application information and materials accessible to families.

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

1e. Discipline Practices: Are the school's discipline policy and practices fair and equitable, as required by law?

Meets Standard

Policies and practices related to discipline are fair and equitable, as required by law. The school has developed progressive, restorative and/or positive systems that align with state and applicable federal law. Policies are clearly articulated and provided to parents and students. School staff receives regular training on policies and practices throughout the school year. Any updates or amendments to policies and practices are appropriately communicated to parents, students, staff, and the Commission. Policy and practices are implemented fairly and without any discriminatory effect.

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

2a. Governance Requirements: Is the school complying with governance requirements?

Meets Standard

The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract relating to governance by its board, including but not limited to:

- Board policies, including those related to oversight of an Education Service Provider (ESP), if applicable
- Board bylaws
- State open meetings law
- Code of ethics
- Conflicts of interest
- Board composition and/or membership rules
- Compensation for attendance at meetings

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

2b. Management Accountability: Is the school holding management accountable?

Meets Standard

The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract relating to oversight of school management, including but not limited to:

- (For schools managed by an Education Service Provider [ESP]) maintaining ultimate authority over management, holding the ESP accountable for performance as agreed under a written performance agreement, and requiring annual financial reports of the ESP
- (For schools not managed by an ESP) oversight of management that includes holding it accountable for performance expectations that may or may not be agreed to under a written performance agreement

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

2c. Employee Rights: Is the school respecting employee rights?

Meets Standard

The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract relating to employment considerations, including those relating to the Family Medical Leave Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and employment contracts. The school does not interfere with employees' rights to organize collectively or otherwise violate staff collective bargaining rights.

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

3a. Reporting Requirements: Is the school complying with reporting requirements?

Meets Standard

The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract relating to relevant reporting requirements to the Commission, the State Board, and/or federal authorities, including but not limited to:

- Accountability tracking
- Attendance and enrollment reporting
- Compliance and oversight
- Additional information requested by the authorizer

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

3b. Health and Safety Compliance: Is the school complying with health and safety requirements?

Meets Standard

The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract relating to safety and the provision of health-related services, including but not limited to:

- Appropriate nursing services and dispensing of pharmaceuticals
- Food service requirements
- Other district services, if applicable

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

3c. Compliance: Is the school complying with all other obligations?

Meets Standard

The school materially complies with all other legal, statutory, regulatory, or contractual requirements contained in its charter contract that are not otherwise explicitly stated herein, including but not limited to requirements from the following sources:

- Revisions to state charter law
- Applicable consent decrees
- Intervention requirements by the authorizer
- Requirements by other entities to which the charter school is accountable (e.g., the State Board)

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

4a. Attendance Goals: Is the school meeting attendance goals?

Meets Standard

The school materially complies with provisions of the charter contract relating to attendance goals.

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

4b. Attrition Rates & Enrollment Stability: Is the school monitoring and minimizing attrition rates and maintaining enrollment stability?

Meets Standard

The school monitors and minimizes attrition rates and analyzes data to ensure stable and equitable enrollment.

Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were material, but the board has instituted remedies that have resulted in compliance or prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

Far Below Standard

The school has failed to implement the program in the manner described; the failure(s) were or are material and significant to the viability of the school, or regardless of the severity of the failure(s), the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward compliance.

4c. 5 Essentials Survey

Meets Standard

The school must achieve a “Most” or “More Implementation” rating for at least three (3) of the five (5) categories, with no single category rating below an “Average Implementation”.

Below Standard

The school has achieved a rating of “Average Implementation for no more than three (3) of the five (5) categories, with no single category achieving a “Most” or “More Implementation”.

Far Below Standard

The school has achieved a rating of “Less Implementation on at least three (3) of the five (5) categories, with no single category achieving a rating of “Average Implementation” or above. Further, the board has not instituted remedies that have resulted in prompt and sufficient movement toward correcting any issues.

ACCOUNTABILITY ACTIONS

Designed to support the Commission’s execution of charter school monitoring and oversight responsibilities as set forth in Illinois law and regulation, and in accordance with national standards for quality authorizing, the following Accountability Actions summarize and make clear the general conditions that may trigger actions for a Commission-authorized school where warranted or required by law, and the types of actions and consequences that may ensue. These responsibilities include implementing, where warranted and in accordance with state law, a range of possible accountability actions.

The Accountability Actions preserve school autonomy and school responsibility for developing and executing remedies to identified concerns, deficiencies, or violations. In following these Accountability Actions, the Commission will provide notice and adequate time and opportunity for schools to address concerns, deficiencies, or violations in non-emergency situations. A tiered process that applies increasing consequences for schools until concerns, deficiencies, or violations are either sufficiently resolved or, if necessary, ultimately results in revocation or non-renewal of the charter contract.

Note: While the Accountability Actions outline a tiered range of possible accountability actions, it *does not* represent a mandatory linear escalation of steps and consequences, in which a school or the Commission must proceed through every step or action. In any particular school’s case, the Commission may skip a step or action, as may be necessary or required by law, and in accordance with law.

To preserve charter school autonomy, it is the responsibility of each school – not the responsibility of the Commission – to develop and execute its own remedies and action/remediation plans to rectify any identified concerns, deficiencies, or violations.

ACCOUNTABILITY ACTIONS

FINDING	ACTION	RESULT
Overall performance rating of Meets Standard (or Exceeds Standard, where applicable) on the Academic Performance Framework, AND ratings of Meets or Exceeds Standard for academic growth as compared to the ASC in measures 2b and 3b, AND ratings of Meets on at least 85% of Organizational and Financial Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter of Good Standing issued to charter school leadership and board president indicating the school has met or exceeded the standards; • School may be featured in Commission meetings or publications; and • School is invited to share best practices. 	Good Standing
Signs of underperformance identified through routine monitoring (including Academic Performance Framework measures, annual site visits, compliance reporting, or by other means) and/or a school's repeated failure to submit required documents on a timely basis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter issued to charter school leadership and board president detailing: specific areas of concern, actions necessary to remedy each, and timeframe within which each must be remedied. 	Concern
School meets one or more of the following thresholds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OVERALL RATING of Below Standards or Far Below Standards in the Academic Performance Framework; • Four or more Below Standard or Far Below Standard ratings on individual metrics in the Academic or Organizational Performance Framework; • Two or more Below Standard or Far Below Standard ratings on individual metrics in the Financial Performance Framework; or • Repeated failure to comply with applicable laws, conditions of the Charter Agreement, or comply with requests to correct identified areas of concern. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter issued to charter school leadership and board president detailing: specific areas of concern, actions necessary to remedy each, and timeframe within which each must be remedied. • School Support Team assigned to support performance improvement; • School Support Team and Commission staff monitor implementation of School's Strategic Action (Performance Improvement) Plan; and • Five-week interval progress reports presented to the Commission staff. 	Deficiency
School meets one or more of the following thresholds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two or more years of Deficiency status on the annual performance report issued by the Commission; • Two or more notices of deficiency based on failure to comply with monitoring or to meet expectations as identified in School Strategic (Performance Improvement) Action Plan, • Two or more notices indicating a failure to comply with conditions of the charter or requests to correct identified areas of concern. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter to charter school leadership, charter school board president, • School Support Team assigned to support performance improvement; • School Support Team and Commission staff monitor implementation of School's Strategic Action (Performance Improvement) Plan; and • Five-week interval progress reports presented to the Commission staff. • Initiate revocation proceedings and/or request withholding of quarterly PCTC payment. 	Probation
School meets one or more of the following thresholds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three or more years of Deficiency status on the annual performance report issued by the Commission, • Three or more notices of deficiency based on failure to comply with monitoring as identified in School Performance Action Plan; or • Three or more notices indicating a failure to comply with conditions of the charter or requests to correct identified areas of concern. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice of Revocation or Non-Renewal Status to the Commission, charter school board and school leadership, • One-year written remediation plan developed by the school and adopted by charter school board, and • School Support Team and Commission staff conducts regular monitoring of remediation plan implementation; and • Student growth percentile (SGP) must equivalent to 50th percentile and/or higher than ASC to be removed from Revocation/NonRenewal Status 	Revocation or Non-Renewal
Review of remediation plan and/or renewal application results in recommendation to revoke or not renew and close.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation of revocation or non-renewal to Commission; and • Letter issued to charter school board and ISBE. • Closure Team assigned, and • Families and students supported to identify and enroll in new schools 	Notice of Charter Closure

CONCLUSION AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Illinois State Charter School Commission hopes that the Accountability System presented here will serve as a model to other districts throughout the State of Illinois that seek to attract charter school operators willing to be measured by rigorous and transparent methods. The development of an Accountability Plan by any charter authorizer takes time, as well as the talents and contributions of many stakeholders.

In closing, the Commission would like to acknowledge the following individuals for their contributions to the development and updates to the Accountability System: Lyria Boast, and her team at Public Impact; James Ford, Ford Research & Solutions, Independent Consultants, Margaret Lin and Kristen Vandawalker and LEE Fellow, Jennifer Thomas.

Commission Staff

Shenita Johnson, *Executive Director/General Counsel*

Robbie Curry, *Director of Portfolio Performance*

Alexandra Rodriguez, *Administrative Analyst*