

Criteria 1: Improving Student Achievement (Standard 1)

A charter school promotes student learning through a clear vision and high expectations. It achieves clear, measurable program goals and student learning objectives, including meeting its stated performance standards, state and federal performance standards, and closing achievement gaps of students.

Rubric Element	Criterion Description	Level 5 Equivalent	Level 2 Equivalent	Level	Evidence and Discussion
1.1	Achieves clear, measurable program goals and student achievement objectives as measured by state, federal standards or objective standards set out in the schools Local Control Accountability Plan	CAASPP student dashboard data in the blue or green categories overall and for all statistically significant subgroups; demonstrated track record of meeting or materially improving performance on objective LCAP student performance goals.	CAASPP student dashboard data in the orange categories overall and for a majority of statistically significant subgroups; student performance goals present in LCAP but unclear or failure to achieve LCAP goals over multiple years.	2	<p>For data, see charts following rubric area 1.</p> <p>NEA's Fall 2017 Dashboard Performance shows a yellow or orange performance level for all students and most subgroups in the areas of Suspension, SBAC ELA, and SBAC Math. For all students and most subgroups, suspension rates improved with an overall decline of 1.3% and significant decreases for multiple subgroups. For both ELA and Math, in 14 of the 18 groups for which data is available, all students or the subgroup declined/declined significantly. 15 of the 18 groups with data remained at 'Low' or 'Very Low' status. Increases were seen for Students with Disabilities and Hispanic/Latino students in Math.</p> <p>Overall, NEA as a K-12 program had 34% of its students meet or exceed standard in the 2017-18 Math SBAC and 44% of its students meet or exceed standard in the 2017-18 ELA SBAC. For the same assessment AUSD students scored 60% in Math and 68% in ELA. For all subgroups NEA underperformed or significantly underperformed relative to AUSD K-12 students with the exception of Students with Disabilities in Math where both NEA and AUSD students scored 18%.</p> <p>An analysis of 2017-18 enrollment demographics for NEA and AUSD schools indicates the following AUSD schools are the closest in composition for comparison purposes (by grade span):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Maya Lin Elementary School (K-5)○ Wood Middle School and Encinal Junior Jets (6-8)○ Encinal High School (9-12) <p>The above schools are all relatively close to NEA geographically. Additionally, Maya Lin, Wood, and Junior Jets have all in the past 6-7 years formed/reorganized and had open enrollment practices, drawing students from beyond their traditional/historic boundaries.</p> <p>Academic performance differs materially between Nea's Lower (K-5) and Upper (6-12) Villages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ At the elementary level, the 2017-18 5th grade SBAC Math and ELA scores were used for comparison. In the area of Math, NEA performs similar to Maya Lin (41% to 45% meeting or exceeding standard respectively) for all students. For the only shared subgroup for which both schools have 5th grade scores (White students) NEA scored 48% while Maya Lin scored 54%. In the area of ELA, NEA outperformed Maya Lin 47% to 36%. For White students, NEA outperformed Maya Lin 71% to 54%.○ At the middle school level, the 2017-18 8th grade SBAC Math and ELA scores were used for comparison. In the area of Math, NEA scored 31% for all students while WMS scored 49% and Junior Jets scored 59%. In the area of ELA, NEA scored 47% while WMS scored 36% and Junior Jets scored 61%. For available subgroups NEA generally underperformed relative to WMS and Junior Jets, with this underperformance most pronounced for Hispanic/Latino students.○ At the high school level, the 2017-18 11th grade SBAC Math and ELA scores were used for comparison. In the area of Math, NEA scored 50% relative to 64% for EHS, and in the area of ELA NEA scored 30% relative to 43% for EHS. Given NEA's 11th grade (and overall 9-12) enrollment, no subgroup data for SBAC in either Math or ELA was available.

					<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The gap is most pronounced at the 11th grade, with NEA students averaging 30% meeting or exceeding standard in ELA and 5% in Math and Encinal students at 64% and 43% respectively. While the gap is less at the 8th grade, it is still 12% for ELA and 13% for Math. <p>Overall, NEA’s elementary program scores similar or above the identified comparison school, and NEA’s middle and high school programs generally perform significantly below the identified comparison schools/programs.</p> <p>Note: Some of NEA’s individual grade levels have relatively few students who tested and/or had reported scores. In the case of the 11th grade for the 2018 SBAC, NEA had 20 students with scores. The 5th grade had 51 and the 8th had 49.</p> <p>NEA generally did not meet the SBAC-specific goals outlined in its LCAP. For goals not related to SBAC, NEA demonstrated positive growth in many areas including reading proficiency as measured by the DRA, Math proficiency as measured by Reflex Math, improvement in students meeting the Healthy Fitness zone, increased parent attendance at events, reduction in suspensions, increase in overall attendance, positive PD feedback, and implementation of curriculum purchasing goals.</p>
1.2	Provides a challenging and coherent curriculum for each individual student	The school has a robust standards-based curriculum with strategies in place to meet the needs and challenge of all students, including those who are not at grade-level. The school has systems in place to formally identify individual student needs and has effective strategies in place to meet the needs of English Learners (EL) and students with Special Education and 504 plans. The school is closing achievement gaps among student sub-groups at a rate exceeding other schools with similar demographics.	The school’s curriculum is standards-based, but is not meeting the needs of all individuals. Support structures for students not meeting grade-level standards are inadequate. EL and students with special education plans are making inadequate progress. The achievement gap among subgroups is on par with those in similar or surrounding schools.	3	<p>Description of Curriculum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● NEA’s stated mission is to empower all students to take ownership of their educational experience, to celebrate their diverse community, and to actively participate as members of a democratic society.● NEA outlines nine principles that represent the schools core values and align with their expected learning outcomes. These are curiosity, organization, persistence, compassion, problem solving, courage, teamwork, integrity, and accountability.● NEA’s description of its educational model emphasizes a foundation of project-based learning to create a dynamic classroom approach in which learners actively explore real-world problems. Also described is a participatory governance model in which learners, parents, and facilitators are empowered to create and sustain the educational program. The CRP states that learners design their own goals and life plans. Page 13 of the CRP includes a detailed list of the school’s salient tenets from research and additional areas considered for younger learners.● The 6-12 program is comprised of 60-80% seminar time with the remainder spent in independent project time or attending community college classes. Seminars include math, science, language arts, foreign language, and social studies.● The school has adopted Eureka Math across all grades, TCI for social studies at 6-12, and Lucy Calkins for ELA. FOSS materials are also used.● The K-5 program places learners into a ‘homeroom’ facilitator’s classroom. The entire K-5 community also gathers every other week in the ‘Tree’ for Contemporary Community Citizenship - including performances by students and groups facilitated by 5th graders. 3rd-5th grade students also rotate through three separate core seminars that are focused on Math, Science, and Humanities. K-5 learners are also able to choose electives each trimester such as dance, theater, and green team. Students demonstrate their meeting of standards in part through the elementary portfolio.● The 6-12 program’s philosophical, theoretical, and research base for the program’s vision are detailed on page 25-26 of the CRP. A stated focus in the engagement of learners in authentic language use in context, making meaning in a language-rich environment.● Nea uses NWEA MAP as a screener for formally identifying students with academic needs. There is an ARC period to support students with IEPs or who need extra time/support in various subject areas.● There is evidence of teacher collaboration to deliver standards-based instruction. Similar lessons occur across a grade level. Standards addressed are written on the board, assignments, and exit tickets. Student learning tasks are correlated to support learning standards, although not always rigorous for students to fully meet the standard.● There are word walls, vocabulary banks, pictures and drawings, sentence frames, and other

					<p>scaffolds to support students, including ELs at the elementary level. Students need more time to process and discuss their thinking with peers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small group instruction is used to support students with early literacy skills, although this could be facilitated with more intentionality to address specific phonics/sight word skills. Students' assigned independent work that occurs during small group time could be differentiated further to align with targeted instructional focus skills. • In over half of the elementary rooms observed, an additional adult provided 1:1 assistance as needed for a variety of students, including Special Education and struggling students. • In elementary there is a Reading Specialist that provides push-in support for English Learners that are struggling in reading and writing. The Reading Specialist also provides pull-out support for English Learners that are struggling. This is determined by multiple measures of assessment (DRA, ELPAC, and MAP testing), and the curriculum being used during this time is Reading A-Z. • Teachers have had limited training in Integrated and Designated ELD. • There is a plan in place for Newcomers, though there aren't any attending NEA this school year. • Teachers meet consistently with the ELD facilitator and Reading Specialist to discuss specific students that are struggling. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The concern is that only secondary students at the Emerging/Lower Expanding Level are receiving Designated ELD. At the elementary level, only the English Learners that are struggling are being pulled out for intervention services, which is not Designated ELD.
1.3	Implements and directs learning experiences (consistent with the school's purpose and charter) that actively engage students	Students are actively and consistently engaged in class and demonstrate a high level of enthusiasm for learning across the curriculum. Students and teachers use resources for learning experiences beyond the limits of the textbook and classroom, including the effective use of technology and community resources. Student engagement is supported by opportunities to relate productively with adults and other students in both academic and non-academic settings. Learning goals are aligned to the educational program outlined in the charter.	Students are inconsistently engaged in class. Instruction is predominantly teacher centered or textbook driven. Technology and community resources are not utilized with any consistency to further relevant learning in or outside the classroom.	3	<p>Overall, elementary students were attending to instruction and following directions in class. They completed assignments and were engaged in reading, writing, math, and science tasks.</p> <p>During whole-class discussions (observed in 3 teacher-led whole class lessons), not all students were engaged. Whole-class instruction consisted largely of teacher talk in which student engagement was often passive.</p> <p>For academic discourse, out of 13 classrooms visited, one room had several partner shares (that involved sharing one word answers) during a class discussion, and three rooms had collaborative group work (planning for a reducing-waste campaign, creating a way for seed dispersal). Besides the three science classes, student peer interactions and academic discourse was limited. This is inconsistent with the vision of a project-based multi-age grouped learning environment set out in the petition at pp. 9-13.</p> <p>There was independent work in 9 out of 13 of the rooms visited (expectations for work behavior were in all classrooms, and students effectively self-managed their work with autonomy).</p> <p>1 out of 13 rooms used technology (showing a map of westward expansion that impacted Native Americans). This is inconsistent with the vision of a "technology-rich" learning environment set out in the petition at p. 9.</p> <p>Overall DOK Level of Instruction seemed low. Many student assignments could be characterized as routinized tasks (complete a sentence frame, roll dice to write sight words, write questions about a graph, order decimals, popcorn reading). In a secondary classroom, on a worksheet that included 6 questions about a chapter, 4 were DOK 1 (Where? What? What? How many?). 1 question asked was open-ended (How?), and the last question asked how the student might feel. Higher DOK level tasks occurred during science instruction which used overarching inquiry questions and asked students to design/create something with a partner or their group.</p> <p>Formative assessment during instruction was observed in 1 out of 6 classrooms visited. In the 1 classroom, there were no adjustments made to instruction based on the formative assessment.</p>
1.4	Uses the results of evaluation and	Resources are allocated appropriately (among materials, equipment, staff, and	Resources allocation is inconsistent and does not clearly align with	3	As evidenced in the analysis section of NEA's LCAP Annual Update, the school uses the results of evaluation and assessment as the basis for future allocations of appropriate resources to promote high

	assessment as the basis for the allocation of appropriate resources to promote high levels of student achievement	facilities) and used effectively to optimize student learning experiences and promote student achievement.	programmatic improvement for increasing student achievement. Resources are inadequate to support learning activities, or resources are available, but not effectively utilized to increase student achievement. There is little monitoring of the use of resources for the optimization of student needs.		<p>levels of student achievement. From 2017-18 to 2018-19 examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Renewal of NWEA MAP license• Expansion of Reflex Math from 4th grade pilot to 1st-8th grades• Increasing the number of Chromebooks based on assessments of learner productivity <p>Pages 46-49 of the Charter Renewal Petition include additional examples of specific goals/allocations of resources based on evaluation evidenced in the CRP.</p> <p>There is an identified Reclassification Criteria for English Learners. Assessment is also being used to determine which English Learners receive push-in and pull-out services.</p> <p>There was no evidence that data is being collected specifically around Long Term English Learners (20 students) or At-Risk English Learners. Additionally, such students are not receiving direct English Learner services.</p>
1.5	Promotes a safe, healthy and nurturing learning environment characterized by trust, caring and professionalism	The school has a strong sense of community, which allows students to take on academic risks and challenges. Most/all students in the school feel that they have one or more adults that they can trust. The school environment is free of violence, the threat of violence, and bullying; and solid discipline policies and practices, safety procedures and crisis plans are in place. The learning environment is clean, attractive, functional, and comfortable and promotes student health and wellness. Students feel supported and respected by teachers and staff. LCAP reflects a dedication to providing a safe learning environment and consistent achievement of or progress toward learning environment LCAP goals.	The school has a limited sense of community. Inadequate facilities and/or lack of clear discipline policies or effective practices, or safety procedures do not support a safe or comfortable learning environment. There is little interaction between adults and students at the school outside of formal classroom instructional time. LCAP does not adequately reflect commitment to promoting safe learning environment or school has failed to consistently implement stated LCAP goals in this area.	4	<p>There are common learner expectations across the campus. In 5 of 12 classes visited, there were community agreements referred to during the lessons. Classrooms are organized and well equipped with the necessary tools for learning. The campus has many spaces for small group instruction and for social interaction.</p> <p>Students were smiling and seemed to understand the routines in the school, including passing periods, lunches, PE, and recess. When asked about how safe the students feel on campus (0 not safe to 5 totally safe), the median score was a 4 from the K-5 group. NEA's Fall 2017 Dashboard Performance shows a yellow or orange performance level for all students and most subgroups in the areas of suspensions; however, suspension rate has significantly declined from the previous year.</p>

1.6	Involves staff, students, parents and other stakeholders (including the school's authorizer) in its accountability for student learning and provides regular, public reports on the school's progress towards achieving its goals	Parents/families are given accessible and relevant information about their child's progress through a variety of methods to communicate student achievement, which include progress reports, report cards, parent/student meetings, etc. Students and parents are well-informed of the class/course learning objectives and of their child's progress on those objectives throughout the school year. The school provides schoolwide progress reports and student achievement data to the school community and other stakeholders, including its authorizer, on a regular basis and solicits feedback and assessment of school progress through parent/student/teacher (and other stakeholders) surveys. School leadership participates in the development of a school accountability report card as required by law.	School leadership participates in the development of a basic school accountability report card but provides little or no other school progress reports to the school's community and/or its authorizer.	4	<p>NEA regularly involves a range of stakeholders in accountability reviews and routinely reports out on the school's progress toward goals. Methods include school committees, school site council, the CLCS governing board, PTSA, school wide events, and the overall WASC/LCAP processes. There was evidence that NEA conducts ELAC meetings in support of their English Learner families.</p> <p>The CLCS board regularly receives input from students, staff, and parents through participation in school and CLCS board meetings and through a dedicated feedback email address and in informal communication.</p> <p>Nea provides performance data to AUSD consistent with its charter and applicable MOUs.</p>
1.7	Maximize access to learning environment for all students	Student suspension and expulsion rates are consistent with an effort to maximizing learning time for students; student suspension and expulsions do not fall disproportionately on a one or more identifiable subgroups of students, including but not limited to students of color and students receiving special education services. Students receiving special education services are served in the least restrictive environment in order to maximize access to the school's education program.	Student suspension and expulsion rates materially affect student learning time. Suspensions and expulsions consistently fall disproportionately on a one or more identifiable subgroups of students. There is a pattern of students receiving special education services being either excluded from the school or served in overly restrictive environments that unnecessarily served in environments that reduce access to the school's education program.	3	<p>Suspension rates remain high as measured against comparable schools. However, the school is aware of the issue, has targeted it for reduction through increased use of restorative practices, and has seen a decrease in suspensions over the past year (see dashboard data below).</p> <p>All students with disabilities at the school are fully integrated into the general education environment. However, the Lower Village serves a lower percentage of students with disabilities than do comparable schools (see data in table below). Moreover, those students enrolled tend to fall more in the mild/moderate category than the moderate/severe category. As a result, it is difficult to fully evaluate the effectiveness of the K-5 special education program. The Upper Village enrolls students with disabilities at a rate equal to or exceeding comparable district schools (see table below). The high rate of secondary SWDs would often raise questions about the effectiveness of the K-5 special education program; however, the rate of student turnover from the Lower to Upper Village means that the increase in secondary SWDs is largely due to the enrollment of a new population of students at the secondary level.</p>

NEA’s performance on the Fall 2017 California School Dashboard is as follows:

Subgroup	Suspension	ELA	Math
All Students	YELLOW High (5.1%) Declined (-1.3%)	ORANGE Low (22.7 below) Declined Significantly (-24.4)	ORANGE Low (44 below) Declined (-3.4)
English Learners	GREEN Medium (3.9%) Declined Significantly (-5.8%)	ORANGE Low (61.3 below) Declined Significantly (-38.5)	ORANGE Low (77.3 below) Declined Significantly (-18.7)
SED	YELLOW Very High (11.3%) Declined Significantly (-2.7%)	RED Very Low (74.5 below) Declined Significantly (-24.6)	ORANGE Low (94.6 below) Declined (-5.9)
SWD	YELLOW Very High (10.9%) Declined Significantly (-5%)	N/A Very Low (116.7 below) Declined Significantly (-16.7)	N/A Very Low (123.8 below) Increased Significantly (19.7)
African American	YELLOW Very High (14.4%) Declined Significantly (-3.9%)	ORANGE Low (68.1 below) Declined Significantly (-17.3)	RED Very Low (98.7 below) Maintained (-1.6)
Asian	ORANGE Medium (3.9%) Increased Significantly (3.9%)	N/A Low (8.7 below) Declined Significantly (-34.6)	N/A Medium (23.3 below) Declined Significantly (-32.3)
Hispanic	GREEN Medium (3.9%) Declined Significantly (-2.6%)	ORANGE Low (45.1 below) Maintained (-.5)	YELLOW Low (66 below) Increased Significantly (17.7)
2 or more races	YELLOW High (6.1%) Declined Significantly (-2.4%)	N/A Low (20 below) Declined Significantly (-28.8)	N/A Low (26.1 below) Declined Significantly (-18.9)
White	GREEN Low (1.7%) Declined (-.4%)	GREEN High (14.7 above) Declined Significantly (-30.5)	YELLOW Medium (11.8 below) Declined (-3.8)

Graduation Rate: Low for all students (82.8%) with an Increase of 5.2%, Low for SED (78.6%) with decrease of 6%. English Learner Progress was High with 79.2% Encinal Junior/Senior High School had a graduation rate of 90.5%

17-18 Demographics	NEA Overall		NEA K-5		NEA 6-8		NEA 9-12		Paden K-5		Maya Lin K-5		WMS 6-8		JJ 6-8		EHS 9-12	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total Enrollment	553		300		118		135		374		415		519		295		1034	
English Learners	62	11%	33	11%	17	14%	12	9%	111	30%	59	14%	103	20%	43	15%	147	14%
SED	178	32%		19%		44%		37%	168	45%	97	23%	261	50%				
SWD	48	9%		9%		11%		20%	38	10%	78	19%	80	15%				
Black/African American	93	17%	32	11%	26	22%	35	26%	28	7%	24	6%	54	10%	42	14%	141	14%
Asian	58	10%	35	12%	9	8%	14	10%	102	27%	57	14%	156	30%	57	19%	252	24%
Filipino	19	3%	7	2%	4	3%	8	6%	31	8%	23	6%	47	9%	37	13%	145	14%
Hispanic/Latino	108	20%	39	13%	28	24%	41	30%	64	17%	60	14%	101	19%	52	18%	155	15%
2 or more races	73	13%	42	14%	18	15%	13	10%	52	14%	54	13%	39	8%	22	7%	76	7%
White	165	30%	127	42%	22	19%	16	12%	81	22%	184	44%	108	21%	80	27%	244	24%
Not Reported	34	6%	16	5%	11	9%	7	5%	11	3%	12	3%	4	1%	0	0%	4	0%

Reported by NEA in Demographic Data Request

All other data from CDE Dataquest

MATH SBAC 17	NEA Overall		AUSD Overall		NEA 5 th		NEA 8 th		NEA 11 th		Paden 5 th		Maya Lin 5 th		WMS 8 th		JJ 8 th		EHS 11 th	
	#	%	%		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Students		34%	60%			41%		31%		50%		57%		45%		49%		59%		64%
English Learners		11%	36%											23%		29%		13%		17%
SED		19%	40%					27%				39%		35%		47%		29%		31%
SWD		18%	18%											20%		7%		8%		0%
Black/African American		15%	26%					18%								35%		29%		20%
Asian		44%	71%									64%		55%		72%		53%		52%
Filipino			51%													42%		38%		32%
Hispanic/Latino		22%	44%			27%		8%				27%				28%		46%		33%
2 or more races		45%	66%																	40%
White		48%	68%			48%								54%		46%		50%		52%

ELA SBAC 17	NEA Overall		AUSD Overall		NEA 5th		NEA 8th		NEA 11th		Paden 5th		Maya Lin 5th		WMS 8th		JJ 8th		EHS 11th	
	#	%	%		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Students		44%	68%			57%		47%		30%		66%		36%		61%		44%		43%
English Learners		14%	32%											8%		32%		20%		20%
SED		31%	48%					36%				39%		25%		60%		45%		43%
SWD		15%	22%											0%		6%		15%		21%
Black/African American		28%	34%					45%								39%		43%		32%
Asian		60%	73%									64%		27%		69%		68%		63%
Filipino			65%													69%		62%		55%
Hispanic/Latino		33%	57%			36%		25%				45%				52%		54%		58%
2 or more races		45%	71%																	60%
White		66%	78%			71%								54%		69%		73%		82%

Criteria 2: Strong Leadership and Responsible Governance (Standards 2, 3)

The leaders of a charter school are stewards of the charter’s mission and vision and carry out their duties in a professional, responsible and ethical manner. Charter school leaders use their influence and authority for the primary purpose of achieving student success.

Rubric Element	Criterion Description	Level 5 Equivalent	Level 2 Equivalent	Level	Evidence and Discussion
2.1	Effectively communicates and engages stakeholders in the mission and vision of the school	<p>The board and school leadership clearly and effectively communicate the mission, goals, pedagogical approach and education model of the school with all relevant stakeholder groups. Stakeholders are active supporters and communicators of the mission and vision to the school community. The mission and vision of the school is clearly articulated, well-known by school stakeholders, and implemented in daily practice.</p>	<p>Communication regarding the mission and vision with stakeholders is sporadic and/or inconsistent. The school's mission and vision are known and understood by few of the school's stakeholders.</p>	4	<p>Parents/guardians were able to clearly communicate many, if not all, of the school's key mission/vision components. They discussed the school's focus on personalized, flexible, and choice-oriented learning environments. They also talked about the school's celebration of diversity, the students' ownership over their learning, and the level of participation students have in the overall school leadership.</p> <p>Parents/guardians also discussed their appreciation of the school's level of communication, particularly in digital form. They felt informed about school activities and key issues. This in turn translated, for them, into greater awareness and engagement in the school's mission and vision.</p> <p>Teachers were able to communicate the mission/vision to AUSD staff during site visits. Implementation of the vision (specifically the emphasis on technology-rich and project-based learning) was not consistently visible in classroom observations, particularly in the Upper Village (6-12) program.</p> <p>The CLCS governing board engaged in a strategic planning process intended to link the school's mission and vision to board- and school-level decision-making. CLCS board considers progress toward school mission every other month and public board meetings.</p>
2.2	Generates and sustains a school culture conducive to staff professional growth	<p>The school leadership provides professional development (PD) opportunities that advance the effectiveness of teaching and learning and monitors that professional development for impact on school achievement. There is open and clear communication between students, staff, and administration; and teachers are empowered to demonstrate teacher leadership throughout the school, as well as establish goals for professional growth.</p>	<p>Staff development is restricted to individuals with little or no link to meeting overall schoolwide goals or to the performance of students. The types of professional development in which teachers participate are limited and/or not relevant to individual and schoolwide needs. Staff does not set goals for professional growth.</p>	4	<p>NEA leadership has implemented a short and long-term professional development cycle that supports a range of staff needs including capacity building for individuals and team, implementation of school initiatives, and personal choice. The leadership team and teacher focus group both described PLC Wednesdays, a time that rotates in purpose to serve different needs. Current PD includes monthly MTSS meetings and an ongoing equity-based strand (3-year project). PD topics are informed by staff surveys and other input as well as the leadership team's needs assessment. Teachers report enjoying the 'facilitator scholar strand' implemented in recent years. This allows each staff member to choose a research topic, engage in inquiry, and present their learning at the end of the year in a colloquium format. Other use of shared PD time have included data chats focusing on MAP, benchmark, and other available data, meetings with the school's equity consultant, and co-planning curriculum.</p> <p>There is strong evidence of leadership designing structures to support and sustain a school culture conducive to staff professional growth. Staff generally report having a strong voice in selection of PD topics and the alignment of the PD received to their daily work.</p>

2.3	Treats all individuals with fairness, dignity and respect	School leaders ensure that school policies regarding equal opportunity and unlawful harassment are effectively implemented. There is open communication among the staff and with the leadership team. School stakeholders report that they are treated with fairness, dignity, and respect and that school leadership is working effectively to create an optimal teaching and learning environment. Complaints regarding the above are not systematic and are resolved through the Uniform Complaint Process or a process that provides equivalent procedural protections.	There are gaps in communication in the school. Policies regarding equal opportunity, unlawful harassment, or other complaints are nonexistent are/or ineffectively implemented. Stakeholders do not feel they have a voice in the school.	3	<p>School has adopted a uniform complaint policy (see attached background materials). Both school leadership and governing board demonstrate understanding of their respective roles in that complaint process.</p> <p>However, District has received several inquiries from Nea stakeholders during the most recent charter term regarding what Nea’s complaint policy is and where to find it. Complaint policies have not consistently been available on a prominent place on the school’s website.</p> <p>Student feedback regarding inclusivity and fairness was consistently positive.</p>
2.4	Has a cogent understanding of the laws that govern charter schools and monitors the trends, issues and potential changes in the environment in which charter schools operate	The school administration and governing board consists of individuals who are experienced in managing organizations and who are well-versed in charter law. School administrators and board members actively and regularly seek information and professional development related to charter operations and laws; and new board members are given a formal, relevant orientation on the purpose and educational vision of the school and on their roles and legal responsibilities. The charter school governing board adheres to and consistently follows a fully adopted set of bylaws which includes: conflicts of interest policies, meeting protocols and procedures, and formal delineations of roles and authorities within the school. Conflicts of interest and conflict resolution policies are comprehensive and clear. School has no recorded instances of material charter law or applicable labor law violation during the charter term. IDEA and Section 504 obligations are consistently met.	Board representation is limited; few are engaged in or understand the charter law. Opportunities for board members to take part in professional development or seek information regarding charter operations, trends and law are limited. Responsibilities and roles of leaders, governing bodies and staff are unclear. Bylaws regarding conflicts of interest, meeting protocols, delineation of roles and responsibilities are not well understood and/or followed by the school. Process for conflict resolution is not well understood and/or consistently implemented. There is a pattern of charter or labor law violations during the term of the charter. There is a pattern or IDEA or Section 504 violations established by CDE or OCR findings or due process proceedings.	2	<p>Based on the NEA Upper Village master schedule for Fall 2018, there were 19 secondary teachers listed. Of the 19 teachers, five (5) are misassigned and not teaching under the proper credential. While the 5 individuals are credentialed in another area, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) does not indicate they have an emergency permit on file for the content in which they are misassigned. Three (3) teachers do not possess any documents per a public search on CTC. Another three (3) teachers were listed on the master schedule but were not on the paperwork provided. Over ⅓ of staff are either misassigned or not credentialed.</p> <p>Per ESSA, an individual is “qualified” to teach a particular content area if they possess the proper credential. Core academic areas are multiple subject, English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, world language, civics/government, economics, history, geography, and the arts. Teachers of core or college prep courses must hold a valid credential. The Legislature provide charter schools some flexibility with noncore, noncollege prep courses.</p> <p>Governing board has developed new member onboarding process designed to ensure new members have a foundational understanding of charter law. Board receives training on Brown Act. Board has clear understanding of its role versus the role of the Executive Director and provides oversight of decision-making by senior staff.</p> <p>Governing board removed AUSD representative in violation of the Education Code; matter remains unremedied.</p>
2.5	Consistently engages in timely reporting of required information to the District, the County, and the State	The school provides required reports and responds to reasonable inquiries about student performance, academic progress and the school’s fiscal health in a thorough, accurate and timely manner. Formats for reporting comply with stated requirements, and any variances are explained. The legal and fiscal authorities and responsibilities of the school and of the authorizer is clearly articulated in writing, and clearly defined operational agreements, contracts, MOU's, and/or protocols have been established with the authorizing agency in key areas such as liability, special education, and facilities.	There is limited communication between the school and its authorizer. Reports and/or responses to inquiries are late and/or incomplete. Operational agreements are vague or non-existent and formal delineation of key areas of responsibility are unclear.	4	School provides required data to AUSD on a regular basis, although reporting is not always timely. School and AUSD successfully negotiated and implemented facilities agreement and operational MOUs during previous charter term.

2.6	Maintains effective and active control of the charter school and seeks input from impacted stakeholders	Governing board has adopted a policy, decision matrix or delegation of powers that identifies the authority and role of stakeholders (individuals and groups) involved with the school. All stakeholders participating in the decision-making process understand their role, who has the final decision-making authority, and what process will be used. In addition, the school establishes regular opportunities for stakeholders to address the administration and board (i.e. parent meetings, surveys, staff meetings, student forums, etc.). The board conducts its meetings regularly (at least quarterly) and in an organized and effective manner to encourage public comment and participation. All board meetings are held in accordance with applicable provisions of law, appropriate recording of all actions taken is ensured, and Board records are maintained in a comprehensive and systematic manner, in both soft and hard copy. The board creates and adopts all necessary policies and ensures their consistent implementation.	Organization has no decision matrix or policy describing the delegation of decision-making authority of stakeholders (individuals and/or groups) involved with the school. Stakeholders are unaware of the decision-making process. The board does little to encourage or seek stakeholder participation or involvement. Governing board meetings are infrequent and materials are not provided in advance. Compliance with open meeting laws is inconsistent. Records of board discussion and action are not current and not maintained in a manner that is readily available to board, staff and community. Board relies on executive director/head of school to develop policies and procedures; defers on major decisions without active debate.	4	<p>CLCS Governing Board has clear understanding of its role versus the role of the Executive Director and provides oversight of decision-making by senior staff. Both board and senior leadership were able to articulate their various roles. Board bylaws clearly set out rules governing the board. Stakeholders have multiple ways to provide feedback and student and parent feedback regarding ability to provide inputs was consistently positive.</p> <p>In addition to Governing Board, Nea has its own school-specific operational board. School board has decision-making authority on academic matters including curriculum, and it provides input on school-level expenditure decisions.</p> <p>Board members and staff were able to verbally articulate respective roles. School has begun to develop written materials delineating respective responsibilities of governing board, school-level board, and management staff.</p> <p>Minutes of governing board meetings are kept and are available on the school's website. Brown Act procedures were inconsistently applied during discussions of AUSD board representative.</p>
2.7	Ensures implementation of the student recruitment, retention, and enrollment process intended in the charter and as defined by statute and regulation	The school leadership and staff follow the procedures described in the school's charter and policy. Recruitment strategies are consistent with the mission of the charter and focus on the targeted population which is inclusive of a diverse range of learners. All communications with families convey the same description of the process. Accurate records of applications, lottery results and wait lists are maintained. The results of the policy are reviewed annually with the board to ensure consistent implementation and to identify areas for improvement.	Student recruitment, retention and enrollment policies are not well-documented. Staff members communicating with families give inconsistent and/or inaccurate information regarding procedures. Enrollment and retention decisions are not consistent; with case-by-case exceptions made for some families depending on circumstances. Board is not informed of enrollment and retention results, other than in general terms.	3	<p>School's demographics broadly reflect successful recruiting strategies among a variety of communities. However, Lower Village serves proportionately fewer students with disabilities and socioeconomically disadvantaged students than comparison schools. In addition, over the term of the charter period Nea has struggled to retain Lower Village students as they articulate into the Upper Village (although retention improved this past year, see charter petition). The resulting student turnover has made it difficult for the school to implement a cohesive culture across the full K-12 program. School acknowledged this challenge during site visit.</p> <p>Board is aware of retention issue and seeking to address it through strategic planning process.</p> <p>Lottery recordkeeping is consistent with law and charter procedures. AUSD staff observed the lottery process on more than one occasion during the charter term and observed no irregularities.</p>

Criteria 3: A Focus on Continuous Improvement (Standards 1, 4)

A charter school engages in a process of continuous self-improvement in order to increase the effectiveness of its educational program. The school regularly assesses and evaluates student learning based on stated goals.

Rubric Element	Criterion Description	Level 5 Equivalent	Level 2 Equivalent	Level	Evidence and Discussion
3.1	Establishes benchmarks and a variety of accountability tools to monitor student progress throughout the year	An appropriate range of formative and summative assessments (which include state-mandated tests, schoolwide assessments and classroom level assessments) are used in making judgments about student progress towards curricular targets. These assessments are matched to well-defined benchmarks for student achievement. Data is used to adjust curriculum and teaching and learning strategies in order to accommodate the changing needs of students (i.e. reteaching, change grouping practices, targeted interventions or enrichment, etc.).	Schoolwide learning objectives and benchmarks are not clearly articulated nor assessed formally outside of statewide testing. Results of student assessments are minimally linked to a school wide improvement plan. There are minimal plans in place to address curricular needs, teacher competency and future staff development based on assessment data.	4	NEA utilizes a range of assessment tools to measure learner understanding and skill acquisition. In addition to established state assessments, NEA implements internal formative and summative assessments and elementary and senior portfolios/projects. Baseline assessments are used at the beginning of the school year to gauge level of mastery and inform each facilitator's instructional planning. Formative assessments are used ongoing to measure mastery. NEA also administers the NWEA MAP test to measure growth in grades 6-11 throughout the school year. Implemented in 2017-18, this assessment assigns growth targets for each student based on their initial scale score. NEA monitors student growth in reading, language usage, and math. In NEA's Charter Renewal Petition NEA uses MAP data to demonstrate areas in which they see the achievement gap closing. A full description of NEA's assessment methods can be found in the Charter Renewal Petition on pages 50-54 and 15-18.
3.2	Establishes both long and short term goals and uses information sources, data collection, and data analysis to actively monitor and evaluate the success of the school's program as described in its charter and LCAP.	The school's LCAP (and any other strategic plan) sets clear, measurable goals for improvement based on data analysis. Goals and plans are actionable, focused on student achievement and are measured by clear targets and timeframes. Short-term and long- term goals are regularly reviewed and appropriate resources to accomplish the plans are allocated accordingly. Goals and resource allocations are clearly linked and explained in the LCAP. LCAP evolves from year to year to reflect changes in data.	The school has a general plan in place for schoolwide improvement but does not identify interim, measurable targets to indicate sufficient progress. Input from stakeholders is limited. LCAPs consistently fail to clearly set out measurable goals or are not updated to reflect changes in data from year to year.	4	<p>Overall the school does establish both short and long-term goals that are generally linked to measurable metrics which can be monitored over time. Through the LCAP and the Charter Renewal Petition, there is evidence that the school is monitoring and evaluating the success of the program through analysis of the established LCAP goals/metrics. This can be observed in detail within the LCAP Annual Update section.</p> <p>On page 44-46 of NEA's Charter Renewal Petition, school goals are established by content area. With the exception of a specific attendance goal (meet or exceed 95% student attendance rate), the goals are directional in nature (maintain, increase, maximize, implement) but do not include specific targets. Within the school's LCAP, more specific targets are established for 2018-19 and 2019-20. These goals are established within specific metrics that the school is monitoring over time. An example is NEA's goal of increasing the percentage of all students meeting/exceeding standard in the ELA and Math SBAC by 3% each year.</p> <p>A follow-up for NEA leadership is to reflect on the relationship between the goals for ALL students (3% annual growth in each SBAC content area) and for subgroups (2% annual growth for ELs, SED students, and students in Special Education). With the goals for subgroups set lower than those for all students, the school has established higher growth goals for the subgroup of students who are English-only, not SED, and have no disability. Over time this will increase the already significant achievement gap observed for all the mentioned subgroups.</p> <p>Other goals set in the LCAP include increasing the percentage of positive responses on PD surveys, the percentage of students 8-12 with 4 year plans, attendance at parent events, number of students in the Healthy Fitness Zone, decreasing suspension rates, and decreasing truancy.</p>

Criteria 4: Fiscal Accountability (Standards 2, 3, 4)

A charter school fulfills its fiduciary responsibility for public funds and maintains publicly accessible fiscal records. The school conducts an annual financial audit, which is made public.

Rubric Element	Criterion Description	Level 5 Equivalent	Level 2 Equivalent	Level	Evidence and Discussion
4.1	Establishes clear fiscal policies to ensure that public funds are used appropriately and directly related to the school's purpose: student achievement of learning goals	The school adheres to an adopted fiscal policy and procedures manual that includes procedures for the authorization of purchases and release of funds, including signatories for checks or purchase orders over a specified threshold, and procedures related to credit cards and revolving cash funds. Bank reconciliations for all school-affiliated bank accounts are completed and reviewed on a monthly basis (person empowered to sign the check is not the same person, or related to the person, who reconciles the account). The school prioritizes funds to maintain a functional, clean, and safe learning environment and to provide adequate materials and equipment to support student learning. Financial decisions are made based on well- identified school-wide needs and priorities.	Fiscal policies are not readily accessible. There is a general understanding of policies and procedures but the staff is unaware of any written documents. Bank reconciliation is completed sporadically. There is also lack of evidence that sufficient funds are allocated to ensure functional, clean and/or safe learning environment is established or maintained. Financial decisions are made sporadically and without systemic approaches to address the needs of the students.	5	<p>There are clear fiscal policies to ensure that public funds are used appropriately and directly related to the school's purpose. Staff reviewed the following CLCS/ACLC/NEA Fiscal Policies and Procedures: Budget Development and Oversight Calendar and Responsibilities, Controls, Budget and Fiscal Management, Negotiating Funding Entitlements, Budget and Fiscal Reports, Property and Liability Insurance, Board Compensation, Authority to Enter Into Contracts and Agreements, Conflict of Interest, Fundraising, Grant Solicitation, and Donation Recognition.</p> <p>Based on review of the 16/17 Audit Report, there were no audit findings.</p> <p>EdTec reconciles school's bank accounts to the general ledger on a monthly basis and prepares 1) Balance Sheet, 2) Budget to Actual Comparison, and 3) Cash Flow Statement. After they are reviewed by the Executive Director and Finance Committees, they are presented to the Board by EdTec.</p> <p>Per conversation with the CEO and COO, school leadership prioritizes funds to maintain functional, clean, and safe learning environments and to provide adequate materials and equipment to support student learning.</p> <p>The CLCS Finance Committee works with Executive Director or the COO in the ED's absence and EdTec to review budget and ensure financial decisions are made on well-identified school-wide needs and priorities.</p>
4.2	Creates and monitors immediate and long-range financial plans to effectively implement the school's educational program and ensure financial stability and sustainability	Comprehensive budget assumptions are prepared during the budget process, and the school's governing body adopts a budget prior to the new fiscal year. The working budget is monitored against actuals at least monthly, including a review of ADA assumptions, and adjusted accordingly. All accounts payable obligations are up-to-date, appropriately described, and disclosed in financial statements. Long-term debt schedules and multi-year contracts, and capital projects are tracked and monitored on a regular basis within the budget and budgeting process. Annual reviews of significant operating costs are shared with all of those who make budget decisions (i.e. school director, board, etc.). Reserves or available credit are adequate to address cash needs.	Board does not consistently monitor budget assumptions with actuals. Accounts payable are not regularly updated. School leadership is unable to clearly identify major operating costs or articulate long-range financial plans. Board reports do not include cash flow analysis and projection of reserves.	5	<p>Based on FCMAT's Fiscal and Business Operations oversight checklist, the charter's risk analysis is low. There is evidence that school leadership creates and monitors immediate and long-range financial plans to effectively implement the school's educational program and ensure financial stability and sustainability. The Executive Director, or the COO in the ED's absence, and EdTec work with CLCS Finance Committee to prepare a set of proposed budget development principles for the CLCS Governing Board and Finance Committees.</p> <p>The budget is monitored and revised during interim reporting and on an ongoing basis by the ED, EdTec, Finance Committee and Governing Board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Based on review of the 16/17 Audit Report, there were no financial statement findings.The school maintains a high reserve level. Per review of the charter's 17/18 Unaudited Actuals, the school ended the year with 40% in reserves.

4.3	Conducts an annual financial audit which is made public	<p>The school is audited by a certified public accountant (CPA) or public accountant (PA) licensed by the California State Board of Accountancy (and not declared ineligible to conduct audits by the State Controller's Office). The school's audit is performed in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards to ensure that the school's finances are being managed in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and practices and the audit tests the validity of the charter school's ADA and reports these findings in the audit report.</p> <p>The charter school receives a school-specific audit report that includes financial statements and audit findings/conclusions specific to the charter school (unless completely dependent on the district) and includes a management letter commenting on areas of possible improvements (if any) in structures, procedures, and management practices of the school, as well as any factors that would prevent them from issuing an unqualified opinion on the financial statements.</p> <p>The charter school board reviews the audit report and responds to any audit findings and designs a corrective action plan to address these findings, and a copy of the audit is sent by the charter school to the authorizing agency, the COE and CDE by legally mandated deadlines, and the authorizing agency reviews the charter school's corrective action in response to any audit exceptions</p>	<p>Annually audited budgets are not made available and accessible to the public. Audit findings remain unresolved, or without sustainable systems in place to avoid recurrences. The audit report is not formally assessed by the governing board to resolve findings as part of its regular oversight procedures.</p>	5	<p>An annual financial audit is conducted by Squar Milner, an independent CPA firm. The charter received an unmodified report with no audit findings in the last three audit reports reviewed. (FY14/15-FY16/17)</p> <p>Per conversation with the ED, the audit report is presented to the board by the auditors.</p>
4.4	Enrollment is stable and/or growing at the rate anticipated by the charter school as projected in the approved charter and in the multi- year budget, with budget and expenditures revised at reasonable intervals based on actual enrollment and attendance.	<p>School projects enrollment as part of annual budget process and updates the budget if enrollment varies from the forecast. Expenditures are adjusted appropriately for changing enrollment, including changes in staffing. School tracks and reports to the governing board on patterns of enrollment and retention, and the effect on the school's long-term sustainability.</p>	<p>School has set no overall goal or plan for enrollment Stability or growth. School's enrollment projections for budget is not based on past experience or changing conditions. Budget is not adjusted and expenditures are not timely altered in response to enrollment variances from planned levels. Recruitment plans are not developed/adjusted in response to actual enrollment patterns. Enrollment trends are not regularly reported to the governing board.</p>	5	<p>Enrollment is expected to increase to 585 in 2019-20 and 598 in 2020-21, which appears reasonable and according to the charter's projections. The MYP reflects a corresponding increase to expenditures to reflect this anticipated increase to enrollment.</p>

4.5	Ensures financial resources are directly related to the school's stated program and goals	LCAP performance goals are directly reflected in the school's resource allocations. Three-year LCAP program is consistent with multi-year budget expenditure projections.	LCAP performance goals do not align with the school's resource allocations. LCAP is not reflected in or inconsistent with multi-year budget expenditure projections.	5	<p>Actions and services outlined in LCAP are aligned to stated program goals, including the overall Vision/Mission. A key element of NEA's vision includes a 'highly collaborative and flexible learning community accessible to all learners and learning styles.' This vision translates into LCAP goals that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Ensuring all students demonstrate academic growth and proficiencies so they leave K-12 ready for college/career○ Engage parents, staff, and community to promote unique educational opportunities for students. <p>Most of the key actions and services support the vision/goals. Aligned professional development (project-based learning, student centered learning, equity, mindfulness), personnel (ELD Specialist, College and Career Counselor, Special Education support staff), assessment systems to generate individual student data, inclusive instructional materials, and parent education all reflect the school's commitment to their vision/mission.</p>
4.6	School projects to maintain financial viability during proposed renewal charter term	Multi—year budget projections based on sound and transparently disclosed assumptions; current multi-year budget equivalent to a district budget which would receive a "Positive" certification from the Alameda County Office of Education.	Multi-year budget based on inconsistent, unreasonable, or unclear assumptions; current multi-year budget equivalent to a district budget which would receive a "Negative" certification from the Alameda County Office of Education.	5	<p>The school maintains high reserve levels and MYP (Multi-year Projections), and cash flow shows that the school will end fiscal year 2021-22 with a positive balance.</p> <p>MYP is equivalent to a district budget which would receive a "Positive" certification from the Alameda County Office of Education.</p>