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Evaluation Standards: Ten Elements of school evaluation – Part 2:

IX. Substantive Student Academic Achievement
X. Sound Financial Operations

NOTE:
In the Evidence columns, under Required Documents:
● Documents in bold blue must be submitted to the Charter School Office.
● Documents in bold black must be on hand, but do not need to be submitted to the Charter School Office.

Summary of Findings
Please note that the comments in this report reflect our analysis as of the end of the 2020-2021 school year.

Areas of Strength
● Established a strong fund balance
● Maintained healthy financial systems
● Academic growth, despite the challenges of the pandemic

Area for Growth
● Ensuring all students make at least one year of growth annually
## IX. Substantive Student Academic Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Sets and meets clear, meaningful, and measurable academic goals and student learning objectives as stated in the charter through an accountability plan (performance contract) with its sponsor. | 1) Articulates its curricular content and performance standards, including minimum student performance standards for advancement or graduation. | **Required Documents:**  
- Performance Contract |
| B. Demonstrates high expectations for student achievement. | 2) Student achievement targets in the accountability plan (performance contract) propel students towards proficient and advanced scores on state assessments and success in future educational and occupational settings. |  
3) Uses multiple forms of assessment, including growth measures assessments, to inform instructional decision making. |
| | 4) Implements assessments that collect data about students’ short-term acquisition and long-term mastery of essential knowledge. |  
5) Analyzes assessments to gauge students’ progress towards meeting school performance goals and makes instructional adjustments, as needed, to improve student achievement. |
| | 6) Tracks and disseminates growth data for students over time using both norm-referenced measures and state assessments. |  
7) Closes the achievement gap among sub-groups of students. |
| | 8) Complies with the accountability plan (performance contract) established with its sponsor. |  
9) Maintains an attendance rate that aligns with the school’s performance contract. |
| | 10) Maintains a high graduation rate (secondary schools) that aligns with the school’s performance contract. |  
Other Evidence  
- Teacher and instructional coordinator interviews  
- Internal formative and summative assessment data  
- MSIP-5 student achievement, attendance and retention data |
Element IX: Student Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Strength</th>
<th>Areas for Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**GENERAL NOTE:**
- Due to the pandemic, the state of Missouri did not administer MAP tests in spring, 2020. Neither the state nor UMSL has current student achievement data to analyze for school performance in this area.

**Introduction**
The last 4 years have presented challenges in assessing student achievement on state assessments in comparison to previous years in the same school and in comparison to similar public schools.

- **SY 2018:** DESE states, “A1 and E2 were excluded in 2017. New ELA and MA assessments in 2018. Direct comparison of MPI and proficiency rates across years is not advisable.”
- **SY 2019:** DESE states, “2018 and 2019 ELA and Math scores are not comparable to 2017 (and prior years) assessments.” For the first time, DESE did not compute a percentage in its APR reports for schools. The report provides information on three questions:
  - Growth (ELA and Math only): Are individual students making achievement gains over time?
  - Status (ELA and Math only): Are all students achieving at high levels at this point in time?
  - Progress (ELA, Math and Science): Is the school, district or charter making improvements over prior years?
- **SY 2020:** DESE states, “On March 19, 2020, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) announced the spring 2020 Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) assessments would not be administered, including Grade-Level (GLA), End-Course (EOC) and Missouri Assessment Program-Alternate (MAP-A) exams. Assessment data is not available for the 2020 school year.”
- **SY 2021:** Statewide assessments were administered, but DESE advised that results were not to be used for accountability purposes.

Because state assessment data are not to be considered for accountability purposes in SY 2021, the UMSL CSO amended the charter Performance Contract, as follows:

- **UMSL will not populate the cells in section E of its performance contracts with state assessment data from 2021 to compare against the performance targets listed in the 2021 column and will not hold Lafayette Preparatory Academy accountable for reaching these targets.**

- **Upon completion of the 2020-2021 school year, UMSL and Lafayette Preparatory Academy will determine the feasibility of adjusting the performance targets in section E for subsequent school years; allowing for the possibility that UMSL might not hold Lafayette Preparatory Academy accountable for reaching the performance targets listed in section E columns for 2022 and beyond.**
Internal Assessments

- Regarding internal assessments of student achievement,
  - Lafayette Preparatory Academy will:
    - Within constraints arising from the pandemic and to the best of its ability:
      - Administer a nationally normed assessment for student achievement in ELA and math to all students at least twice during the 2020-21 school year.
      - Establish individual student growth targets based on data from the assessment(s).
    - Share the data from the assessment(s) with UMSL.
    - At the end of the 2020-2021 school year, share findings related to individual student annual growth outcomes with UMSL.
  - UMSL will NOT:
    - Hold Lafayette Preparatory Academy accountable for students reaching their individual growth targets based on data from the internal assessments administered in 2020-21.
  - UMSL will:
    - Incorporate internal assessment outcomes related to individual student growth in its 2021 annual review report; specifically, in the section on student academic achievement.

Comparisons with SLPS Schools

- UMSL may compare Lafayette Preparatory Academy’s 2020-2021 state assessment outcomes with those of comparable schools within St. Louis Public Schools; with the understanding that the comparison will account for variance in the attendance models (in-person, fixed-blended and virtual) each school followed, including shifts between the models through the school year.

After the assessments were administered in SY21, and DESE has revealed that LEA-level data will be made available publicly on December 1, 2021, but it is unlikely school-level data will be released, the UMSL CSO has determined only internal assessment data will be reported. Comparisons to SLPS schools will not be made because comparison data is not available.

Internal Data

Data was collected from the iReady and NWEA Assessments taken in both fall and spring and took into consideration only those students who took both the fall and spring assessment.
IReady Reading: Grades K-8
* Analysis is pulled directly from summative reports submitted by Sarah Ranney, of LPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Progress Made Toward Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Stretch Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= 19% Typical Growth</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%-39% Typical Growth</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%-59% Typical Growth</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%-79% Typical Growth</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-99% Typical Growth</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% Typical Growth</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 64% made at least 80% of typical growth; 44% made at least 80% of stretch growth goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Levels</th>
<th>Fall %</th>
<th>Spring %</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade Level, Intervention Needed</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Grade Level, Grade-Level Instruction</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Grade Level, Accelerated Instruction</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 86% of students are ready for “at or above grade level” instruction (up from 78% in the fall)

IReady Math: Grades 2-8
## iReady Progress to Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Progress Made Toward Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Stretch Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= 19% Typical Growth</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%-39% Typical Growth</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%-59% Typical Growth</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%-79% Typical Growth</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-99% Typical Growth</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% Typical Growth</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 51% made at least 80% of typical growth; 26% made at least 80% of stretch growth goals

## iReady Reading Achievement Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall %</th>
<th>Spring %</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Grade Level, Intervention Needed</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Grade Level, Grade-Level Instruction</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Grade Level, Accelerated Instruction</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 88% of students are ready for “at or above grade level” instruction (up from 78% in the fall)

## Findings

- **ELA**
  - 64% made at least 80% of typical growth; 44% made at least 80% of stretch growth goals
  - 86% of students are ready for “at or above grade level” instruction (up from 78% in the fall)
• Math
  ○ 51% made at least 80% of typical growth; 26% made at least 80% of stretch growth goals
  ○ 88% of students are ready for “at or above grade level” instruction (up from 78% in the fall)

Conclusion
The challenges of understanding student growth during the 2020-2021 school year were many, as schools adjusted to meet students’ needs during the COVID-19 pandemic. Conditions for administering assessments were less than ideal; platforms for learning were varied between virtual, on-site, and hybrid models; students and staff were operating with additional stressors and trauma.

Even with the challenges, most students at Lafayette Preparatory Academy made typical growth in both Math and ELA. Further, 20% more in ELA and 27% more in Math are above grade level, as compared to the fall. LPA did an excellent job of ensuring students continued to learn despite the challenges of the pandemic.

IX. Sound Financial Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Fulfills its fiduciary responsibility for public funds by ensuring the school operates in a fiscally sound and appropriate manner. | 1) Preserves a minimum of three percent budget surplus. 2) Maintains accessible and appropriate fiscal records. 3) Core Data and other required school reporting is conducted in a timely and appropriate manner. 4) Conducts an annual financial audit. 5) Ensures that school business and expenses, including personnel, are made free of conflict of interest and directed toward meeting the mission of the school through: a) Board review of monthly check register b) Oversight of credit card expenses c) Oversight of cash management d) Monitoring attendance reporting e) Provision of insurance coverage including: i) Director and Officers | Documents
• Annual Secretary to the Board Report (ASBR)
• Independent Annual Audit
• Cash Flow Projection and Analysis
• Annual Debt Report
• Tear Sheet and Invoice for Locally Published Annual Audit
• Monthly Check Registers
• Monthly Bank Statements and Cash Reconciliations
• Quarterly Reports
• Proof of Insurance Statements |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Dishonesty</th>
<th>Other Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Liability</td>
<td>● Interview with CFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Liability</td>
<td>● Payroll and retirement records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>● Core Data Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmen’s Compensation</td>
<td>● Evidence in board minutes that the check register has been reviewed and approved by the board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Establishes clear fiscal policies that use public funds appropriately

| 1) Adhere to an adopted and board approved fiscal policy and procedures manual. | Documents |
| 2) Ensure fiscal policies include procedures for the authorization of purchases and release of funds | ● Annual Budget |
| 3) Adopt a budget by June 30 for the upcoming fiscal year. | ● Monthly Financial Statements |
| 4) Ensure that the budgeting process maintains a direct focus on teaching and learning needs with a fiscal balance to cover expenses with revenue. | ● Banking Information |

C. Ensures financial resources are directly related to the school's purpose: student achievement and learning

| 1) Ensure that the school’s physical space, materials, and supplies are conducive to accomplishing the charter’s school-wide learning goals as specified in the charter. | Documents |
| 2) Establish policies to ensure that contracts reflect fair market value. | ● Staff Salary Records (including average staff salary) |
| 3) Determine compensation levels for employees that are appropriate for the positions and responsibilities and that are consistent with industry norms | Other Evidence |

Element X: Financial Operations

In review of information provided by Lafayette Preparatory Academy the following is the analysis of Lafayette Preparatory Academy’s financial picture:

- FY17 ending fund balance reported on the ASBR was 23.2%; $502,989
- FY18 ending fund balance reported on the ASBR was 26.24%; $711,244
- FY19 ending fund balance reported on the ASBR was 38.16%; $1,166,936
- FY20 ending fund balance reported on the ASBR was 44.19%; $1,625,948
- FY21 ending fund balance reported on the ASBR was 50.39%; $2,025,273

Concerns - No concerns.

Standard A

- ASBR: The ASBR was filed on time.
- Independent Annual Audit: Complete. The FY20 Audit was approved by the Board and submitted to DESE on time.
- Cash Flow Projection and Analysis: School maintains a monthly cash flow document. Cash flow projections approved by the Board
- Annual Debt Report: The school received an SBA PPP Forgiveness Loan in FY20. The loan was forgiven in FY21; other loans are submitted to the state.
- Audit Published: FY20 was published in Missouri Lawyers Media.
- Evidence - Information provided by Susan Marino and Shannon Spradling.

Recommendations - None

Standard B

- Annual Budget: Board approved and amendments were made as presented for FY21 and current year FY22.
- Monthly Financial Statements: Monthly financial statements are reviewed and approved by the Board and published on website
- Banking Information: Cash is invested at Regions money market account and outside Certificates of Deposit at other banks.
- Account Coding: Coding is in compliance with DESE Financial Accounting requirements

Recommendations - None

Standard C

- Board approves all hiring agreements
- The average teaching salary in FY21 is $47,707.

Recommendations - None