

Evaluation Rubric SY2025

Face to Face Academy

SECTION I – IS THE LEARNING PROGRAM A SUCCESS?

1.1 MCA Proficiency: Are students performing as well as or better than the state, the resident district, and comparison schools on MCA math and reading exams?

1.1a Reading

1.1b Mathematics

Note that for Face to Face Academy, comparison schools include 3-4 demographically similar comparison schools with the MDE-generated virtual comparison (when available) serving as an additional comparison school.

1 = Does not meet standard More than 10 percentage points below comparison groups

2 = Approaching standard 6-10 percentage points below comparison groups

3 = Meets standard Within 5 percentage points of comparison groups

4 = Exceeds standard Exceeds comparison group by more than 5 percentage points

SY2024-2025 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2024)

	Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	50%			
Average of demographic match schools	3.3%	4	37.5	1.5
Resident district	18.2%	4	37.5%	1.5
State	35%	4	25%	1
			100%	Math Total:4
	Reading Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	36.8%			
Average of demographic match schools	22.2%	4	37.5%	1.5
Resident district	41.70%	3	37.5%	1.125
State	52.2%	1	25%	.25
			100%	Reading Total: 2.875

SY2024-2025 Rating 1.a: 4 1.b: 2.875 Overall: 3.44																																																												
Comments: F2F maintained its math proficiency at 50%. Students outperformed their peers in comparable schools as well as the resident district and state.																																																												
This is the first year that F2F's number of students taking the Reading MCA was large enough to be reported. F2F students outperformed their peers in comparable schools and were within range of the resident district. They were below the state proficiency level.																																																												
SY2023-2024 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2023)																																																												
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Math Proficiency</th> <th>Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)</th> <th>Weight</th> <th>Points earned</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Charter School (CS)</td> <td>50%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average of demographic match schools</td> <td>3.3%</td> <td>4</td> <td>37.5</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Resident district</td> <td>19.4%</td> <td>4</td> <td>37.5%</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>State</td> <td>36.00%</td> <td>4</td> <td>25%</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>100%</td> <td>Math Total: 4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Reading Proficiency</th> <th>Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)</th> <th>Weight</th> <th>Points earned</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Charter School (CS)</td> <td>CTSR</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average of demographic match schools</td> <td>22.2%</td> <td>N/A – CTSR</td> <td>37.5%</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Resident district</td> <td>37.8%</td> <td>N/A – CTSR</td> <td>37.5%</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>State</td> <td>51.7%</td> <td>N/A CTSR</td> <td>25%</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>100%</td> <td>Reading Total: N/A - CTSR</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned	Charter School (CS)	50%				Average of demographic match schools	3.3%	4	37.5	4	Resident district	19.4%	4	37.5%	4	State	36.00%	4	25%	4				100%	Math Total: 4		Reading Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned	Charter School (CS)	CTSR				Average of demographic match schools	22.2%	N/A – CTSR	37.5%	N/A	Resident district	37.8%	N/A – CTSR	37.5%	N/A	State	51.7%	N/A CTSR	25%	N/A				100%	Reading Total: N/A - CTSR
	Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned																																																								
Charter School (CS)	50%																																																											
Average of demographic match schools	3.3%	4	37.5	4																																																								
Resident district	19.4%	4	37.5%	4																																																								
State	36.00%	4	25%	4																																																								
			100%	Math Total: 4																																																								
	Reading Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned																																																								
Charter School (CS)	CTSR																																																											
Average of demographic match schools	22.2%	N/A – CTSR	37.5%	N/A																																																								
Resident district	37.8%	N/A – CTSR	37.5%	N/A																																																								
State	51.7%	N/A CTSR	25%	N/A																																																								
			100%	Reading Total: N/A - CTSR																																																								
SY2023-2024 Rating 1.a: 4 1.b: NA Overall: 4																																																												

Comments: F2F increased math proficiency significantly from the previous year with students outperforming their peers in comparable schools as well as the resident district and state.

SY2022-2023 Rating (Based on academic results from SY2022)

	Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	13%			
Average of demographic match schools	0%	4	37.5	1.5
Resident district	18%	3	37.5%	1.13
State	36.6	1	25%	.25
			100%	Math Total: 2.88
	Reading Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	CTSR			
Average of demographic match schools	27.25	N/A – CTSR	37.5%	N/A
Resident district	44.9%	N/A – CTSR	37.5%	N/A
State	55.16	N/A CTSR	25%	N/A
			100%	Reading Total: N/A - CTSR

SY 2022-23 Rating

1.1a Reading: N/A - CTSR

1.1b Mathematics: 2.88

Overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 2.88

Comments/Evidence: The school compared favorably to its demographically comparable schools in both math and reading. Reading scores cannot be recorded as the evaluation is a public document and cell sizes were too small to publish results.

SY 2021-22 Rating

	Reading Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned

Charter School (CS)	N/A			
Average of demographic match schools	N/A		37.5%	
Resident district	23.73%		37.5%	
State	41.40%		25%	
			100%	Reading Total: N/A
	Math Proficiency	Score (see criteria for 1-4 above)	Weight	Points earned
Charter School (CS)	0%			
Average of demographic match schools	N/A		37.5%	
Resident district	45.65%		37.5%	
State	58.22%		25%	
			100%	Math Total: 1

SY 2021-22 Rating

1.1a Reading: N/A

1.1b Mathematics: 1

Overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 1

Comments/Evidence: Fewer than 10 students took reading MCAs in SY2021, and cell sizes for demographic comparison schools were also too small to report. Note that for SY2021 results on measures using standardized test data are provided for informational purposes only and will not be included in roll-up average scores.

1.2 MCA Proficiency for Students in Poverty: Are students living in poverty (defined as qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch) performing as well as or better than the state and resident district on MCA math and reading exams? (Note: State and resident district are weighted equally in this measure. For this and all measures below, if analysis results in different scores for Reading and Math, report overall average for the measure, i.e., 2 for Reading and 3 for Math, = 2.5, etc.)

1.2a Reading

1.2b Mathematics

1 = Does not meet standard More than 10 percentage points below comparison group.

2 = Approaching standard 5-10 percentage points below comparison group.

3 = Meets standard Within fewer than 5 percentage points of comparison group.

4 = Exceeds standard Exceeds comparison group by 5 or more percentage points.

SY2024-25 Rating (based on MCA 2024)

1.2a Reading: 3.5
1.2b Mathematics: CTSTR

Overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.5

Comments/Evidence:

Reading: State 37.1 %, District 31.8%, F2F 37.5% $\rightarrow (3+4)/2 = 3.5$

Math: State: %, District %, F2F CTSTR% \rightarrow N/A (CTSTR)

The math data is not available due to small cell sizes.

SY2023-24 Rating

1.2a Reading: 2

1.2b Mathematics: 4

Overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3

Comments/Evidence:

Reading: State: 37.3%, District 27.9%, F2F 25% $\rightarrow (1+3)/2=2$

Math: State: 18.4%, District 12.1%, F2F 35.7% $\rightarrow (4+4)/2=3.5$

SY2022-23 Rating

1.2a Reading: 4

1.2b Mathematics: 3.5

Overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.75

Comments/Evidence:

Reading: State: 37.4%, District 36.4%, F2F 60% $\rightarrow (4+4)/2=4$

Math: State: 16.1%, District 9.8%, F2F 20% $\rightarrow (3+4)/2=3.5$

SY2021-22 Rating

1.2a Reading: N/A

1.2b Mathematics: N/A

Overall score produced by the average of these two scores: N/A

Comments/Evidence: This data is not available due to small cell sizes.

Source: MCA data available on MDE website or school self report if cell size is too small, Test data spreadsheets

1.3 MCA Progress: Are students maintaining or moving toward proficiency? Note: Maintaining proficiency is defined as students who were proficient (meeting or exceeding) remaining in either the meeting or exceeding category. Moving toward proficiency is defined as a student moving up one or more 'levels' (does not meet to partially meets; partially meets to proficient, etc.) or a student who scored below 820 on the math and/or reading MCA growing to a minimum score of 1030 (reading) or 1130 (math).

1.3a Reading
1.3b Mathematics

Note that year one data will be collected as a baseline with thresholds set the following year.

1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 35 percent of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency.
2 = Approaching standard	35-49.9 percent of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency.
3 = Meets standard	50-54.9 percent of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency.
4 = Exceeds standard	More than 55 percent of students are maintaining or moving toward proficiency.

SY2024-2025

1.3a Reading = 4
1.3b Math = 4
Overall = 4

Comments:

Data is currently unavailable on the MDE MN Report Card. However, F2F independently calculated and reported MCA Progress in their Annual Report.

- 88.9% of students achieved growth targets in reading.
- 70% of students achieved growth targets in math.

SY2023-2024

1.3a Reading = CSTR
1.3b Math = 4
Overall = 4

Comments: F2F consistently demonstrates the ability to support students in making gains in both reading and math with 75% of students meeting growth targets.

SY2022-2023

1.3a Reading: 83.3% = 4
1.3b Mathematics: 70% = 4
Overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 4

Comments/Evidence: While cell sizes were small, students consistently demonstrated their ability to make progress in both reading and mathematics.

SY2021-22

1.3a Reading: N/A
1.3b Mathematics: N/A
Overall score produced by the average of these two scores: N/A

Comments/Evidence: This data is not available

Source: MCA data available on MDE website or school self report if cell size is too small, Test data spreadsheets

1.4 Are students in grades 9-10 making substantial and adequate gains over time, as measured using the school's selected standardized assessments (NWEA testing percentage meeting RIT growth goals)?

1.4a Reading

1.4b Mathematics

1 = Does not meet standard Analysis indicates that a minimal proportion of tested students made expected gains (less than 40%).

2 = Approaching standard Analysis indicates that an inadequate proportion of tested students made expected gains (40%-49%).

3 = Meets standard Analysis indicates that an adequate proportion of tested students made expected gains (50%-65%).

4 = Exceeds standard Analysis indicates that an adequate proportion of tested students made expected gains (more than 65%).

SY 2024-2025

1.4a Reading: 4

1.4b Math: 4

Overall: 4

Comments:

70% of 9th and 10th graders met NWEA Reading Growth Goals.

75% of 9th and 10th graders met NWEA Math Growth Goals.

SY2023-2024

1.4a Reading: NA

1.4b Math: NA

Overall:NA

Comments:

While F2F returned to a full NWEA testing schedule in SY23, cell sizes were too small to report.

SY2022-2023 Rating

1.4a Reading: N/A

1.4b Math: N/A

Overall score produced by the average of these two scores: N/A

Comments: The school administered the NWEA in the spring of 2022, but did not complete a fall administration.

SY2021-22 Rating

1.4a Reading: N/A

1.4b Math: N/A

Overall score produced by the average of these two scores: N/A

Comments: The school did not administer NWEA assessment in school year 2020-21

Source: Annual Report, End of year report, Test data spreadsheets

1.5 Is the school moving students toward graduation by ensuring that continuously enrolled students meet their individual credit accumulation goals?

1 = Does not meet standard Less than 65% of students met their credit accumulation goal.

2 = Approaching standard 65-79.9% of students met their credit accumulation goal.

3 = Meets standard 80-90% of students met their credit accumulation goal.

4 = Exceeds standard More than 90% of students met their credit accumulation goal.

SY2024-2025

Rating: 4

Comments:

As reported in the SY24 Annual Report, 90% of students met or exceeded their credit accumulation goals and an additional 6.1% partially met credit accumulation with at least 80% progress.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 4

Comments: As shared in the SY23 Annual Report, 92.1% of students met or exceed their credit accumulation goals and an additional 3.9% making at least 80% progress..

SY2022-2023

Rating: 4

Comments: As stated in the school's annual report, 89.8% of students met their accumulation goal in school year 2022, with an additional 6.1% making meaningful accumulation of 80% of their original credit accumulation goal. The authorizer is using their professional discretion to move this item to a four, given the strength of students making meaningful accumulation and the extremely small number of students served who made less than 80% of their original goal.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: According to the school's annual report, 81.1% of students met their accumulation goal in school year 2020-21.

Source: MDE Data Analytics Request

1.6 Does students' performance on post-secondary readiness assessments in reading and mathematics (i.e.: ACT, SAT, Accuplacer, or MCA college-ready cut score) reflect college and career readiness?

1 = Does not meet standard A minimal proportion of tested students were college ready (Less than 65% of students demonstrated readiness with or without remediation).

2 = Approaching standard an inadequate proportion of tested students were college ready (65-79.9% of students were college ready with or without remediation).

3 = Meets standard an adequate proportion of tested students were college ready.
(80-95% of students were college ready with or without remediation.)

4 = Exceeds standard an exceptional proportion of tested students were college ready.
(Meeting standards for level 3 AND over 40% were college ready without remediation.)

SY2024-2025

Rating: N/A

Comments:

F2F Academy cell size is too small to report.

It is important to note that F2F has extensive programming to prepare students for college and careers after high school. Every graduating senior completes a quarter-long class, Senior Seminar. This course helps seniors to create a transitional plan post high school. Both college and career topics are covered. Additionally, a Career Exploration class is offered to juniors and seniors. Other transitional services offered to students are assistance with driver's education classes, housing resources/grants, support with college applications, FAFSA, and job applications. F2F also offers a Work-Based Learning Program.

PSEO – 3 students participated in SY24.

SY2023-2024

Rating: NA

Comments: While the opportunity for students to participate in Accuplacer and other post-secondary readiness assessments returning in SY23, F2F continues to grapple with the role these tests play in the college admissions process. As such, F2F shared information in four categories for SY23 to provide insight into post-secondary readiness:

1. Graduates enrolled or accepted to a post-secondary program 3
2. Graduates meeting requirements to waive placement tests through eligible categories 7
3. Graduates that have yet attempted the application process 4
4. Graduates completing the application process, but were denied admission 0

SY2022-2023 Rating

1.6a Reading: N/A

1.6b Math: N/A

Overall Rating:

Comments: The school is working to determine how best to collect information for this goal moving forward. Over the past few years an increasing number of institutions of higher education nationally have moved away from using the standardized tests on which this metric relies. At this time, adequate data is not available for scoring.

SY2021-22 Rating

1.6a Reading:

1.6b Math:

Overall Rating:

Comments: The school did not administer the Accuplacer assessment in school year 2020-21

Source: MDE Website, Annual Report, End of year report, Test data spreadsheets

1.7 Is the school meeting its school-specific academic goal(s) as measured by the Safe and Responsive Schools Survey?

1 = Does not meet standard School has clearly not met any of its school-specific academic goals.

2 = Approaching standard School is making progress toward meeting all its school-specific academic goals.

3 = Meets standard School has met its school-specific academic goals.

4 = Exceeds standard School has met all school-specific academic goals and clearly exceeded expectations for one or more of those goals.

SY2024-2025

Rating: 4

Comments:

The average rating was 4.58 across four categories (personal safety, belongingness, climate, and personal school experience).

SY2023-2024

Rating: 4

Comments: The average rating was 4.52 across four categories (personal safety, belongingness, climate and personal school experience).

SY2022-2023

Rating:

Comments: Scores for personal school experience and belongingness were particularly high (89-91%), with strong indications of student satisfaction and school mission attainment across all categories.

SY2021-22

Rating:

Comments: This information was not included in the school's annual report. If available, please supply this data during the comment period in order to allow this goal to be scored.

Source: Annual report

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

1.8a: Reading

1.8b: Math

1 = Does not meet standard More than 10 percentage points below state EL performance.

2 = Approaching standard 6-10 percentage points below state EL performance.

3 = Meets standard Within 5 percentage points of state EL performance.

4 = Exceeds standard Exceeds state EL performance by more than 5 percentage points.

SY2024-2025

1.11a Reading : N/A

1.11b Math: N/A

Overall Rating: N/A

Comments

F2F did not serve any students identified as English learners in SY2024.

SY2023-2024

1.11a - NA

1.11b - NA

Overall – NA

Comments:

F2F did not serve any students identified as English learners in SY2023.

SY2022-2023 Rating

1.11a: Reading:

1.11b: Math:

Overall Rating:

Comments: As noted in MDE data and the school's annual report, F2F did not serve any students identified as English Learners in SY2022.

SY2021-22 Rating

1.11a: Reading:

1.11b: Math:

Overall Rating:

Comments: The school did not have any students identified as ELs in school year 2020-21

Source: MDE website

1.9 Are students receiving special education services performing at or above the state average for students receiving special education services as measured by MCA proficiency? Note that for schools with greater than 70% of students qualifying for FRL, demographic categories will also be filtered by FRL status.

1.9a: Reading

1.9b: Math

1 = Does not meet standard More than 10 percentage points below state special education performance.

2 = Approaching standard 6-10 percentage points below state special education performance.

3 = Meets standard Within 5 percentage points of state special education performance.

4 = Exceeds standard Exceeds state special education performance by more than 5 percentage points.

SY2024-2025

Rating

1.9a Reading: N/A

1.9b Math: N/A

Overall: N/A

Comments:

This data is not available as cell sizes are too small to publicly report.

SY2023-2024

Rating

1.9a Reading: NA

1.9b Math: NA

Overall: NA

Comments: This data is not available as cell sizes are too small to publicly report.

SY2022-2023

Rating

1.9a: Reading:

1.9b: Math:

Overall Rating:

Comments: This data is not available as cell sizes were too small to be publicly reported.

SY2021-22

Rating

1.9a: Reading:

1.9b: Math:

Overall Rating:

Comments: This data is not available as cell sizes were too small to be publicly reported.

Source: MDE website

1.10 Are students attending school regularly as measured by the percentage of students earning over 70% of their possible attendance points?

1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 50% of students meet the attendance point threshold.
2 = Approaching standard	50-59.9% of students met the attendance point threshold.
3 = Meets standard	60-69.9% of students met the attendance point threshold.
4 = Exceeds standard	Over 70% of students met the attendance point threshold.

SY2024-2025

Rating: 4

Comments:

71.6% of students met their attendance threshold. The Academy successfully continues to offer incentives to promote attendance.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 4

Comments:

70.6% of students met attendance threshold F2F has a robust system for monitoring student attendance as the school strongly believes attendance is critical to attaining credit accumulation. The school provides several incentives to promote attendance. Each student can accumulate points for being on time (2 pts.) or simply making it to school (1 pt). Various levels of prizes are handed out during each contact period depending on the number of points an individual earns (every 5 weeks).

SY2022-2023 Rating: 3

Comments: As provided in the school's annual report, 69.7% of students met the attendance point threshold. Though very slightly lower than the prior year, this still represents strong performance. parent

SY2021-22 Rating: 4

Comments: According to the school's annual report, 70.14% of students met their attendance point threshold. The school provided several incentives, students accumulated points for attendance and prizes were allocated every 5 weeks.

Source: Annual/quarterly reports, Site visits

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

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

SY2024-2025

Rating: 4

Comments:

Face to Face Academy's mission is "To graduate the most at-risk for dropping out of high school by integrating the highest quality of educational and support services." On its website, the Academy's core principles are listed as a small learning environment, strong academics, dedicated staff, and building resources.

Administration and teachers are fully committed to ensuring that all students are supported and feel a part of the F2F community. Staff meet daily in the morning and afternoon to discuss and identify any students that may need individualized support. Student progress reports are routinely given to students to keep them aware of their academic progress, and staff meet one-on-one with any student at risk of failing a course to create an action plan. During the fall site visit, students said they have key staff members they feel connected to and supported by.

F2F's academic scheduling is very innovative. The Academy's Equitable Access Online Model (EALM) offers the flexibility of on-line, hybrid, and in person schedules. They developed a schedule that allows for small flexible learning pods. Additionally, this type of scheduling allows students that might miss school due to sickness, anxiety, lack of transportation and/or family issues to attend school virtually. The year-round school schedule is also valued by Face-to-Face's staff and students as it provides for a consistent full year schedule with more frequent school breaks.

Face-to-Face has developed a curriculum to meet the needs of students who have a range of academic foundations and are coming in with academic gaps. The online classes and in-person lessons teach the same concepts. Educators work collaboratively to plan cross-curricular activities. During the site visit, differentiate instructions were observed within the lessons and all students were actively engaged.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 4

Comments: The commitment to the school's vision and mission shines through all aspects of the program and the devotion of the F2F team. Observations and conversations with students, teachers,

staff, board members and families during site visits emphasized the school's commitment to supporting students to not only earn a high school diploma, but be prepared for post-secondary life - from the online and hybrid options to the twice daily meetings of the team to discuss student progress to the senior seminar to the podcast and much more,

SY2022=2023 Rating: 4

Comments: Fall and spring visits both indicated a strong adherence to the school's mission and vision. Face to Face Academy continues to evolve within its mission of "providing an opportunity for youth who have been unsuccessful in a traditional educational setting to earn a high school diploma while acquiring life skills and emotional maturity," and continued to explore online and hybrid options for students, all the while centering on the needs of each individual. Staff are devoted to a quality program that meets students where they are at, and the school's model—including frequent touch-points between staff—supports students in developing emotional maturity within a safe, caring, high-accountability environment. Staff interviews and high staff retention rates both point to a school where administrators and teachers work together toward a shared mission.

SY2021-22 Rating: 4

Comments: Face to Face continues to fulfill its mission: *to provide an opportunity for youth who have been unsuccessful in a traditional educational setting to earn a high school diploma while acquiring life skills and emotional maturity.* As mentioned before, the school has adjusted their programming during the pandemic to accommodate their students' range of needs, allowing students to complete work both in person and online. The school continues to serve high need students most at risk of dropping out. Staff regularly note their choice to work with the student in their school rather than traditional models.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, strategic plan or other documentation

1.12 Are students accepted to and enrolling in post-secondary programs at a high rate within 24 months of graduation? Note: Post-secondary programs can include training in the trades, reputable vocational and/or certificate programs that lead to living-wage positions, military service, and 2 and 4 year college programs.

1.12a: Acceptance

1.12b: Enrollment

Note: The initial year of this goal will include baseline data collection for informational purposes, benchmarks will then be set and scored in the remaining years of the contract.

1 = Does not meet standard

- a. Less than 35% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program
- b. Less than 15% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program

2 = Approaching standard

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Between 35%-44.1% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program b. Between 15%-24.9% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post- secondary program
--

3 = Meets standard

- a. Between 45%- 65% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program
- b. Between 25%- 50% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program

4 = Exceeds standard

- a. Over 65% of students in the graduating class have been accepted into a post-secondary program
- b. Over 50% of students in the graduating class have enrolled in a post-secondary program

SY2024-2025

1.12a Postsecondary Acceptance: 3

1.12b Postsecondary Enrollment: 3

Overall: 3

Comments:

Within 24 months of graduation, 63% of students were accepted into a post-secondary program.

Within 24 months of graduation 44.4% of students were enrolled in a post-secondary program.

SY2023-2024

1.12a Postsecondary Acceptance: 7/14 50% = 3

1.12b Postsecondary Enrollment: 3/14 21.4% = 2

Overall = 2.5

Comments:

SY2022-2023 Rating

1.12a: 63.6% acceptance=4

1.12b: 36.3% enrolled=3

Overall score produced by the average of these two scores: 3.5

Comments: Per the SY2022 annual report, no students who applied for admission to a post-secondary program were denied enrollment.

SY2021-22 Rating

1.12a: N/A

1.12b: N/A

Overall score produced by the average of these two scores: N/A

Comments: This goal will be scored for SY2023 and beyond.

Source: MDE Sleds Data, School reported data

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

2.1 Does the school have an active finance committee that meets regularly and reports to the full board?

1 = Does not meet standard	The school has no active finance committee
2 = Approaching standard	The school's finance committee meets only as needed and only to review financials and/or the finance committee does not report its findings to the full board.
3 = Meets standard	The finance committee meets monthly, examines financial statements, and provides a thorough report of its findings to the full board.
4 = Exceeds standard	The finance committee meets at least monthly and examines financial statements, as well as short and long-range financial issues. Thorough reports of findings are provided to the board.

SY2024-2025

Rating: 4

Comments:

Face to Face has formed a partnership with Dieci School Finance, which provides sound financial services. The team from Dieci manages the school's accounting services, audit preparation, payroll processing, grant management, and other financial management services. They assist the Executive Director in creating an annual budget as well as a three-year budget. The Face-to-Face Academy School Board has oversight of the financial management of the school. The Board Treasurer reviews and authorizes disbursement. At the monthly Board Meetings, review of the budget is always an agenda item.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 4

Comments: While F2F does not have a finance committee, the board includes members with financial experience and are supported by their financial services provider. Members actively participate in finance discussions.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 4

Comments: Face to Face Academy takes a 'committee of the whole' approach and does not have a finance committee, but ensure the board includes members with financial expertise and experience. The school has a strong long-term relationship with its financial services provider SBS, Dieci School Finance, and has earned the MDE finance award for 9 years running.

SY2021-22 Rating: 4

Comments: Face to Face Academy takes a 'committee of the whole' approach and does not have a finance committee, but ensure the board includes members with financial expertise and experience. The school has

a strong long-term relationship with its financial services provider SBS, Dieci School Finance, and has earned the MDE finance award for 9 years running.

Source: Monthly board packets; Site visits

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

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

SY2024-2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

It is the goal of Face-to-Face Academy to achieve and maintain an Unassigned Fund Balance in the General Fund between 45% to 50% expenditures. Quarter 2 report included both the Fund Balance Policy and reported that the fund balance was at 65.2%.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 4

Comments: The school provides the fund balance policy annually as part of Quarterly Report 2. The school has prioritized maintaining a fund balance in alignment with the policy as one of the five strategic priorities in their strategic plan.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 4

Comments: The school does have a fund balance policy and is aware (per quarterly report 2 p. 22) that its current balance is above the targeted level.

SY2021-22

Rating: 4

Comments: Face to Face understands the importance of a strong fund balance. Face to Face has a goal to maintain a Fund Balance Policy between 40-45% of annual expenditures. The Board also has identified a set of strategies to ensure this goal is attained as well as required steps should the balance drop below 40%.

Source: Monthly board packets; Board policy manual

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

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

SY2024-2025

Rating: 4

Comments:

The audit had no findings and is clean. The school was recognized as being in the upper tier of the schools when it comes to areas of accurate budgeting and resources allocation.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 4

Comments: The 2024 Financial Audit was completed by BerganKDV. As in previous years, the audit was clean with no findings.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 4

Comments: The audit was completed and submitted on time to St. Thomas and MDE. The school received a clean audit with no findings throughout its contract.

SY2021-22 Rating: 4

Comments: The audit was completed and submitted on time to St. Thomas and MDE. The school received a clean audit with no findings throughout its contract.

Source: Annual financial audit

2.4 Does the school establish and maintain a balanced budget?

- Budget is approved and provided to UST before June 30;**
- Includes a cash flow projection for the year showing positive cash flow;**
- Is adjusted in a timely fashion when needed;**
- Meets established fund balance policy goals; and**
- Does not require major* program cuts)?**

***Major program cuts are defined as cuts that impact a school's ability to deliver its core programming to students in a way that negatively impacts student experience.**

1 = Does not meet standard	A budget is not approved by June 30; the budget is not adequately detailed; no cash flow projection is established; lower than expected enrollment requires major budget adjustments; or the budget does not meet the fund balance policy goals set forth by the board.
2 = Approaching standard	A detailed budget is approved before June 30 but may not include a cash flow projection for the year; established budget may require adjustment due to lower than expected enrollment; budget meets the fund balance policy goals set forth by the board.
3 = Meets standard	The detailed budget is approved before June 30 and includes a cash flow projection for the year; established budget is based on realistic enrollment; and is adjusted if needed. The budget meets the fund balance policy goals set forth by the board and allows for maintenance of core programming.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY2024-2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

A comprehensive budget was approved prior to June 30th, reflecting the organization's adherence to a well-defined and structured budget planning process. F2F Academy approaches budgeting conservatively setting reasonable ADM targets and requiring a projected surplus at the end of each fiscal year.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 3

Comments: As noted in previous evaluations, F2F employs a conservative approach to budgeting that is accurate and based on realistic enrollment projections. This allows the school to make strategic purchases when the opportunity arises, such as leasing the adjacent property that the ABC recently purchased. The board and leadership continue to explore ways to grow the program in a financially sustainable manner.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 3

Comments: Face to face continues to operate in a thoughtful, conservative manner as noted in prior years. The school is able to budget accurately and administrative staff, including the executive director and academy office manager are experienced with the systems needed to effectively run the school and keep all elements on budget.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: Face to Face has operated with thoughtful, conservative budgeting in SY2022. The school began the year with a budgeted ADM of 93 and adjusted to 87 in September. The school has consistently approved its budget documents through a thorough process that allows adequate time for board review and approval prior to the June 30th deadline.

Source: Monthly board packets, UST site visits, UST meetings with business manager(s)

2.5 Budgeted Enrollment Realization: Does the school's target ADM (as established by initial board-approved budget) match its actual ADM? (Calculated as actual ADM divided by budgeted ADM.)

1 = Does not meet standard Enrollment realization is 90% or less.

2 = Approaching standard Enrollment realization is 90-95%.

3 = Meets standard Enrollment realization is greater than 95%.

4 = Exceeds standard NOT APPLICABLE

SY2024-2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

According to the Quarter 2 report, as of December 31st, the ADM was 91.3 which is above the budgeted 87.0 students. Enrollment realization was 104.9%

SY2023-2024

Rating: 3

Comments: The school's SY2023 ADM was 83.2 students. Midway through SY2024, the ADM was 83.27, which was slightly below the projected enrollment.

SY2022-23

Rating: 3

Comments: The school's SY2022 ADM was 87.51 students, in line with projection for the year and closer to pre-pandemic trends.

SY2021-22

Rating: 3

Comments: Original budgeted enrollment at 93.00 ADMs. Current enrollment (end of 4/30/22) 87.00 ADMs Which is an enrollment realization of 93.5%

Source: Monthly board packets, UST site visits, UST meetings with business manager(s)

2.6 Does the school have sufficient cash on hand to meet its near-term obligations?

1 = Does not meet standard The school has fewer than 30 days cash on hand.

2 = Approaching standard The school maintains 30-59 days cash on hand.

3 = Meets standard The school maintains a minimum of 60 days cash on hand or is meeting the cash on hand requirements of its bond covenants, whichever is greater.

4 = Exceeds standard NOT APPLICABLE

SY2024-2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

According to April financial updates, F2F has reconciled cash balance of \$1,038,797 at the end of April and cash on hand was 100.02 days.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 3

Comments: Per the FY23 Audit, the cash balance was \$800,428.

SY2022-2023

Rating:

Comments:

The school has a reconciled cash balance of \$737,773 at the end of December, which amounts to approximately 199 days cash on hand.

SY2021-22

Rating:

Comments: According to April financial statements the school has the school had a reconciled cash balance of \$415,579 at the end of April. Which amounts to approximately 112.44 days cash on hand.

Source: Annual Report, Auditor Report, Financial Statements, Board policies

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

1 = Does not meet standard The school's fund balance is less than 10% of annual expenditures.

2 = Approaching standard The school's fund balance is between 10-15% of annual expenditures.

3 = Meets standard The school's fund balance is more than 15% of annual expenditures.

4 = Exceeds standard The school's fund balance is more than 20% of annual expenditures AND overall academic outcomes fall within the 'meets standard' range.

SY2024-2025

Rating: 4

Comments:

The SY 2024 audit shows the Academy with a Fund Balance of \$1,226,919. For the year ending June 30, 2024, the Academy was able to achieve a surplus of \$37,649. This amount represents a 65.2% Fund

Balance as a percent of unrestricted expenditures, a number that is significantly above the Board adopted policy to maintain a balance of between 45%-50%.

SY2023-2024

Rating: 4

Comments: F2F ended SY2023 with an unassigned fund balance of 1,179,070. This represents a fund balance of 64.7%. This increase was primarily due to the ECR funds.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 4

Comments: The school's SY2022 audited fund balance was 50.1% of annual expenditures (\$908,631). As noted in the school's second quarterly report, "The historically high fund balance can be attributed to increasing enrollment trends as well as Federal Funding (ESSER) made available to schools in response to the COVID 19 Pandemic. The Average Daily Membership for SY22 was 87.51 students, more in line with three-year projections after a unprecedented enrollment of 94.5 students in SY 21."

SY2021-22 Rating: 4

Comments: For fiscal 2020-21, the schools unassigned fund balance ended at \$824,366. The ending fund balance represents 49.9% of expenditures. The school's total net position increased by (\$192,440).

Source: Annual Report, Auditor Report, Financial Statements, Board policies

2.8 Is the school meeting bond covenants (if applicable)?

1 = Does not meet standard The school is not meeting one or more bond covenants.

2 = Approaching standard The school is meeting all bond covenants in the current year, but has been out of compliance with one or more covenants in the past three years.

3 = Meets standard The school has consistently met all bond covenants.

4 = Exceeds standard Not Applicable

SY2025

Rating: N/A

Comments:

Face to Face Academy has an ABC, but they have not secured any bonding or financing associated with it; therefore, they do not have bond covenants.

SY2024

Rating: NA

Comments: Face to Face recently formed an ABC to purchase the property adjacent to the school to expand outdoor educational space.

SY2022-2023 Rating:

Comments: Face to Face Academy has no building company, bonds, or bond covenants.

SY2021-22 Rating:

Comments: Face to Face Academy has no building company, bonds, or bond covenants.

Source: Annual Report, Auditor Report, Financial Statements, Board policies

SECTION 3: IS THE ORGANIZATION EFFECTIVE AND WELL RUN?

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

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

SY2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

All Board members serving during SY25 have completed all three mandatory training areas. The Executive Director and Academic Director have also completed these training sessions. Ongoing professional development in the form of workshops is part of F2F's Board Meetings. The following topics were covered: The Academy's Innovative Credit System, Employee Benefits & Salaries, Employee Retention Credit, School Finance – General Education; MACS Legislative Initiatives; Digital Learning Days – Best Practices; Employee Benefits – Beyond Salary, ABC Finance & Funding, Authorizer Goal Framework, Enrollment Policy; Lease Aid formula & requirements, and proposed education policy changes at the Federal level.

SY2024

Rating: 3

Comments: F2F documented in the Quarterly 3 Board Member Template, that all board members have completed their initial training as well as a multitude of ongoing trainings in SY2024 including: Four Strategic Areas of Growth, School Wide Behavioral Strategies, Legislative Agenda & Charter School Priorities, and Response to Cold Weather & Snow Days, The Academy's Innovative Credit System, Employee Benefits & Salaries, Employee Retention Credit, School Finance – General Education; MACS Legislative Initiatives; Digital Learning Days – Best Practices.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 3

Comments: As stated in the school's annual report, "all board members who have been seated for at least one year have completed all mandatory training." The school's Executive Director and Academic Director also complete board trainings, a helpful best practice. Authorizer observation of board meetings, review of board training forms in Quarterly Reports, and review of board packets has also provided evidence of ongoing board training and the board's commitment to ensuring that it remains capable and competent.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: According to the Board information chart provided on February 22, 2022, all of the school's board members are in compliance with their initial training and annual board training requirements.

Source: Monthly board packets, UST site visits, Statement of compliance sheet, Annual Report

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

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

SY2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

The board understands and meets the requirements of the Open Meeting Law and maintains its records in an orderly manner.

- Board meeting times and location are published and are posted to all stakeholders in a variety of ways with dates and location available on the school's website and in school mailings and announcements. Every five weeks a parent email/letter, which includes the detailed school event calendar with an invitation for parents to attend the monthly board meetings.
- Printed material via computer is available
- A Border Binder that includes Board Member contact information, calendar, agendas, meeting minutes and relevant documents are kept in the main Administrative Office.
- Meeting is conducted only with a board quorum
- Votes are recorded and are part of minutes
- Meetings are conducted in accordance with the board's bylaws.

No Open Meeting Law violations were observed or reported.

SY2024

Rating: 3

Comments: No Open Meeting Law violations were observed or reported.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 3

Comments: **Comments:** No Open Meeting Law violations were observed or reported. The board includes seven members each serving staggered three-year terms. During SY2023, three members were parents or

school alumni (one current parent), three were teachers, and one was a community member who was not a former parent/student. This configuration is in alignment with the bylaws.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: No Open Meeting Law violations were observed or reported. The board includes three teachers, one parent and three community members currently, which is in alignment with the bylaws.

Source: Board minutes, ongoing correspondence, UST site visits

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

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

SY2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

All staff are appropriately licensed.

SY2024

Rating: 3

Comments: All staff are appropriately licensed.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 3

Comments: All staff are appropriately licensed.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: Staff are appropriately licensed.

Source: MDE STAR Discrepancy Reports (self-reported data, crosscheck with licensure file checks) D-1

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

1 = Does not meet standard	The school cannot certify that it completes criminal background checks of staff and the board.
2 = Approaching standard	The school certifies that it completes criminal background checks of the staff but not the board.
3 = Meets standard	The school certifies that it completes criminal background checks of staff and the board, as required by school policy.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

Face to Face Academy's narrative on quarterly report (p. 17) confirms they are implementing the background check policy. All full-time staff, contracted workers and board members are required to have a background check before working at the school.

SY2024

Rating: 3

Comments: F2F has a background check policy, which is confirmed in quarterly report 3 (pp 17-18). Staff, board members and volunteers continue to be covered under the policy.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments: The school's second quarterly report narrative (p. 17) confirms that the school's policy on background checks continues to apply to staff, board members, and volunteers.

SY2021-22

Rating: 3

Comments: As mentioned in quarterly reports F2F performs background checks on staff members, board members and volunteers.

Source: UST site visit, board chair interview, background check policy

3.5 Is the school compliant with other applicable law? Note that this measure includes, but is not limited to:

- Meeting admissions and enrollment practice/policy requirements
- Meeting governance model requirements

1 = Does not meet standard The school is not in compliance with other applicable law.

2 = Approaching standard NOT APPLICABLE

3 = Meets standard	The school is in compliance with other applicable law.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE
SY2025	
Rating: 3	
Comments:	Face to Face Academy's enrollment procedures consist of 5 stages: informational meeting, registration form, lottery and waiting period, enrollment, and intake. Its enrollment policy is in compliance with state statutes.
The Board consists of 7 elected Directors and consists of teachers, parents and community members which meets the governance model requirements.	
Title IX Sex Nondiscrimination policy, grievance procedure and process were revised in 2024 and is following MN state statute. The Title IX coordinator is Academic Director, Jennifer Plum.	
SY2024	
Rating: 3	
Comments: The school appears to be in compliance with applicable law and has a process in place to ensure policies are updated as needed to maintain compliance.	
SY2022-2023 Rating:	3
Comments: The school's governance model meets statutory requirements, and admissions/enrollment practices were in compliance as observed. The school seeks to serve every student who wishes to enroll and has generally been successful in this goal, though at times a waiting list means students may have a delay in their desired start date.	
SY2021-22 Rating:	3
Comments: St. Thomas did not observe any noncompliance issues. No complaints related to noncompliance were received.	
Source:	UST site visit, board chair interview, background check policy

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

- Understanding of board and school leader roles (governance vs. management)
- Annual board self-evaluation
- Annual school-leader evaluation
- Annual approval of professional development plan for school leader (if applicable)
- Annual evaluation of Educational Service Provider (CMO/EMO) if applicable
- Orientation process for new members
- Regular Strategic planning (at least once every five years)

1 = Does not meet standard	At least some board members do not understand the role of the board and the role of the school leader. Board policies and practices are not transparent or not present. Board meetings often address issues not central to the role of the board and/or fail to address core functions such as leader evaluation and school financial/academic health.
2 = Approaching standard	Some board members, but not all, exhibit understanding of their roles as board members and the role of the school leader. Board policies and practices are not always transparent and/or are not fully developed. The board inconsistently addresses issues central to its role such as leader evaluation, leader professional development plan approval (if applicable), and school financial/academic health.
3 = Meets standard	The Board exhibits understanding of its role and the role of the school leader. The board policies and practices are generally transparent and systems are in place to maximize effectiveness of the board, including an orientation process for new members, annual board self-evaluation, annual leader (and EMO/CMO if applicable) evaluation, annual approval of leader development plan (if applicable) and a plan for conducting and tracking initial and ongoing training. The board engages in regular strategic planning. The board is able to adequately sustain its membership through recruitment efforts.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY2025

Rating: 3

Comment:

Through its bylaws, the board understands that it is the governing body of the school and oversees the school's achievement of its vision and mission and goals through managing the financial affairs of the school, reviewing and approving annual budget, overseeing the performance of the Program Director, conducting regular Board self-assessments, ensuring consistent evaluation of student performance, promoting the engagement of the community and parents/guardians and adopting policies for the school.

During the 23-24 school year, the Board updated its comprehensive strategic plan. A formal Needs Assessment was conducted with input solicited by a number of stakeholders. The Board identified 5 focal areas for F2F's strategic plan: college & career readiness, graduation and retention, facility needs, comprehensive & competitive compensation framework, and strong fund balance to support innovative programming. During the summer of 24, a sixth area was identified: personal growth, emotional well-being and critical thinking.

The Board conducts a self-review annually. They utilize a rubric generated by the MN Association of Charter Schools. The rubric focuses on the areas of "duty of care, duty of loyalty, and duty of obedience. The results of the self-review assist in planning the Board's professional development for the upcoming school year.

The Executive Director (ED) is reviewed by the Board every year. All Board members and all F2F's staff are surveyed to elicit their feedback on the performance of the ED. An Executive Committee of the Board, made up of non-teacher Board members, executes and shares the results of the evaluation with the ED

during a board meeting and uses the format to set professional goals for the upcoming year. F2F's Board developed a 24-25 ED professional development plan with the input of the ED.

SY2024

Rating: 3

Comments: F2F Board continues to have continuity in its membership, which is complimented by an orientation process when new members are being seated. Board observations and interviews with board members indicate a strong understanding of the role of the board and implementation of effective board practices including annual leader evaluation, ongoing board training and strategic planning.

SY2022-23 Rating: 3

Comments: Interviews with board members and board observations indicated a strong understanding of the role of the board vs. management. Per the school's SY2022 Annual Report, the board updated its strategic plan and conducted a formal needs assessment during the spring of 2022. Results of this process included identifying the following areas of focus: facilities, competitive compensation, graduation and retention rates, and bridging the gap between high school and college/work. The board reviews the Executive Director and Academic Director annually through a thoughtful and comprehensive process.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: F2F's SY21 Annual Report, notes that among other things, the Executive Director is evaluated in communication skills, teamwork/interpersonal effectiveness, managing others, quality of work, and creating efficient work processes. The process has been consistently used by the executive committee and board for years and appears valued by both the Executive Director and board.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, board minutes, interview with board chair

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

1 = Does not meet standard	Board policies and/or bylaws are outdated and not reviewed regularly.
2 = Approaching standard	Board policies and/or bylaws are reviewed and approved as needed, but are not comprehensively reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis.
3 = Meets standard	Board policies and bylaws are reviewed for content and legal compliance, updated, and approved on a regularly scheduled basis, no less than once every three years.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY2024-25

Rating: 3

Comments:

The Board has developed a process to ensure a proposed policy is reviewed and created in a timely and thoughtful manner. At the beginning of each Director's term, a Board Manual is issued to each member

containing all relevant Academy policies. These policies are reviewed at the start of each school year to identify policies that may need updating because of legal or administrative requirements. The identified policies will be discussed at a board meeting, followed by a draft proposal which is discussed at a board meeting and at the third board meeting the board will vote on adoption. In the revising and creation of policies, the Board and Administration utilize their network of resources: MDE, Authorizer, Deici School Finance, Indigo Education, MACS and other charter schools. Face to Face Academy reviewed its bylaws in January 2023.

SY2024

Rating: 3

Comments: F2F continues to implement the policy review process described in the schools SY23 Annual Report.

SY2022-23 Rating: 3

Comments: The board demonstrates effective governance practices which include regular review of board policies and bylaws. As noted in the Annual Report (SY2022), the board reviews all policies at the start of each school year, paying special attention to those noted by the Executive Director or outside agencies as needing update. Board members may also pull policies for closer review, or suggest the need for a new policy. The school's bylaws were most recently reviewed and re-approved in January of 2021.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: The board demonstrates effective governance practices which include regular review of board policies and bylaws

Source: Board minutes, board policies, Governance binder, UST site visit, **Annual Report**

3.8 Does the board submit a complete board packet (including agenda, minutes, director report, other relevant documents, check register, cash flow sheet, enrollment report, balance sheet and income and expense report), to be received by all members of the board, school leadership, and UST at least three days prior to all board meetings?

1 = Does not meet standard	Board packets are not submitted on time AND are incomplete
2 = Approaching standard	Board packets are submitted on time (more than 75 percent of the time) but incomplete OR not submitted on time (less than 75 percent of the time) but complete
3 = Meets standard	Board packets are submitted on time (more than 75 percent of the time) and complete
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

F2F Executive Director ensures that board packets are distributed in a timely fashion allowing board members to review and prepare for the monthly board meeting. The Board packet documents are informative and aid in thorough discussions during board meetings.

SY2024

Rating: 3

Comments: F2F consistently distributes complete board packets on time.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 3

Comments: F2F's Executive Director consistently distribute board packets on time allowing board member sufficient time to prepare for board meetings. Documents provided are thorough and sufficient to prepare members for thoughtful discussion of agenda items.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: F2F's Executive Director consistently distribute board packets on time allowing board member sufficient time to prepare for board meetings.

Source: Monthly board packets; Board materials tracking document (G-1 CS info)

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

1 = Does not meet standard The school is not fulfilling its legal obligations regarding ELs and requires substantial improvement

2 = Approaching standard The school is fulfilling all of its legal obligations regarding ELs but requires some improvements

3 = Meets standard The school is fulfilling its legal obligations regarding ELs and requires no considerable improvements

4 = Exceeds standard NOT APPLICABLE

SY2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

Currently, F2F Academy does not have students that require EL services. This has been a constant throughout the school's existence. F2F ensures that all new enrolled students receive a Home Language Questionnaire. In the future, if an EL student enrolls at F2F, the school will work with its Authorizer and other support providers to develop further resources to address EL programming.

SY2024**Rating: 3**

Comments: While F2F historically has had no students enrolled who require EL services. All students receive a Home Language Questionnaire. Quarterly Report 2 details the plan the school has in place should student/s enroll who require services.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 3

Comments: F2F currently has no students enrolled who require EL services. According to quarterly report 2, all students receive a Home Language Questionnaire. Most students who are non-native speakers have either reached proficiency or exhausted their years of qualifying for services (7). According to quarterly report 2, the school is ready and committed if student need to access services and continues to explore options to ensure it is prepared to respond quickly in the event that a student requiring services enrolls.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: F2F currently has no LEP students enrolled. According to quarterly report 2, when a student is identified as potentially qualifying for LEP services, they receive a Home Language Questionnaire. According to quarterly report 2, the school is ready and committed if student need to access services.

Source: UST site visits, Reference EL Packet, Formalized complaints at MDE, or Critical Elements review (SP-1)

3.10 Is the school fulfilling its legal obligations related to access and services to students with individual education plans (IEPs)? (i.e. The school has a TSES manual that is school-specific and board-approved; has a special education director actively involved in working with special education staff and school leadership; effectively contracts with entities to provide services to students when necessary; completes annual IEP meetings on time; has been subject to no investigations related to special needs students; and has received a clean audit by MDE in the last audited school year. The school ensures that staff have appropriate training and are familiar with current legislation and research related to best practices for serving students with IEPs.)

1 = Does not meet standard	The school is not fulfilling its legal obligations regarding students with special needs and requires substantial improvement
2 = Approaching standard	The school is fulfilling all of its legal obligations regarding students with special needs but requires some improvements
3 = Meets standard	The school is fulfilling its legal obligations regarding students with special needs and requires no considerable improvements
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY2025**Rating: 3**

Comments:

F2F Academy has a board approved TSES Manual that was last reviewed in September 2023. F2F Academy successfully implements a strong special education program that delivers services within the framework of the school's "inclusive classroom" model. The school employs highly qualified Special Education teachers, social workers, and educational assistants. It also contracts for the following positions: Special Education Director, School Psychologist, Autism Spectrum & Speech/Language Therapist. Added in the 2023-2024 academic year was a targeted resource class. This addition has not just helped academics, but as reported by students, it helped improve mental health and overall confidence. Additionally, F2F staff meets twice a day to discuss student progress and how to better ensure all students are receiving a quality education. No complaints appear to have been made to MDE in SY2024, and no complaints or concerns were raised with the authorizer.

SY2024

Rating: 3

Comments: Approximately 30% of F2F students have an IEP annually. The school continues to have a strong special education program, which is detailed in Quarterly Report 2.

SY2022-2023

Rating: 3

Comments:

The school continues to have a strong special education program that evolves to meet the needs of current student cohorts. SY2022-2023 saw the addition of a new half-time position to support students receiving special education services who were identified as falling behind their peers academically. The school continues to maintain thoughtful systems which support students' mental and academic health, connect with families, and monitor progress effectively. Whenever possible, the school provides instruction in general education classrooms with additional courses and supports tailored to the IEP requirements and goals of the enrolled students. All staff receive professional development in the area of effective differentiated instruction.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: In the school year 2020-21, 33 students were enrolled in special education programming at the school. The school's recent move to hybrid programming options reflect the culture of personalization evident at the school. The school has a morning staff check in where students of concern are identified and offer proactive steps to address student needs. The school's special education team include 6 licensed staff. No complaints appear to have been made to MDE in SY2021 and no complaints or concerns were raised with the authorizer.

Source: UST site visits, Reference: special education investigation search on MDE website and special education training materials; Special education director interview

3.11 Is the school able to maintain a high percentage of teacher retention?

1 = Does not meet standard

Fewer than 70 percent of teachers remained at the school last year (excluding retirements).

2 = Approaching standard	Between 70 and 84 percent of teachers remained at the school last year (excluding retirements).
3 = Meets standard	More than 85 percent of teachers remained at the school last year (excluding retirements).
4 = Exceeds standard	Over the course of the contract (or at least 3 years) teacher retention has consistently remained high (>85 percent)

SY2025

Rating: 4

Comments:

Face to Face Academy continues to have strong teacher retention with 100% retention from the SY24 to SY25. This has allowed for strong connections to be formed leading to student success both academically and socially.

SY2024

Rating: 4

Comments: The longevity of the F2F staff team is impressive and is to be commended. The school believes this continuity and individual staff commitment strongly contribute to student success. Similarly to last year, 100% of staff returned.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 4

Comments: The schools annual report noted that all staff with a role over .5FTE returned from SY2022 to SY2023. Many staff members at F2F have been a part of the school community for well over a decade. This retention speaks volumes about not only the commitment of the individual staff members, but also the health of the organizational culture. The team's ability to weather the past few years successfully—and intact, is impressive. Students and families are well-served by this extremely competent, experienced, and caring group of individuals.

SY2021-22 Rating: 4

Comments: The school reported that 11/11 (100%) of the teaching staff employed in the 2020-21 school year were returning in the 2021-2022 school year. This is an exceptional result and a continuation of a trend of strong teacher retention. The ability to retain a strong and experienced staff is of particular importance during a time of intense competition for high quality educators and puts Face to Face Academy in a strong position to continue serving students well. St. Thomas appreciates the talent and expertise represented by the Face to Face staff and appreciates their commitment to serving students.

Source: Annual report

3.12 Does the school generally retain its students from October 1st through the close of the school year?

1 = Does not meet standard	Student retention rates are more than 10% below the school's agreed-upon target rates.
2 = Approaching standard	Student retention rates are 5-10% below the school's agreed-upon target rates.
3 = Meets standard	The school is consistently fully enrolled. Student retention rates are within 5% or above the school's agreed-upon target rates
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY2025

Rating: 2

Comments:

According to the Academy's Annual Report, 82% of students remained enrolled from the beginning of the year. This figure also includes students that graduated midyear. There was no set school's agreed-upon target rate. The average retention rate of other University of St. Thomas authorized charter school is around 90%.

SY2024

Rating: 3

Comments: F2F began the year with 98 students enrolled as of October 1 and an additional 30 students enrolled after October 1. 35 students left during the school year. This 9 graduated mid-year. 65 students were enrolled the full school year. This reflects a 75.5% retention rate.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 3

Comments: F2F retained 81.4% of their students during the school year. This is a positive outcome, particularly given the student population served. Note that figures from the prior year were impacted by the pandemic and are unlikely to be achievable under normal circumstances.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: F2F retained 98.9% of their students during the school year.

Source: Annual report, renewal application, MDE Website

3.13 Does the school exhibit a high level of parent satisfaction?

1 = Does not meet standard	Less than 75% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school OR the school failed to achieve a response rate greater than 10%.
2 = Approaching standard	More than 75% but less than 85% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school and the school achieved a response rate greater than 10%.
3 = Meets standard	More than 85% but less than 95% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school and the school achieved a response rate greater than 10%.

4 = Exceeds standard	At least 95% of parents surveyed indicate they are satisfied with the school and the school achieved a response rate greater than 10%.
SY2025	
Rating: 3	
Comments:	Face to Face Academy uses the Safe Schools Survey, a tool that measures parents/guardians' beliefs on important core issues such as effective learning, belongingness, and overall school experience. The overall average of the results was 4.58 out of 5. The scale was 1(poor) to 5(excellent).
SY2024	
Rating: 3	
Comments:	From the school's Safe and Supportive Schools survey which is administered annually, the average rating was 4.52 across four categories (personal safety, belongingness, climate and personal school experience). 23 surveys were returned representing the families of 29 students.
SY2022-2023 Rating:	<u>3</u>
Comments:	The school's results on the Safe and Supportive Schools survey indicated strong performance in the areas of school experience (4.45/5=89%) and Belonging (4.54/5=91%).
SY2021-22 Rating:	<u>3</u>
Comments:	The school reported in its annual report that, "parents indicted a high degree of satisfaction with the Academy's efforts, especially during its focus on COVID safety measures." Parents rated the school 4.6/5 (92%) when asked: "How would you rate the support your child is receiving to learn and do well?"
Source:	Annual report, School parent satisfaction survey--overall satisfaction indicator

3.14 Is the school's physical plant safe and conducive to learning?	
1 = Does not meet standard	The facility requires much improvement in order to provide a safe environment that is conducive to learning. Significant health and safety requirements have not been met OR the school lacks many conditions such as the following: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students.
2 = Approaching standard	Significant health and safety requirements are being met, but the facility needs some improvement in order to provide a safe environment that is

	<p>conducive to learning. It partially – but not fully – provides conditions such as the following: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students.</p>
3 = Meets standard	<p>Significant health and safety code requirements are being met AND the facility generally provides a safe environment that is conducive to learning, based on conditions such as: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students.</p>
4 = Exceeds standard	<p>All health and safety code requirements are being met AND the facility generally provides a safe environment that is conducive to learning, based on conditions such as: a) a design well-suited to meet the curricular and social needs of its students, faculty, and community members; b) a size appropriate for the enrollment and student-teacher ratios in each class; c) adequate maintenance and security; d) well-maintained equipment and furniture that match the educational needs of the students; e) accessibility to all students. Additionally, the facility meets the mission of the school.</p>
SY2025 Rating: 4	
Comments:	<p>F2F Academy effectively uses all its space. The building has a secured entrance and external doors are locked. Student work is displayed throughout the school building and represents F2F's diverse student body. As F2F has small class sizes, all the rooms were well suited for the number of students. With the property the school's ABC purchased in the 23/24 SY, the school is in the planning stages of developing an experiential learning outdoor space that will tie into core and elective classes. The space will include three new outdoor classrooms, recreation and physical education spaces, expanded garden spaces, a memorial garden, and gathering space.</p>
SY2024 Rating: 4	<p>Comments: F2F's facility is well maintained, safe and serves the students and program well. While the location does not allow for a significant increase in in-person instruction, the school has applied lessons learned and best practices from COVID to establish hybrid and online learning opportunities as well. Additionally, the school's ABC recently purchased land adjacement to the school to allow for expanded outdoor learning space.</p>
SY2022-2023 Rating: 4	
Comments:	<p>F2F's facility meets legal health and safety requirements and is well cared for. Enrollment levels grow slowly each year, and the school is actively assessing its options to accommodate its future student body. The board and school leadership have also taken thoughtful action in the near-term to ensure</p>

that the spaces used by students remain clean, up-to-date, and capable of serving the school's needs. A number of updates were made recently, including re-configuration of some rooms, installation of a sliding wall, fresh paint, and additional small workspaces for students.

SY2021-22 Rating: 4

Comments: F2F's facility meets legal health and safety requirements, and the school is well designed and furnished in a way that is extremely welcoming, and also conducive to their model. For example, the school recently added studio space to accommodate podcast recording.

Source: Authorizer observation

3.15 Does the school have systems in place that are reducing the number of subjective disciplinary incidents? Note, 'systems' include use of a clear disciplinary policy and relevant management/policy training for teachers. Subjective disciplinary incidents are those captured in the disruptive/disorderly category in DIRS.

1 = Does not meet standard The school does not have a clear disciplinary policy that is widely understood and implemented and subjective disciplinary incidents rose by more than 15 incidents from the prior year.

2= Approaching standard The school has a clear disciplinary policy, but it is not widely understood and implemented and/or subjective disciplinary incidents rose significantly (10-15 incidents or more) from the prior year or remained at a high level (impacting more than 10% of students).

3 = Meets standard The school has a clear disciplinary policy which is widely understood and implemented, and subjective disciplinary events either declined or remained below 10. Classrooms are generally observed to be well-managed during site visits.

4 = Exceeds standard The school has a clear disciplinary policy which is widely understood and implemented, and is felt to be fair by students and families. Subjective disciplinary events have been stable at a level impacting less than 5% of students, or resulting in less than 5 incidents per year for at least two years. Classrooms are uniformly observed to be well-managed during site visits.

SY2025

Rating: N/A

Comments:

St. Thomas is no longer using DIRS data. F2F Academy has a School Wide Behavior Strategies Plan which is described in the Quarter 3 report. Behavior interventions are approached from a model of restorative justice and self-accountability. Behavior interventions are divided into 4 categories: Basic, Moderate, Major, and Final. In an attachment to the Quarter 3 report, F2F provided a detailed explanation of each category. F2F's Equitable Access Learning Model helps to reduce interruptions to education when a student is out of the school building due to serving consequences.

SY2024

Rating: NA

Comments: St. Thomas is no longer using DIRS data due to a question of reliability. As described below, F2F has a school wide behavior management policy that is based on a restorative lens and supported by EALM.

SY2022-2023 Rating: N/A

Comments: DIRS data for Face to Face Academy was not available. However, it is worth noting that the school does have a school wide behavior management policy which is utilized consistently by individual teachers as a part of classroom management, as well as holistically by the entire staff as a part of twice-daily staff meetings. As noted in the school's April Quarterly Report (QR3) p.3, behavior management comes from a restorative lens whenever possible and "Staff are extremely aware of the importance of a student remaining engaged and connected with school. The Academy's Equitable Access Learning Model (EALM) provides an additional tool to reduce interruptions to educational services when students are serving consequences that require them to be out of the school building."

Authorizer observations indicate that EALM has provided a unique and effective options for helping students remain attached to school as they can continue to learn with their same instructors, and seamlessly transition back into the in-person setting.

Interviews with students and families in the fall of 2023 indicated that individuals from both groups view the school's behavior management policies as fair and equitable.

SY2021-22 Rating: N/A

Comments: The DIRS data is not available

Source: MDE DIRS Data, School reported data

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

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

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

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

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

SY2025

Rating: 4

Comments:

F2F Academy has a robust, multifaceted educational program. The program includes small class sizes, a high teacher-student ratio, flexible class scheduling consisting of in person and online classes, year-round calendar, community events/celebrations and instructional & behavior management tools that create a safe community for learning. The staff meet daily before the beginning of the school day and at the end of the school day to discuss students who may need additional support academically, behaviorally, and/or socially. This consistent oversight ensures that students are getting the needed support throughout the day. All students have an Advisor who provides additional one-on-one support. For students continuing to struggle, the school implements their child-find process which is consistent with MN Rule 3525.1341. Additionally, the school ensures that each student receives the support and education needed for them to be successful after graduation. The *NextUp Transition Curriculum* was introduced in SY24 to support instruction for post-high school employability. Also, every graduating senior completes a quarter-long class called Senior Seminar in order to create a transitional plan post high school. The goals of this class are twofold: successful completion of high school and a smooth transition into a work or college program after graduation.

SY2024

Rating: 4

Comments: F2F continues to be a model for its student support structures. The primary structures are described below and, in the school's quarterly reports. However, it is important to note that the school is continuously assessing student needs, stays abreast of the best and emerging practices, and has the flexibility to adapt as needed. The shift to hybrid and online structure is a prime example.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 4

Comments: F2F is exemplary in the area of a school having structures in place to effectively identify and support students needing academic accommodations, mental health supports or other supports in a timely fashion. The full staff meets twice per day and is able to raise and very quickly take action to support students in real time and proactively. The school's schedule is arranged in a way that "allows different team members to be available during every hour of the school day." Communication with family members/guardians or other important persons in a students' life is as frequent as necessary and differentiated to support student needs. The school also works with families/household members to connect individuals with additional supports as needed to ensure that students' households have stability whenever possible.

SY2021-22 Rating: 4

Comments: The school works tirelessly to ensure all student needs are met to the greatest extent possible, staff routinely call students to support their mental health and academic needs and providing

classwork and access to technology. The school also carefully tracks student progress monitoring and adjusting repeatedly to ensure that students continue their journey toward graduation and is even taking note of practices to continue after the pandemic is over. During site visits, staff was observed during their morning meeting to review and discuss students struggling academically or behaviorally, response options are identified, and the efficacy of previous responses are discussed.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews

3.17 Is the school committed to culturally affirming practices and equity by engaging in/ providing the following:

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

1 = Does not meet standard	Staff do not engage in cultural competency training. The board/ staff are not representative of the students the school serves and there is no plan to engage the school's broader community.
2 = Approaching standard	Staff/ Board members inconsistently engage in cultural competency training. The school is committed to recruiting staff/ board members who are representative of their school's community as evident by recruitment practices.
3 = Meets standard	Students/ families of all backgrounds report that the school feels welcoming and accepting. Staff/ Board members regularly engage in cultural competency training, and equity is included in the school's strategic plan. The school routinely engages the school's broader community, as evidenced by staff/ board composition. And the school utilizes a curriculum that is not only representative of the student's it serves; it also represents a multitude of backgrounds and perspectives.
4 = Exceeds standard	NOT APPLICABLE

SY2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

Face to Face Academy

During the Fall Site Visit, parents and students expressed that they feel the school offers both a safe and welcoming environment. Additionally, F2F's curriculum and programming integrate real-life experiences and hands-on activities, helping students gain practical skills while developing a deeper understanding of diversity and inclusion. Experiential learning included courses such as music, ceramics, gardening, and cooking. Students participated in F2F's Wilderness & Outdoor Programming including hiking, skiing, and preparing for an overnight trip. Also, through F2F's student-run podcast and the launch of the Academy's YouTube Channel, students express and highlight societal and community issues. Students also participated in Activate to Relate at the Philadelphia Community Farm. This program teaches how community

connections promote land stewardship. A group of 8 students participated in the day-long Youth Climate Justice Summit, which included meeting local and state officials. The school's library hosts a large collection of urban and multicultural books and resources that serves its diverse student population. The Academy staff participated in extensive professional development including the Summer Literacy Initiative, Book Club, and Kami. A Literacy Coach worked directly with each teacher to address differentiation for all learning styles for both in-person and online instruction. All coaching was done through the lens of how students approach reading. Through QComp, the Academy also hosted in-house professional development workshops focused on *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain* by Zaretta Hammond, further reinforcing the school's commitment to equity, inclusion, and culturally relevant pedagogy.

SY2024

Rating: 3

Comments: During the site visit, students and families expressed they felt welcomed and accepted. Focus Area 2 in the current strategic plan is to "Increase Graduation and Retention Rates through the continued development of the Equitable Access Learning Model." Observations and discussions with staff highlighted that engaging students in coursework and with materials that are culturally relevant is a priority.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 3

Comments: Interviews with students and families during the fall SY2023 visit indicated that students and families find the school a welcoming and accepting environment. Equity is a key part of the school's value system and authorizer observation of the development and use of the EALM program over the past two years indicates that equity and access to course materials and learnings for students across modalities was a key concern. *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain* by Zaretta Hammond was used as a focus text for in-house workshops throughout the year.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: During site visits, students and families reported that staff at the school go well-beyond expectations to make students feel at home at F2F via phone calls and regular check ins. The school reports in their annual report that they have devoted federal funds to "culturally relevant curriculum and professional development opportunities." The school is located in a community clinic which serves as a hub for the neighborhood.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews

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

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

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

SY2025

Rating: 3

Comments:

The Academy's unwavering commitment to equity and inclusion is deeply embedded in its mission "to graduate the most at-risk for dropping out of high school by integrating the highest quality of educational and support services." This commitment is clearly reflected in the diverse student population it serves. Through intentional marketing strategies, the Academy reaches out to often marginalized communities, resulting in a student body where approximately 85% qualify for free or reduced-price lunch, 65% identify as students of color, and nearly 30% receive special education services—each of these figures well above the state average.

SY2024

Rating: 3

Comments: F2F continues to serve a diverse student population and value equity. School programming, policies and practices are clearly designed to embrace and support this diversity.

SY2022-2023 Rating: 3

Comments: Face to Face serves a student population that is diverse in every way and has continued to be able to serve all students interested in joining the school without an overly long wait. Roughly 29% of the school's students received special education services during SY2023, and the experienced staff, low student-staff ratios, and personalized/relationship-focused model have created an exceptional learning environment. School policies and practices are clear, and equity focused, and authorizer interviews with students and families indicate that the school's valuing of equity comes through clearly. The school does not currently serve any English Learners, but is prepared and willing to offer services should the need arise.

SY2021-22 Rating: 3

Comments: The school has been successful in achieving consistent enrollment and fair practices for new students with little advertisement or recruiting. As noted above, F2F's facility is well designed and furnished in a way that is extremely welcoming, and also conducive to their model. Student note that they like being in/at the building. The school recently added studio space to accommodate podcast recording.

Source: Site visits, ongoing correspondence, interviews