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| --- |
| Charter Renewal Process |

According to §2411 Charter Term and Renewal a charter may be renewed for successive terms of 5 years, although an authorizer may grant a renewal for a term not to exceed 15 years based on the performance, demonstrated capacities and circumstances of each public charter school. An authorizer may grant renewal with specific conditions for necessary improvements to a public charter school.

No later than June 30th of a public charter school’s 4th year of operation under each 5-year term of a charter contract, the authorizer shall issue a public charter school performance report. If the charter of the public charter school is expiring, the authorizer shall offer charter renewal application guidance to the school. The performance report required in this subsection must summarize the public charter school’s performance record to date, based on the data required by this chapter and the charter contract, and must provide notice of any weaknesses or concerns perceived by the authorizer concerning the school that may jeopardize its position in seeking renewal if not timely rectified. The school must be given the opportunity to respond to the performance report and submit any corrections or clarifications for the report. The renewal application guidance required must include or refer explicitly to the criteria and standards that will guide the authorizer’s renewal decisions, which must be based on the performance framework under §2409. The renewal application guidance must, at a minimum, require and provide an opportunity for the public charter school to:

1. Present additional evidence, beyond the data contained in the performance report, supporting its case for charter renewal;
2. Describe improvements undertaken or planned for the school; and
3. Detail the school’s plans for the next charter term.

No later than September 30th of a public charter school’s 5th year of operation under a term of a charter contract, or September 30th of a public charter school’s final authorized year of operation under a term of a charter contract, the governing board of a public charter school seeking renewal shall submit a renewal application to the Maine Charter School Commission pursuant to any renewal application guidance offered by the Maine Charter School Commission.

The Maine Charter School Commission shall rule by resolution on a renewal application under this section no later than 45 days after the filing of the renewal application. In making charter renewal decisions, every authorizer shall:

1. Ground its decisions in evidence of the public charter school’s performance over the term of the charter in accordance with the performance framework under §2409;
2. Ensure that data used in making renewal decisions are available to the public charter school and the public; and
3. Provide a public report summarizing the evidence basis for each decision.

A charter may be revoked at any time or not renewed if the authorizer determines that the public charter school failed to comply with the provisions of this chapter or: committed a material violation of any of the terms, conditions, standards or procedures required under this chapter or the charter contract; failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward the performance expectations set forth in the charter contract; failed to meet generally accepted standards of fiscal management; or violated any provision of law from which the school was not exempted.

If an authorizer revokes or does not renew a charter, the authorizer shall clearly state, in a resolution of its governing entity, the reasons for the revocation or nonrenewal. The authorizer shall include in the charter contract a description of the standards and processes under which the authorizer may pursue revocation of the charter contract. The processes must comply with §2410, subsection 2 and provide an opportunity for the public charter school to be heard prior to a decision on revocation.

The following public charter school performance report shall be issued no later than June 30th, 2020, ACADIA Academy’s 4th year of operation under its initial 5-year charter contract. The performance report summarizes ACADIA Academy’s performance record to date and provides notice of any weaknesses or concerns perceived by the Maine Charter School Commission (MCSC) concerning the school that may jeopardize its position in seeking renewal if not timely rectified. ACADIA Academy will be given the opportunity to respond to this report and submit any corrections or clarifications.

|  |
| --- |
| School Information |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| School Name | ACADIA Academy |
| Address | 12 Westminster Street, Lewiston, Maine 04240 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Board President | Amy Dieterich |
| Board Vice President | Sean Siebert |
| Board Secretary | Mary Verrill |
| Board Treasurer | Samantha Pedersen |
| Board Member | Christopher Brann |
| Board Member | Joey Beaudette |
| Board Member | Sean Bushway |
| Board Member | Danielle Moreau |
| Board Member | Victoria Stanton |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Director | Brittiny-Rae Perron |
| Facilities Manager | Tracy Turner |
| Special Education Coordinator | Emily Giorgetti |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Year Opened | 2016-17 School Year |
| Years in Operation | 4 |
| Number of Sending Districts | 12 |
| Grades Served | PreK – 5 |
| Current Enrollment | 229 *(as of 10-1-19 certified date)* |
| Students on Waiting List | 75 *(as of 10-1-19 certified date)* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mission | ACADIA, A Charter Academy for Developing Independence and Achievement, will provide a rigorous, comprehensive educational program for children of the Lewiston/Auburn area in grades PreK through 6th. ACADIA will promote high educational achievement through direct teaching opportunities that are entwined with extensive experiential learning opportunities. ACADIA faculty and staff will support the development of the whole child as each student develops academically, socially and emotionally in a safe community that requires personal accountability and meaningful participation. It is our intent to support our individual students in developing their full potential, while teaching them the value of belonging, connectedness and contribution to our larger community. |
| Vision | ACADIA, A Charter Academy for Developing Independence and Achievement, will provide for a unique and innovative educational experience. ACADIA students will fully participate within our learning community, experiencing rigorous daily instruction comprised of carefully selected curricula to allow for academic acceleration, small group interaction and meaningful application. Authentic, relevant experiential activities will provide critical opportunities for our students to grasp real world application of concepts and skills, through the delivery of multi-modal learning opportunities that are necessary to meet the learning preferences of our students. Our students will be challenged to meet high expectations for academic performance, social and emotional competence, and demonstrate evidence of commitment to their community. We expect students to embrace high standards of personal accountability and commitment to their personal learning journey through innovative projects of self-study and interest. |
| Demographic Information | |

|  |
| --- |
| Performance Framework |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **2020** | | | |  |  | **2019** | | |  | **2018** | | |  | **2017** | | |
| Indicator |  | Exceeds | Meets | Partially meets | Does not Meet |  | Exceeds | Meets | Partially meets | Does not Meet |  | Meets | Partially meets | Does not meet |  | Meets | Partially meets | Does not meet |
| Student Academic Proficiency |  | No data due to COVID-19 | | | |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |
| Student Academic Growth |  | No data due to COVID-19 | | | |  |  | **X** |  |  |  |  | **X** |  |  | Gather baseline data | | |
| Achievement Gaps in proficiency and growth between major student subgroups |  | No data due to COVID-19 | | | |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |
| Student Attendance |  | **X** |  |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |
| Enrollment |  | **X** |  |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |
| Governance Board Performance and Stewardship |  |  | **X** |  |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |
| Financial Performance and Sustainability |  |  | **pending** |  |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |
| Adequacy of Facilities Maintenance in Support of Program |  |  | **X** |  |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |
| Parent and Community Engagement |  | No survey data due to COVID-19 | | | |  |  | **X** |  |  |  |  | **X** |  |  | **X** |  |  |
| School Social and Academic Climate |  |  | **X** |  |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  | **X** |  |  |  |  | **X** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Academic Performance |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *2016-17* | *2017-18* | *2018-19* | *2019-20* |
| *Academic Proficiency* | Partially Met | Partially Met | Partially Met | No data due to COVID-19 |
| *Academic Growth* | NA | Partially Met | Partially Met |
| *Achievement Gaps* | Met | Met | Met |

**Student Academic Proficiency:**

**Year 1, 2016-17**

**Targets:**

* Year 1 of Testing (2017-2018), eligible students will complete ELA and Math testing to determine the baseline data for ACADIA Academy students. Goals will be set using the results of the baseline information and information gained from the larger testing data set generated by Maine students.
* In Years 1-5, the FAST (The Formative Assessment System for Teachers) Bridge Computer Adaptive Assessment for Reading, 75% of students will exhibit a Rate of Improvement (ROI) from Fall to Spring, that falls within the 75th percentile or higher nationally.
* In Years 1-5, using the FAST Bridge Computer Adaptive Assessment for Mathematics, 75% of students will exhibit a Rate of Improvement (ROI) from Fall to Spring that is at the 75th percentile or higher nationally.
* In Years 1-5, 100% of students will make demonstrated progress towards 100% of MAPS (My Achievement Plans for Success) Goals outlined throughout the school year, as evidenced by work samples collected within the PRIDE Portfolios.
* In Year 1, the MAPS (My Achievement Plans for Success) will be developed and implemented; complete with a rubric designed to objectively define stages of Proficiency. During Year 1, baseline data will be developed about student use of MAPS and proficiency levels. This baseline data will be utilized to develop goals for Years 2-5.
* In Year 1, students will be assessed in Reading utilizing the FAST Bridge Computer Adaptive Assessment. Baseline data will be collected on all students and utilized to establish goals for Years 2-5.
* In Year 1, students will be assessed in Math utilizing the FAST Bridge Computer Adaptive Assessment. Baseline data will be collected on all students and utilized to establish goals for Years 2-5.
* In Years 1-5, using the FAST Bridge Curriculum Based Measures for reading and early literacy, 75% of students will exhibit a Rate of Improvement (ROI) from Fall to Spring that is at the 75th percentile or higher nationally.

**Performance:**

Because ACADIA Academy began with grades preK-2 in its first year, no students were eligible to participate in Maine State Assessments.

ACADIA Academy reported that FAST Bridge Adaptive does not offer the ability to calculate the number of students who demonstrated 75% or higher ROI as outlined in the school’s Performance Framework. The following data were provided.

Reading:

* 15% of students demonstrated 85% ROI or higher.
* 35% of students were within 30-84.99% ROI.

Math:

* 16% of students demonstrated 85% or higher.
* 28% of students fell within the 30-84.99% ROI range.

100% of students made demonstrated progress towards 100% of MAPS (My Achievement Plans for Success). Goals outlined throughout the school year, as evidenced by work samples collected within the PRIDE Portfolios, meeting the 100% target.

ACADIA Academy created a rubric designed to objectively define stages of Proficiency on the MAPS (My Achievement Plans for Success). The school used the data collected and set goals for 2017-2018. ACADIA met the MAPS target for school year 2016-17.

Students were assessed in reading and math using the FAST (The Formative Assessment System for Teachers) Bridge Computer Adaptive Assessment. Baseline data were collected on all students and is being used to establish goals for years 2-5.

Reading:

* In Kindergarten 58% of students were On Grade Level (OGL).
* In First grade 52% of students were OGL.
* In Second grade 70% of students were OGL.

Math:

* In Kindergarten 65% of students were On Grade Level (OGL).
* In First grade 83% of students were OGL.
* In Second grade 91% of students were OGL.

On the FAST Bridge Curriculum Based Measures (CBM) for reading and early literacy the following percentages of students exhibited a Rate of Improvement (ROI) from Fall to Spring that was at the 75th percentile or higher nationally.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage of students with a (ROI) at 75th percentile or higher by grade | |
| Kindergarten | 50% |
| First Grade | 23% |
| Second Grade | 19% |

The target of 75% of students exhibiting a (ROI) from Fall to Spring that is at the 75th percentile or higher nationally was partially met.

**Year 2, 2017-18**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| State Assessment-reading: Year 1 of Testing (2017-2018), eligible students will complete testing to determine the baseline data for ACADIA Academy students | Goals will be set using the results of the baseline information gained from the larger testing data generated by Maine students | Grade 3 – 21.43% proficient | Met |
| State Assessment-math: Year 1 of Testing (2017-2018), eligible students will complete testing to determine the baseline data for ACADIA Academy students | Goals will be set using the results of the baseline information gained from the larger testing data generated by Maine students | Grade 3 – results not publicly reportable due to small ‘n’ size and maintaining student confidentiality | Met |
| School Selected Assessment-reading: students will be assessed in Reading utilizing the FAST Bridge Computer Adaptive Assessment | In year 2, ACADIA will maintain 59% OGL (on grade level) | K – 73%  1 – 50%  2 – 66%  3 – 70%  (School-Wide - 65%) | Partially Met |
| School Selected Assessment-math: students will be assessed in math utilizing the FAST Bridge Computer Adaptive Assessment | In year 2, ACADIA will maintain 79% OGL (on grade level) | K – 75%  1 – 79%  2 – 83%  3 – 30%  (School-Wide - 77%) | Partially Met |
| School Selected Assessment- Goal Setting: In year 2, student success creating and using their MAPS (My Achievement Plans for Success) | During year 2, baseline data will be developed about student use of MAPS and proficiency levels. This baseline data will be utilized to develop goals for years 3-5 | Baseline data were collected | Met |
| School Selected Assessment – PreK Brigance:  PreK students will be assessed during the spring testing window | Students will score at or above the cut off score for their age bracket at the time of testing | 79% of students scored at or above the cut off score for his/her age bracket | Did Not Meet |

**Performance:**

100% of eligible ACADIA students participated in the state testing. Grade 3 students were tested. 21.34% of students scored proficient on the ELA assessment. Because of the small ‘n’ size, scores in math are available to the school and the Commission but are not publicly reportable for maintaining student confidentiality. The school will analyze the results and set targets for the coming year.

On the FAST Bridge Reading Assessment, the target of maintaining 59% OGL was reached in 2 out of 4 grade levels. Grade 1 did not meet the 79% target (gr. 1 OGL=50%). On the FAST Bridge Math Assessment, the target of maintaining 79% OGL was reached in 2 out of 4 grade levels. Grades K and 3 did not meet the 79% target (K OGL=75%, gr. 3 OGL=30%).

Goal Setting – Every teacher used the PRIDE rubric to determine what level a student was on a 4-point proficiency rating with regards to goal setting, planning, execution, and reflection of goals. ACADIA Academy adjusted the rubrics as needed during the summer staff meetings and used baseline data to set benchmarks for SY 2018-19.

On the PreK Brigance, 23 of 29 students (79%) met the cut off score for their age group. ACADIA Academy reported having learned from the results of the Brigance administration.

**Year 3, 2018-19**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Proficiency on State Assessments in reading | The number of students meeting, or exceeding state expectations will be equal to or greater than the state average | % at/above state expectation:  ACADIA – 42.9%  Maine – 55.9% | Did Not Meet |
| Proficiency on State Assessments in math | The number of students meeting, or exceeding state expectations will be equal to or greater than the state average | % at/above state expectation:  ACADIA – 37.5%  Maine – 35.6% | Met |
| Proficiency on the spring administration of the Brigance | 75% of PreK students will score at or above the cut off score for their age bracket on spring testing | 72% of PreK students scored at or above the cut off score | Met |

**Performance:**

ACADIA met its target for proficiency on the MEA in math and did not meet it in ELA. The school met the target for PreK proficiency.

**Year 4, 2019-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Proficiency on State Assessments in reading | The number of students meeting, or exceeding state expectations will be equal to or greater than the state average | |  | | --- | | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Maine Department of Education applied for, and received, waivers that eliminate state assessment requirements for this year. | | NA |
| Proficiency on State Assessments in math | The number of students meeting, or exceeding state expectations will be equal to or greater than the state average | |  | | --- | | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Maine Department of Education applied for, and received, waivers that eliminate state assessment requirements for this year. | | NA |
| Proficiency on the spring administration of the Brigance | 75% of PreK students will score at or above the cut off score for their age bracket on spring testing | |  | | --- | | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the spring Brigance was not administered. | | NA |

**Performance:**

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, 2020 proficiency data are not available.

The school’s MEA results from 2018-19 showed significant improvement from the previous year’s results. In 2019, the school had more students taking the assessment, as it had two grade levels taking the assessment rather than one (grades 3 and 4).

In 2018, 21.43% of students were at or above expectations in ELA. In 2019, 42.85% of students were at or above expectations.

In 2018, the percentage of students at or above expectations for math was not reportable due to small ‘n’ size. In 2019, 37.5% of students at or above grade level.

**Student Academic Growth:**

**Year 1, 2016-17**

**Targets:**

During the 2017-2018 school year ACADIA third grade students participated in the Maine State Assessment for math and reading. The data were used to establish baseline data and will be utilized to establish goals for growth.

**Performance:**

Because ACADIA Academy began with grades PreK-2 in its first year, no students were eligible to participate in Maine State Assessments. Growth targets were not applicable in Year 1.

**Year 2, 2017-18**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| School Selected Assessment-reading: In years 1-5, using FAST Bridge Computer Adaptive Assessment for Reading, students will exhibit a specific Rate of Improvement (ROI) from Fall to Spring | 75% of same students tested in Fall and Spring will exhibit a Rate of Improvement (ROI) from Fall to Spring that falls within the 50th percentile or higher nationally | K – 72%  1 – 43%  2 – 34%  3 – 56%  School-Wide – 54% | Did Not Meet |
| School Selected Assessment- math: In years 1-5, using FAST Bridge Computer Adaptive Assessment for Mathematics, students will exhibit a specific Rate of Improvement (ROI) from Fall to Spring | 75% of same students tested in Fall and Spring will exhibit a Rate of Improvement (ROI) from Fall to Spring that falls within the 50th percentile or higher nationally | K – 74%  1 – 79%  2 – 47%  3 – 33%  School-Wide – 61% | Partially Met |
| State Assessment- Same Cohort Growth in reading: During the 2017-2018 school year, ACADIA third grade students will participate in the Maine State Assessment | Baseline data will be utilized to establish goals for growth | Baseline data collected – see student academic proficiency | Met |
| State Assessment- Same Cohort Growth in math: During the 2017-2018 school year, ACADIA third grade students will participate in the Maine State Assessment | Baseline data will be utilized to establish goals for growth | Baseline data collected – see student academic proficiency | Met |

**Performance:**

FAST Bridge Reading – The target of having 75% of students having a 50% or higher rate of improvement was not met. The K-3 average was 54%.

FAST Bridge Math – The target of having 75% of students having a 50% or higher rate of improvement was met at the first-grade level. The 3 other grades did not reach the target.

The school has state assessment data for 1 year. The school analyzed the results to set growth targets.

**Year 3, 2018-19**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Students will show progress in their learning through growth in their NWEA scores in ELA reading and language from fall to spring of each school year | Students will show progress in their learning through growth in their NWEA RIT scores from fall to spring of each school year | 89% of students showed growth on NWEA scores from fall to spring | Met |
| Students will show progress in their learning through growth in their NWEA scores in math from fall to spring of each school year | Students will show progress in their learning through growth in their NWEA RIT scores from fall to spring of each school year | 98% of students showed growth on NWEA scores from fall to spring | Exceeded |
| Growth on NWEA as measured by projected growth on MAP assessment | School will meet goal of 70% of eligible[[1]](#footnote-2) students will meet their projected growth on NWEA ELA reading and language by the end of the school year 2022-2023  2018-2019 Establish baseline | 46% of eligible students met their projected growth on NWEA ELA reading and language from fall to spring | Established Baseline |
| Growth on NWEA as measured by projected growth on MAP assessment | School will meet goal of 70% of eligible students will meet their projected growth on NWEA math by the end of the school year 2022-2023  2018-19 Establish baseline | 52% of eligible students met their projected growth on NWEA math from fall to spring | Established Baseline |
| Growth on ELA reading and language Teaching Strategies Gold scores from fall to spring | PreK students will show progress in their learning through growth in their ELA reading and language TSG scores from fall to spring | 100% of students met the literacy growth range | Exceeded |
| Growth on math Teaching Strategies Gold scores from fall to spring | PreK students will show progress in their learning through growth in their math TSG scores from fall to spring | 100% of students met the math growth range | Exceeded |

**Performance:**

On the ELA portion of the NWEA the school-wide average of students making growth was 88.8%; 144 out of 162 students with fall and spring scores showed progress on their learning. On the math portion of the NWEA the school-wide average of students making growth was 98%; 159 out of 161 students with fall and spring scores showed progress on their learning.

The school-wide average for meeting projected RIT on the NWEA ELA was 45.6% (74 out of 162 students with both fall and spring scores.) The school-wide average for meeting projected RIT on the NWEA ELA was 51.5% (83 out of 161 students with both fall and spring scores.)

**Year 4, 2019-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| PreK students will show progress in their learning through growth in their TSG1 scores in ELA reading and language from fall to spring | PreK students will show progress in their learning through growth in their ELA reading and language TSG scores from fall to spring | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the spring TSG was not administered. School will not have comparative data from fall to spring; therefore, no growth data to report | NA |
| PreK students will show progress in their learning through growth in their TSG scores in math from fall to spring | PreK students will show progress in their learning through growth in their math TSG scores from fall to spring | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the spring TSG was not administered. School will not have comparative data from fall to spring; therefore, no growth data to report | NA |
| Students will show progress in their learning through growth in their NWEA RIT scores in ELA reading and language from fall to spring of each school year | Students will show progress in their learning through growth in their NWEA RIT scores from fall to spring of each school year | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the spring NWEA test window was cancelled. Due to this cancellation, no growth data are available to report | NA |
| Students will show progress in their learning through growth in their NWEA scores in math from fall to spring of each school year | Students will show progress in their learning through growth in their NWEA RIT scores from fall to spring of each school year | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the spring NWEA test window was cancelled. Due to this cancellation, no growth data are available to report | NA |
| Growth on NWEA as measured by projected growth on MAP assessment | School will meet goal of 70% of eligible[[2]](#footnote-3) students will meet their projected growth on NWEA ELA reading and language by the end of the school year 2022-2023 | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the spring NWEA test window was cancelled. Due to this cancellation, no growth data are available to report | NA |
| Growth on NWEA as measured by projected growth on MAP assessment | School will meet goal of 70% of eligible students will meet their projected growth on NWEA math by the end of the school year 2022-2023 | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the spring NWEA test window was cancelled. Due to this cancellation, no growth data are available to report | NA |
| Growth on ELA reading and language Teaching Strategies Gold scores from fall to spring | PreK students will show progress in their learning through growth in their ELA reading and language TSG scores from fall to spring | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the spring TSG was cancelled. Due to this cancellation, no growth data are available to report | NA |
| Growth on math Teaching Strategies Gold scores from fall to spring | PreK students will show progress in their learning through growth in their math TSG scores from fall to spring | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the spring TSG was cancelled. Due to this cancellation, no growth data are available to report | NA |

**Performance:**

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, 2020 growth data are not available. In reviewing fall to winter data, there is evidence that, overall, the students who have attended ACADIA since pre-k are achieving a greater level of academic proficiency.

**Achievement Gaps in proficiency and growth between major student subgroups:**

**Year 1, 2016-17**

**Targets:**

* During Year 2, after completion of the initial testing with the Maine State Assessment, ACADIA staff will determine the performance gaps between major student subgroups and will develop goals to decrease performance gaps across those subgroups.
* During November of 2016, after completion of the initial testing with the FAST Bridge Assessment, ACADIA staff will determine the performance gaps between major student subgroups and will develop goals to decrease performance gaps across those subgroups.

**Performance:**

The first administration of FAST Bridge was done in October. In November staff looked at the data and noted a considerable number of students were on grade level.

Subgroups included: students receiving special education services, first grade struggling readers, and students reading above grade level.

ACADIA Academy met the target of using FAST Bridge Assessment data to determine the performance gaps between major student subgroups and developing goals to decrease performance gaps across those subgroups.

**Year 2, 2017-18**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Gaps in proficiency and growth between major student subgroups on Maine State Assessment in reading | After completion of the initial testing with the Maine State Assessment, ACADIA staff will determine the performance gaps between major student subgroups and will develop goals that will show decrease in performance gaps across those subgroups | Baseline collected – results not publicly reportable due to small “n” size and maintaining student confidentiality | Met |
| Gaps in proficiency and growth between major student subgroups on Maine State Assessment in math | After completion of the initial testing with the Maine State Assessment, ACADIA staff will determine the performance gaps between major student subgroups and will develop goals that will show decrease in performance gaps across those subgroups | Baseline collected – results not publicly reportable due to small “n” size and maintaining student confidentiality | Met |
| Gaps in proficiency and growth between major student subgroups on school selected assessments for literacy | ACADIA Academy will decrease identified subgroup gaps in proficiency from the fall administration of the FAST Bridge assessment to the spring administration of the FAST Bridge assessment | Gap decreased by 5% between students with an Individualized Education Plan and students who do not have an IEP | Met |
| Gaps in proficiency and growth between major student subgroups on school selected assessments for math | ACADIA Academy will decrease identified subgroup gaps in proficiency from the fall administration of the FAST Bridge assessment to the spring administration of the FAST Bridge assessment | Gap decreased by 18% between students with an Individualized Education Plan and students who do not have an IEP | Met |

**Performance:**

Based on the school selected assessment:

Reading – In the fall, 67% of ACADIA students with an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) were below Grade Level Expectations (GLE), while 36% of students without an IEP were below GLE. At the spring assessment, 50% of students with an IEP were below grade level, while 24% of students without an IEP were below grade level. The gap was decreased by 5% in this area.

Math – In the fall, 59% of ACADIA students with an IEP were below GLE, while 18% of students without an IEP were below GLE. At the spring administration, 30% of students with an IEP were below GLE and 7% of students without an IEP were below GLE. The gap was decreased by 18% in this area.

The Maine State assessment data were collected to establish baseline data among various student subgroups. The results are available to the school and the Commission but are not publicly reportable due to small “n” size and maintaining student confidentiality.

**Year 3, 2018-19**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Achievement gaps in proficiency between major subgroups on the Maine state assessment | The school will provide evidence of closing achievement gaps between major subgroups (EL, special education, gender, ED, 504, ethnic and racial minorities) | On the MEA an achievement gap is present between males and females in both math and ELA, with females outperforming males in both areas – by 10% and 33%, respectively | Met |
| Achievement gaps in growth between major subgroups on the NWEA | The school will provide evidence of closing achievement gaps between major subgroups (EL, special education, gender, ED, 504, ethnic and racial minorities) | The school collected and reported baseline data on subgroups | Met |

**Performance:**

Baseline data were collected for closing achievement gaps by gender on both the MEA and NWEA.

**Year 4, 2019-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Achievement gaps in proficiency between major subgroups on the Maine state assessment | The school will provide evidence of closing achievement gaps between major subgroups (EL, special education, gender, ED, 504, ethnic and racial minorities) | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Maine Department of Education applied for, and received, waivers that eliminate state assessment requirements for this year | NA |
| Achievement gaps in growth between major subgroups on the NWEA | The school will provide evidence of closing achievement gaps between major subgroups (EL, special education, gender, ED, 504, ethnic and racial minorities) | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the spring NWEA test window was cancelled. Due to this cancellation, no growth data are available to report | NA |

**Performance:**

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic neither MEA proficiency data, nor NWEA growth data are available.

|  |
| --- |
| Attendance and Reenrollment |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
| Attendance | Met | Met | Met | Exceeded |
| Enrollment/Reenrollment | Met | Met | Exceeded | Exceeded |

**Year 1, 2016-17**

**Targets:**

Student Attendance:

* During the 2016-17 school year attendance data will be collected and reported on all students enrolled in ACADIA Academy during the days in session following the traditional school calendar. This data will be utilized as baseline data and to establish attendance goals for year 2.

Student Enrollment:

* In years 1-5, ACADIA will maintain 90% of student enrollment throughout the school year.
* In years 2-5, ACADIA will maintain 90% of students in year-to-year re-enrollment.
* In years 2-5, ACADIA will maintain 90% of students enrolled for these consecutive years for all eligible students.

**Performance:**

ACADIA Academy’s average daily attendance rate was 95%.

During the 2016-17 school year ACADIA Academy maintained 98% of student enrollment throughout the school year, meeting the target of maintaining 90% of student enrollment throughout the school year.

ACADIA had a re-enrollment rate of 96%.

**Year 2, 2017-18**

Student Attendance

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Average Daily Attendance Rate | ACADIA will hold daily attendance that is at or higher than 95% | ADA = 96% | Met |

**Performance:**

ACADIA’s daily attendance rate was 96.1%.

Enrollment

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Maintaining student enrollment throughout the year | In years 1-5, ACADIA will maintain 90% of same students enrolled at the state count day through the school year | Same student enrollment at end of year = 98% | Met |
| Student re-enrollment from one year to the next | In years 2-5, ACADIA will maintain 90% of eligible students showing intent to re-enroll | Re-enrollment = 98% | Met |

**Performance:**

On October 1 “state count day,” ACADIA had 172 students enrolled. The school had 4 students unenroll during the year (2 moved out of state and 2 moved back to their district school). All remaining 168 students re-enrolled, for a reenrollment percentage of 97.7%. Summer enrollment was 96% for extended year learning.

**Year 3, 2018-19**

Student Attendance

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Chronic absenteeism | Schools will have 10% or fewer students classified as chronically absent on the last day of school | 9% chronic absenteeism rate | Met |
| Average Daily Attendance | Schools will have an average daily attendance rate in grades PreK – 8 of 93% or higher | 95% average daily attendance rate | Met |

**Performance:**

At ACADIA Academy there were a considerable number of students who did not have a chicken pox vaccine and were excluded from school (in accordance with state law) for 21 days due to chicken pox being present at the school. This led to a lower average daily attendance rate and a higher chronic absenteeism rate than in past years.

Enrollment

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Enrollment throughout the school year | 85% or more of eligible students enrolled on the last day of school will be the same students who were enrolled on state count day[[3]](#footnote-4) | 98% of students enrolled on the last day of school were the same students who were enrolled on state student count day | Exceeded |
| Recurrent enrollment from one year to the next | 85% or more of eligible students enrolled on the last day of school will have completed an “Intent to Reenroll” form for the next school year | 96% of eligible students enrolled on the last day of school completed an “Intent to Reenroll” form for the next school year | Exceeded |

**Performance:**

During the school year four students unenrolled. One family with two students withdrew during the year (to switch to homeschooling) and another family with two students moved away from the area to a distance that increased travel time beyond what was reasonable.

At the end of the school year four students opted not to return for the following year: three children (from two families) moved away from the area and one child was to be homeschooled.

**Year 4, 2019-20**

Student Attendance

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Chronic absenteeism | Schools will have 10% or fewer students classified as chronically absent on the last day of school | 4% chronic absenteeism rate (through March 13, 2020) | Exceeded |
| Average Daily Attendance | Schools will have an average daily attendance rate in grades PreK – 8 of 93% or higher | 97% average daily attendance (ADA) rate | Exceeded |

**Performance:**

ACADIA Academy continues to have a very low rate of chronic absenteeism and a very high ADA rate.

Enrollment

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Enrollment throughout the school year | 85% or more of eligible students enrolled on the last day of school will be the same students who were enrolled on state count day[[4]](#footnote-5) | 98% of students enrolled on the last day of school were the same students who were enrolled on state student count day | Exceeded |
| Recurrent enrollment from one year to the next | 85% or more of eligible students enrolled on the last day of school will have completed an “Intent to Reenroll” form for the next school year | 97% of eligible students enrolled on the last day of school completed an “Intent to Reenroll” form for the next school year | Exceeded |

**Performance:**

ACADIA Academy retained 224 out 229 students during the 2019-2020 school year, resulting in a 96.8% retention rate. Three students withdrew due to moving and two students withdrew due to family circumstances. There are four families that have chosen not to return for school year 2020-2021. Two of these families are going to enter their children into their local school to begin middle school, one family is moving, and one family has selected to return to their local school.

|  |
| --- |
| Governance and Operations |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
| Governance | Met | Met | Met | Met |

**Year 1, 2016-17**

**Targets:**

* In years 1-5, 100% of ACADIA Board meetings will be open to the public; minutes will be kept and made available to the public online and upon request, for public review.

**Performance:**

ACADIA met its target for Governance during the 2016-17 school year. The Board met monthly and provides support and direction to the administration in setting policies and shaping the future direction of the school.

The Board members have a diverse set of skills and expertise including a PhD and School Psychologist, attorney, banker, police officer, adult education specialist, former elementary school teacher, finance professional, and case manager. All members of the Board are active participants.

Board meetings are open to the public. Notices are posted on the ACADIA website. Meeting minutes were posted after approval at the subsequent board meeting with inconsistency. During the 2016-2017 school year ACADIA Academy received three communications from the Commission regarding minutes not being posted promptly. In response, ACADIA identified the cause of the delay and posted all minutes. Additionally, the school implemented a plan for verifying the prompt posting of minutes.

**Year 2, 2017-18**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Public accountability – Transparent, responsive, and legally compliant Board operations | In years 1-5, 100% of ACADIA Board meetings will be open to the public; minutes will be kept and made available to the public online and upon request, for public review | Regular meetings held, minutes posted | Met |

**Performance:**

All board meetings were open to the public, and minutes were kept and posted to the school’s website.

The board continued to meet monthly and provided support and direction to the administration in setting policies and shaping the direction of the school. The board composition was of a diverse set of skills and expertise including but not limited to, a PhD and School Psychologist, attorney, CPA, police officer, adult education specialist, former elementary school teacher, finance professional, case manager, and 2 early education professionals. The board had 4 sub committees: membership, education, grievance, and finance.

**Year 3, 2018-19**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Public Accountability: Transparent, responsive, and legally compliant Board operation | The Governing Board will hold a minimum of 6 meetings per school year | The Governing Board held 11 meetings during the school year | Exceeded |
| Public Accountability: Transparent, responsive, and legally compliant  Board operation | Timely publication of Board meeting minutes upon approval | Board meeting minutes were posted within 5 days of approval | Met |

**Performance:**

ACADIA Academy’s governing board met regularly during the 2018-19 school year. Meeting minutes were posted to the school’s website and were submitted to the MCSC after approval by the board.

**Year 4, 2019-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Public Accountability: Transparent, responsive, and legally compliant Board operation | The Governing Board will hold a minimum of 6 meetings per school year | The Governing Board held 11 meetings during the school year | Exceeded |
| Public Accountability: Transparent, responsive, and legally compliant Board operation | Timely publication of Board meeting minutes upon approval | Board meeting minutes were posted within 5 days of approval | Met |

**Performance:**

The school’s governing board met regularly throughout SY 2019-20 and posted both agenda and minutes to its website.

|  |
| --- |
| Fiscal Performance |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
| Fiscal Performance | Met | Met | Met | pending |

**Year 1, 2016-17**

**Targets:**

* Year 1: Operating costs within 15% of the budget plan.
* Year 2-5: Operating costs within 10% of the budget plan.

**Performance:**

In its first year ACADIA Academy’s operating costs were below budget and met the target of not going over budget by more than 15%.

**Year 2, 2017-18**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Budget versus actual revenue and expenditures | Operating costs within 10% of each year’s revised budget plan which will be approved by the board annually | Operating cost was 92% of budgeted amount | Met |

**Performance:**

At the end of the school year the school’s finance manager reported that based on the full year forecast that was prepared alongside the budget the school estimated that it would finish the year with $1,645,040 in operating expenses, approximately 92% of the governing board approved operating budget which was $1,790,035.

**Year 3, 2018-19**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Near Term Measures   1. Current Ratio 2. Unrestricted Days Cash on Hand | School evaluates its Near-Term Financial Health using the Financial Performance and Stability outline provided by the Commission | Near term measures are healthy | Near term measures are healthy |
| Sustainability Measures   1. Total Margin 2. Debt to asset ratio | School evaluates its Financial Sustainability using the Financial Performance and Stability outline provided by the Commission | Sustainability measures are healthy | Sustainability measures are healthy |
| The school has an annual financial audit conducted. Audit and management letter are submitted to the commission. Audit has no material findings or misstatements | Unmodified opinion on (consolidated) financial statements: no material weaknesses, significant deficiencies or reportable instances of noncompliance and other matters identified in the other information accompanying the auditor’s report on financial statements or in the auditor’s report on internal control over financial reporting and on compliance and other matters | The school had a clean audit for FY 18 | Met |

**Performance:**

The school submitted quarterly financial reports as well as Near Term Measure and Sustainability Measure Data. The data were analyzed, and the school was determined to be healthy in both the Near Term and Sustainability Measures.

**Year 4, 2019-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Near Term Measures   1. Current Ratio 2. Unrestricted Days Cash on Hand | School evaluates its Near-Term Financial Health using the Financial Performance and Stability outline provided by the Commission | Near term measures are healthy | pending |
| Sustainability Measures   1. Total Margin 2. Debt to asset ratio | School evaluates its Financial Sustainability using the Financial Performance and Stability outline provided by the Commission | Sustainability measures are healthy | pending |
| The school has an annual financial audit conducted. Audit and management letter are submitted to the commission. Audit has no material findings or misstatements. | Unmodified opinion on (consolidated) financial statements: no material weaknesses, significant deficiencies or reportable instances of noncompliance and other matters identified in the other information accompanying the auditor’s report on financial statements or in the auditor’s report on internal control over financial reporting and on compliance and other matters. | The school had a clean audit for FY 19. | pending |

**Performance:**

The school submitted quarterly financial reports as well as Near Term Measure and Sustainability Measure Data. The data were analyzed, and the school was determined to be healthy in both the Near Term and Sustainability Measures.

|  |
| --- |
| Adequacy of Facilities Maintenance in Support of Program |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
| Facilities | Met | Met | Met | Met |

**Year 1, 2016-17**

**Facilities Target:**

* Capital Improvement Plan for years 2-5 developed in the Spring of 2017, plan adhered to in years 2-5.

**Performance:**

ACADIA Academy’s Capital Improvement Plan for year 2 was been approved by the fire marshal and the construction permit was received in June. The year 2 plan included the addition of 3 classrooms, a “cool down” room, and the addition of a partial wall and door to PreK.

ACADIA met the target of developing a capital improvement plan for years 2 and 3.

**Transportation Targets:**

* In years 1-5, transportation costs will be kept within 10% of the budget.
* In years 1-5, data for student utilization of transportation will be recorded on a quarterly basis.

**Performance:**

ACADIA Academy spent less than its budgeted amount for transportation and met the goal of keeping transportation costs within 10% over or below the budget.

Quarterly bus use:

* October – 79 students (61% of population)
* January – 57 students (44% of population)
* April – 44 students (34% of population)
* June – 44 students (34% of population)

The number of students riding in the morning did not differ greatly from the afternoon, except for the Auburn bus on Fridays. ACADIA had a new bus contract ready for 2017-18 and eliminated the need for mid-day busing with the transition to full day PreK. The 2017-18 bus budget was approximately half of the 2016-17 budget. ACADIA Academy met the target for tracking transportation use. ACADIA Academy reported that the decline in bus use during the school year was a result of students enrolling in aftercare and families choosing to pick-up due to work schedules.

**Year 2, 2017-18**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Facility meets State standards | The school facility will pass all required local and state inspections | School passed required inspections | Met |

**Performance:**

All facility inspections were passed. Over the course of the year, ACADIA Academy noted a discoloration in its water. A water test indicated a higher than expected level of iron in the water. The school installed “iron specific” water filtration system installed in the water source

The school reported transportation use increased. 44% of the school’s student population used the school’s bus system. The school added bus monitors to the routes to ensure student safety and to keep behavior positive on the rides.

**Year 3, 2018-19**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Meet Local and State requirements | The school certifies that its facility (or facilities) meet all local and state requirements for public school facilities | School certifies facility meets requirements | Met |
| Capital Improvement Plan | The school has a current capital improvement plan approved by its governing board | The school has a current capital improvement plan approved by its governing board | Met |

**Performance:**

The school certified that its facility met all requirements for public school facilities. The school had a current board-approved capital improvement plan for the facility.

**Year 4, 2019-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Meet Local and State requirements | The school certifies that its facility (or facilities) meet all local and state requirements for public school facilities | School certifies facility meets requirements | Met |
| Capital Improvement Plan | The school has a current capital improvement plan approved by its governing board | The school has a current capital improvement plan approved by its governing board | Met |

**Performance:**

The school certified that its facility met all requirements for public school facilities. The school had a current board-approved capital improvement plan for the facility. The school created a new position for Facilities Manager.

|  |
| --- |
| Parent and Community Support, Student Involvement |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
| Parent & Community Engagement | Met | Partially met | Met | No data due to COVID-19 |

**Year 1, 2016-17**

**Targets:**

* In years 1-5, monthly ACADIA newsletters will be provided to all families and posted on the ACADIA website.
* In years 1-5, ACADIA will offer monthly events open to parents and community members. These events will be advertised in languages representing our student demographics.
* In year 1, ACADIA will collect baseline data on parent volunteer efforts and hours. This data will be used to create involvement goals for years 2-5.
* In years 1-5, parent participation in student-led conferences will be reached at a minimum level of 90%, including in person attendance, video conferencing, and telephone conferencing.

**Performance:**

Newsletters were created and posted on the ACADIA website as well as sent home to all families. On short months, newsletters were combined. During the school year 7 newsletters were distributed.

ACADIA Academy offered monthly events open to parents, except for February. Events included: visit to Ricker Hill Orchard, Harvest Supper, Literacy Night, Flap Jack Breakfast, and many others. Most events had 3-5 parent volunteers helping.

Parents were asked to volunteer at many of the monthly events (including those listed above) as well as participating in other events such as library maintenance, reading support, classroom volunteers, and classroom field trips. ACADIA Academy’s parents volunteered a total of 386 hours during the 2016-17 school year.

Parent participation in student led conferences was reported as 100% meeting the target of 90%. Students participated in 3 student led conferences during the school year. To prepare for these conferences, each student created a student portfolio to collect evidence and artifacts of learning, set learning goals in each content area, and set goals for growth areas of SEL and mindset. The school reported future work in this area would include making the use of the portfolios a weekly opportunity rather than periodic with the conferences.

**Year 2, 2017-18**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Communication to families | In years 2-5, ACADIA will provide a minimum of 7 newsletters to all families and these newsletters will be posted on the ACADIA website | 7 newsletters were sent | Met |
| Events will be offered to the parents of the community | In years 2-5, ACADIA will offer a minimum of 7 monthly events open to parents of community members. These events will be advertised in languages representing student demographics | Over 15 events were offered to parents | Met |
| Parental involvement | In years 2-5, parental involvement will maintain or increase the year 1 hours (313) | 320 hours of parent volunteers | Met |
| Conferencing on Progress | In years 1-5, family/guardian participation in at least one student-led conference will be reached at a minimum level of 90% annually. Participation may include in person attendance, video conferencing, and telephone conferencing | Participation:  Fall = 100%  Spring = 98% | Met |

**Performance:**

7 newsletters were sent to families and were posted on the school’s website.

ACADIA offered over 15 monthly events and 320 hours of parent volunteer time. The school reported many hours were not recorded, as parents and family members volunteered to complete projects at home.

All students participated in a student led conference in the fall, with 100% participation by parents. In the spring, all students and all but 2 families participated in a second conference.

ACADIA Academy continued to work with the University of Southern Maine for both occupational therapy and social emotional learning. The school also continued its relationship with the University of Maine in Orono and the Cooperative Extension with 4H to provide both summer science learning for students through STEM learning programs and for continuous science lessons once a week with 3rd grade. The school planned to offer this annually to 2nd and 3rd grade. ACADIA’s work with Thorn Craig and Bates Science students continued into the summer with the building of pollinator gardens on the side of the school.

**Years 3 and 4**

*See School Climate*

|  |
| --- |
| School Climate |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
| School Climate | Partially Met | Met | Met | Met |

**Year 1, 2016-17**

**Targets:**

* In year 1 all incidences of bullying, harassment or other abusive behavior will be formally documented and reported to parents or guardians.
* The data will be utilized as Baseline data and goals will be developed for years 2-5.
* In years 1-5, confidential surveys concerning social and academic climate will be completed with a minimum of a 90% response rate from parents, staff and students. This data will establish baseline for performance standards to be set for years 2-5.

**Performance:**

ACADIA Academy did not have any reportable incidents of bullying, harassment, or abusive behavior during the 2016-17 school year.

ACADIA Academy participated in Panorama Education Surveys in 2017. Families and staff/teachers provided feedback for ACADIA. ACADIA Academy met the 90% response rate from staff but did not meet it for parents.

* ACADIA had 64 responses to the family survey. ACADIA had 107 families. While some families may have participated twice, it appeared there was a 60% participation rate in the family survey.
* 100% of staff responded (20) to the teacher/staff surveys.
* ACADIA Academy did not have any students in grade 3 or higher, so there were no student survey results to report.

**Year 2, 2017-18**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Instances of bullying, harassment, or other abusive practices | In years 2-5, ACADIA will maintain or decrease incidents of substantiated bullying | One incident of bullying reported | Did Not Meet |
| Confidential survey of parents, staff, and students | In year 2, ACADIA will have a 70% parent participation rate on the family survey. Staff and student participation rates will be 90% or higher | Participation:  Families – 68%  Teacher/Staff – 100%  Students – 80% | Partially Met |

**Performance:**

During the 2017-18 school year ACADIA had 1 substantiated incident of bullying. In 2016-17 there were no incidents of bullying. ACADIA did not meet the target to maintain or decrease incidents. While it was an increase in incidents from the previous year, the baseline was zero incidents, which could not be decreased.

ACADIA Academy had strong participation on the Panorama Education surveys. Family participation was 68%, teacher/staff participation was 100%, and student participation was 80%. The 90% minimum participation was met for teachers/staff and was not met for students. The family participation, while strong, missed the 70% target by 2% (68% participation).

**Year 3, 2018-19**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Reporting of behavior incidents | The school will follow the Maine DOE required reporting for incidents of behavior | Reported as required | Met |
| Panorama Survey – Family Participation | 40% of families will participate in the Panorama survey | 38% of families participated in the Panorama survey | Partially Met |
| Panorama Survey – Student Participation | 65% of eligible students will participate in the Panorama survey | 83% of eligible students participated in the Panorama survey | Exceeded |
| Panorama Survey –  Teacher/Staff Participation | 70% of teachers/staff will participate in the Panorama survey | 71% of teachers/staff participated in the Panorama survey | Met |
| Panorama Survey | Annually, the school will review its Panorama Education results and develop an action plan to address areas for continued improvement. Plan and outcome will be submitted to the Commission | The school reports it will use the results of this survey to inform an action plan and make necessary changes for the next school year | Not applicable – School was not required to develop a plan in 2018-2019 school year |

**Performance:**

ACADIA Academy completed its reporting of behavior incidents to the MDOE as required. The school administered the Panorama School Climate Survey in spring 2019. Participation of families on the survey was 38%, 2% below the target. Teacher/staff survey participation met the target with 71% participation and student participation exceeded the target with 80% participation.

**Year 4, 2019-20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Target** | **Results** | |
| Reporting of behavior incidents | The school will follow the Maine DOE required reporting for incidents of behavior | Reported as required | Met |
| Panorama Survey – Family Participation | 40% of families will participate in the Panorama survey | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Panorama Surveys were not administered during the 2019/20 school year. | NA |
| Panorama Survey – Student Participation | 65% of eligible students will participate in the Panorama survey | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Panorama Surveys were not administered during the 2019/20 school year. | NA |
| Panorama Survey –  Teacher/Staff Participation | 70% of teachers/staff will participate in the Panorama survey | Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Panorama Surveys were not administered during the 2019/20 school year. | NA |
| Panorama Survey | Annually, the school will review its Panorama Education results and develop an action plan to address areas for continued improvement. Plan and outcome will be submitted to the Commission. | The school submitted its plan based on 2019 survey data for implementation during the 2019-2020 school year. | Met |

**Performance:**

ACADIA Academy completed its reporting of behavior incidents to the MDOE as required. The Panorama School Climate Survey was not administered in spring 2020 due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

|  |
| --- |
| Effective Leadership |

From October 2019 to April 2020 ACADIA Academy did not have a Special Educator Coordinator. The responsibilities of the position were assumed by the Head of School. Due to time constraints and added work responsibilities the Head of School was unable to fulfill some of her administrative responsibilities in the area of educational leader (e.g., teacher evaluation) A special education coordinator was hired in March.

The position of Facilities Director was established in the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this position was to provide the Head of School with needed support in managing school facilities and operations. This position has served as a valuable administrative resource for the school.

|  |
| --- |
| Instructional Quality |

ACADIA Academy uses a universal grouping system for math and reading instruction. Information used in grouping students includes curriculum-based assessments, NWEA data, intervention data, IEP goals and teachers’ observations and recommendations. Students are provided with direct instruction at their learning level, with some students spending time with students in another grade level, typically one grade higher or lower. Smaller group size is used for students with significant learning challenges, along with instructional support from Educational Technicians.

The Head of School reported that due to time constraints and limited resources, the school has not been able to implement with fidelity its state required Teacher Professional Evaluation and Professional Growth plan (TPEPG). Some teachers were provided with classroom observational feedback by an experienced and trained consultant during January, February and March 2020, just prior to the closing of school facility due to COVID-19 in March. The Head of School stated that providing teachers with instructional feedback, as well as ensuring the alignment of curriculum/instruction/assessment will be the focus of her work in 2021.

|  |
| --- |
| Evidence of Mission and Vision Implementation |

*(See Page 5 for School’s Mission and Vision)*

ACADIA has created a unique learning program which encompasses hands-on year-round learning. The school believes it has created a safe and welcoming community using Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports and Restorative Justice practices. The school reports that students are eager to go to school and are owners in their learning.

The school keeps a close eye on its academic data and uses it to make meaningful changes so students continue to make progress. The school reports that its Anytime Anywhere learning plan allowed it to start off with learning on the first day of building closure due to COVID-19. After the initial few weeks of closure, the school worked to adapt its programming to better suit the long-term closure.

ACADIA Academy uses a direct instruction model that incorporates carefully selected curricula augmented with relevant experiential applications. “Hands-on” activities allow for multi-modal learning necessary to meet the varied needs and learning preferences of students and support real world application of concepts and skills. Prior to the Covid-19 building closures, there were more than 30 field trips where students engaged in the application of knowledge and skills while becoming familiar with people and places in their community. During the building closure the school continued using virtual “field trips” to engage students in learning with experts in the community. Virtual field trips included science engagements around animals, plants, magnets and more. Prior to school closure, special guests visited classrooms to reinforce how and why academic concepts apply to the world around them. This year’s visitors included meteorologists, dentists, scientists, police officers and more. Throughout the year, each classroom completed multiple “What I Need to Know” (WINK) projects, which were student-selected and driven, and provided an opportunity to explore in-depth topics of interest.

ACADIA’s cross-grade grouping systemallowed students to access academic instruction at their level. For example: a 3rd grader who was ready for a 4th grade curriculum could go to math class in the 4th grade. Likewise, a first grader who still needs to work on some kindergarten skills can join a kindergarten reading group. Additional math and reading teachers help during cross-group instructional time which allows for smaller group sizes, more individual attention, and meaningful small group interactions. The school reports that, because every student can access any class, peers view this “movement” as the norm and is stigma-free.

At ACADIA Academy all students keep a Pride Portfoliothroughout the year to monitor their progress and success. Twice per year, students share portfolios with their families at Student Led Conferences, where they discuss personal goals and report on progress made.

In July and August 2019, the school held its summer program. The 6-week/3-days per week Summer Program, in which over 90% of students participate, further reinforces attainment and mastery of important academic skills, provides exposure to real-world settings, and time to practice social skills. Morning sessions focused on math and reading instruction. During afternoon sessions, students chose a study unit that included hands on activities and a field trip for real life application where students chose a topic to explore through a cross-curricular lens. Teachers reported a significant decrease in student behavior issues during the summer when participants had increased opportunity for experiential learning and personal choice. Another benefit the school noted was the academic gains that many students make during the program. The school reported many students had noticeable growth from their spring to fall NWEA scores as opposed to the summer slide that is typical for many students.

|  |
| --- |
| Compliance with Terms of Charter Contract and Laws |

ACADIA Academy is in compliance with the charter contract and all applicable laws.

|  |
| --- |
| Spring 2020 Site Visit Report |

**Maine Charter School Commission**

**Monitoring Site Visit Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SITE VISIT DATE | May 28, 2020 (via Video Conference) |
| SCHOOL NAME: | Acadia Academy |
| ADDRESS: | 12 Westminster Street, Lewiston, Maine |
| GRADES SERVED: | Grades PK - 5 |
| ENROLLMENT: | 229 |
| YEAR OPENED: | 2016 |

Interim Report

Monitoring Site Visit Purpose

The primary purpose of site visits is to inform authorizer decisions, both imminent, such as assessing a school’s readiness to open, and longitudinal, when a visit is undertaken mid-term as part of routine monitoring.

The purpose of monitoring visits is to gauge the overall progress a school is making toward the goals outlined in its charter. In most cases, the authorizer will already possess some quantitative data about that progress – test scores, attendance rates, and other annual outcomes, so a monitoring visit can help explain the context behind that data and explore the school’s fidelity to its approved program.

Site visits are a mechanism for collecting additional evidence regarding a school’s performance against the expectations memorialized in its contract and contribute to the body of data authorizers utilize to ultimately make renewal recommendations. They also provide staff with the opportunity to review and analyze documentation that may be better understood on-site, such as factors impacting attendance, or rates of academic growth across subgroups. Site visits can also provide a basis for authorizer judgment or intervention where there is limited state assessment data yet available.

Monitoring Site Visit Process

Monitoring Site Visits are based on both the criteria set forth in the school’s performance framework and the school’s alignment with its mission. The categories in the performance framework are student achievement, academic and support programs, school climate and family engagement, school leadership, governance, and finance.

The following individuals participated in the May 28, 2020, monitoring visit:

* Bob Kautz, Executive Director, Maine Charter School Commission
* Gina Post, Director of Program Management, Maine School Charter Commission
* Jim Rier, Maine Charter School Commission
* Joe Drago, Consultant, Maine Charter School Commission
* Dr. Roberta Lucas, MDOE, Special Services
* Amy Allen, Staff, Maine Charter School Commission
* Dr. Joseph Mattos, Consultant, Maine Charter School Commission

The monitoring site visit was conducted via a video conference. Team members used the MCSC Monitoring Site Visit Manual to plan and conduct the visit. Prior to the site visit, team members reviewed documents and other information related to the school’s mission and performance framework.

Key documents and other information reviewed by the team prior to and at the time of visiting included:

* School calendar
* Current enrollment and demographics
* Staff roster
* Current organizational chart
* Board meeting minutes
* Board member meeting attendance
* School’s strategic plan [AS APPLICABLE]
* Current Education Service Provider contract [AS APPLICABLE]
* Professional Development calendar and agendas [AS APPLICABLE]
* Staff evaluation tool
* Administrator evaluation tool used by governing board
* Panorama school climate survey results
* School’s self-assessment
* Previous year’s monitoring report [AS APPLICABLE]
* School’s performance framework
* Copies of current recruitment materials
* Student enrollment application

Meetings were held with school leadership and governance via video conferencing. A standard set of questions, as per MCSC manual, as well as school specific questions were discussed during the visit.

Group interviews held by the team included:

* Acadia Academy Leadership Team
  + Brittiny-Rae Perron, Head of School
  + Emily Giorgetti, Special Education Coordinator
  + Tracy Gendron Turner, Facilities Director
* ACADIA Academy Director
  + Brittiny-Rae Perron
* Acadia Academy Governing Board:
  + Amy Dieterich, Chairperson
  + Samantha Pederson, Board Member
  + Victoria Stanton, Board Member

Monitoring Site Visit Findings

1. Mission Alignment
   * Board members and school leadership were aligned in their understanding of ACADIA Academy’s Mission and Vision and how it is displayed in the school’s instructional practices and school goals. Specifically, they believe ACADIA Academy provides a high-quality education which is focused on experiential and exploratory hands-on learning, as well as on the social and emotional development of the student. School leadership provided numerous examples of experiential learning, which happen during both summer programming and the regular school year. It was also stated that teachers do classroom based exploratory projects each quarter with students as well as student selected WINK (What I Need to Know) projects. School leadership discussed needing to do more work with teachers in setting systematic expectations and student outcomes for experiential and exploratory learning projects.
   * With respect to addressing students’ social and emotional needs, teachers conduct daily activities which provide students with an understanding of their emotions and skills to help them when they are struggling. Students are taught strategies for handling stress, anger, sadness, excitement and other emotions that encounter. It was also stated that ACADIA Academy uses a Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) model for classroom management and a Restorative Justice model to resolve conflict and restore relationships. Lastly, ACADIA Academy has incorporated into its daily schedule morning and afternoon reflection periods (2 minutes each) with guided mindfulness and calming activities.
2. Student Achievement

Although MEA and NWEA testing were suspended in the spring of 2020 due to COVID--19, ACADIA Academy did provide a limited update as to student performance using MEA and NWEA data.

* + In 2017-2018, only 21.43 % of students were at or above expectations in MEA ELA. In 2018-2019, 42.85% of students were at or above expectations.
  + In 2018-2019, 37.5% of students were at or above expectations, which was slightly higher than state average.
  + In 2017-2018 ACADIA Academy scored below many of the schools in Lewiston and surrounding area on MEA. In 2018-2019, ACADIA Academy performed better on the MEA than all the schools in Lewiston, as well as higher than many schools in surrounding area.
  + Winter NWEA schoolwide scores showed that 60.2% of students were at or above grade level in Math and 64.8% of students were at or above grade level in Reading.
  + It was also noted that student NWEA scores from Spring to Fall regularly show improvement, which ACADIA Academy believes it is due to its year-round school schedule.
  + In comparing Fall 2019 and Winter 2020 NWEA data, there was a reduction in the number of students scoring below the 20th percentile.
  + NWEA growth scores from 2018-2019 to 2019-2020 showed that students with IEPs met their growth goals at a higher rate than the general school population.

ACADIA Academy’s reported Chronic Absenteeism rate for the first 3 quarters of 2019-2020 was 4%, lower than the 2018-2019 school year rate of 9%, and significantly lower than the state average.

1. Academic and Support Programs

* ACADIA Academy uses a universal grouping system for math and reading instruction. Information used in grouping students includes curriculum-based assessments, NWEA data, intervention data, IEP goals and teachers’ observations and recommendations. Students are provided with direct instruction at their learning level, with some students spending time with students in another grade level, typically one grade higher or lower. Smaller group size is used for students with significant learning challenges, along with instructional support from Educational Technicians.
* It was explained that student interventions are set up at grade levels and are implemented a bit differently at each level. The school is working to transition to a unified school system process e.g., Response to Intervention process. Staff have participated in MDOE training and a teacher has been assigned to provide leadership in overseeing and documenting all facets of the RTI process. The Head of School and Special Education Coordinator will provide support and work closely with this teacher to ensure that the process is implemented with fidelity and student learning needs are being met as a result.
* The Head of School reported that due to time constraints and limited resources, the school has not been able to implement with fidelity its state required Teacher Professional Evaluation and Professional Growth plan (TPEPG). Some teachers were provided with classroom observational feedback by an experienced and trained consultant during February and March 2020, just prior to the “closing” of school due to COVID-19 in March. The Head of School stated that providing teachers with instructional feedback, as well as ensuring the alignment of curriculum/instruction/assessment will be the focus of her work in 2021.

1. School Climate and Family Engagement

* The Panorama School Climate Survey was not administered in 2019-2020 school year due to COVID-19 pandemic.
* 97.8% of ACADIA Academy’s students remained enrolled from student count day (October 1, 2019) to the last day of school.
* As of the last day of school 96.8 % of students had completed an intent to reenroll form for the 2020-2021 school year.

1. School Leadership
   * ACADIA Academy faced significant challenges in the area of school leadership during the 2019-2020 school year. From October 2019 to April 2020 ACADIA Academy did not have a Special Educator Coordinator. The responsibilities of the position were assumed by the Head of School. Due to time constraints and added work responsibilities the Head of School was unable to fulfill some of her administrative responsibilities in the area of educational leader (e.g., professional development.)
   * The position of Facilities Director was established in the 2019-2020 school year. The purpose of this position was to provide the Head of School with needed support in managing school facilities and operations. This position served as a valuable and needed administrative resource for ACADIA Academy.
   * The Head of School was provided with a written “informal evaluation” in March 2020, which was authorized by the Board and compiled by a consultant. This informal evaluation included feedback from a teacher and staff survey conducted at the end of the 2019 school year.
   * ACADIA Academy is confident that with a complete School Leadership team in 2020-2021, all responsibilities will be met.
   * In fall of 2019, a behavior technician was hired to work under the special ed coordinator responding to students in need of behavioral support.
2. Governance

* Due to ongoing conversations and regular communications with the Head of School, ACADIA Academy’s Board of Directors appear to have a firm understanding of the school’s operations and its strengths and challenges. Board members demonstrated knowledge and understanding in response to questions about student’s academic performance, issues related to school leadership resources, school finances, and school facilities. During the 2019-2020 school year the Board responded to identified school needs for additional resources by 1. establishing Facilities Director position, 2. increasing teacher professional development days, 3. approving the hiring of a consultant to assist the Head of School with specific projects, and 4. increasing teacher salaries and benefits to be more competitive with area school systems.
* The Board is very pleased with the Head of School’s performance and have considerable faith in her leadership. The Board plans to conduct a formal evaluation for the Head of School in June 2020. This evaluation will be based on the Head of School’s Job Description, as well as from survey feedback from staff, parents and Board members.
* The Board has not conducted any strategic planning during the past school year. It reports it will be addressing this need in the next 12 months.
* The Board has not had much turnover in the past several years. The Board stated it need to be very deliberate in filling vacant positions. The Board feels that it has individuals who have experience and expertise in important areas such as legal issues, finance, technology, marketing, and working with non-profit organizations.

1. Finance

* The MCSC team discussed several issues related to ACADIA Academy finances. These issues included:
  + Process for creating a budget to ensure that the budget is meeting the school’s needs and students’ learning needs.
  + The value and need for Education Service Provider contracts.
  + Long range plans for facility repairs and maintenance (e.g., roof replacement)
  + Impact of the possibility of reduced state funding.
* Based on the issues discussed, MCSC team members recommended the following:
  + Review all ESP contracts regarding pricing and service delivery.
  + Create a 10-25 Year Facility Plan for repairs, replacement of systems, facility expansion, etc.
  + Create alternate 2020-2021 budget models based on the possibility of reduced state subsidies for all Maine schools (due to possible significant reduction in state revenues due to Covid-19).

|  |
| --- |
| Commendations and Considerations for Charter Renewal |

**Commendations**

* ACADIA Academy has substantially met or exceeded its goals in each year of operation.
* The one area where the school partially met its goals in past years, was academic growth, which appears to have increased during the SY 2019-20 school year, based on mid-year data. (Fall to Spring data were not available due to COVID-19 school facility closures).
* The school has consistent board membership with representation from members with various skills sets.
* The current Head of School has been in the position for two school years and has shown dedication and stability and a growth mindset.
* The Board has been responsive to the needs of students, staff, and school leadership by providing appropriate resources and support.
* The school’s financial performance is noteworthy in terms of their liquidity, including cash management, limited debt and generation of an annual surplus. This implies that there is some capacity for careful investment in programs, personnel and equipment to support educational results.

**Considerations**

* The school may benefit from reviewing all Education Service Provider contracts regarding pricing and service delivery.
* The board should consider ways to keep the position of special education coordinator filled and not vacated again.
* ACADIA Academy should consider identifying written, common PK-5 expectations and student outcomes for exploratory and experiential projects.
* The Board should consider a long-term financial planning exercise – especially now that ACADIA owns the building.
* The financial awareness and resource allocation decisions of the board and staff would be better supported by integrating the key financial metrics into the quarterly financial reports and by maintaining a 12-month cash flow projection.

1. Eligible is defined as having both a fall and spring score for students in grades k-10 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Eligible is defined as having both a fall and spring score for students in grades k-10 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. State student count day is October 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. State student count day is October 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)