# New Mexico
# Charter School Performance Framework

## Introduction

The New Mexico Charter Schools Performance Framework supports the Public Education Department (PED) Charter School Division (CSD), the Public Education Commission (PEC), and charter schools themselves in answering three questions posed by an approach called Results-Based Accountability™: How much did each charter school do? How well did they do it? Is anyone better off as a result?[1]

The Performance Framework provides a roadmap for an annual review of the performance of state-authorized charter schools and is a material term of the charter schools' contracts, as stated in NMSA §22-8B-9.1 (1978).

## How the Framework is Used

Traditionally, charter school authorizers use performance frameworks as tools for school monitoring and accountability. The CSD and PEC have designed the New Mexico Performance Framework to be more than that. In addition to providing transparent criteria by which the PEC will make informed charter renewal decisions, the Framework is also intended to support all parties in:

1) Understanding where schools are strong and where they need support,
2) Supporting schools' internal continuous improvement efforts,
3) Identifying and celebrating promising practices and programs, and
4) Providing the PED, PEC, and individual schools with data and stories that help communicate a meaningful and positive narrative about New Mexican students, communities, and schools.

## School Review Process

Annually, CSD will prepare a report for the PEC and for each school after reviewing evidence and data from different sources, as outlined in the Framework. The report will be a variation of the single-point rubric (see Appendix A for an example), in which, _for each performance area_, CSD provides the school with written feedback on evidence of success and/or concern. Providing feedback for each measure is intended to provide both schools and CSD with meaningful information on what there is to celebrate and where schools need support. In addition, _for each performance area_, CSD assigns a rating of:

| Rating by Performance Area | Definition |
|---|---|
| Meets or Exceeds Success Criteria | School meets or exceeds the "success criteria," as defined in the Performance Framework. |
| Working to Meet Success Criteria | School's evidence of success does not meet the "success criteria" but does not fall so far below as to necessitate a "red flag" as defined in the Performance Framework. |
| Falls Far Below Success Criteria (Red Flag) | School meets the criteria for a "red flag" as defined in the Performance Framework. This rating should be used with discretion as it is intended to flag serious problems. |

---

[1] https://clearimpact.com/results-based-accountability/

The school review process must provide the CSD and PEC with the information they need to act if a school is flagged for support or intervention. To that end, each school will receive an overall evaluation as follows:

| Overall Evaluation | Definition |
| --- | --- |
| Doing Well in All Areas | School does not receive any red flags. |
| Needs Support in Few Areas | School receives 1 red flag. |
| Requires Attention | School receives 2 red flags. |
| Consider for Intervention | School receives 3+ red flags. |

# Performance Framework Overview

| Category | Performance Area |
|---|---|
| **School-Specific Measures** | 1A. Mission Implementation |
| | 1B. Measure #1: [How much did we do?] |
| | 1C. Measure #2: [How well did we do it?] |
| | 1D. Measure #3: [Is anyone better off?] |
| **Educational Measures** | 2A. Academic Outcomes |
| | 2B. Recurrent enrollment |
| | 2C. Special populations |
| | 2D. Cultural and linguistic responsiveness (CLR) |
| | 2E. Student-staff relationships |
| | 2F. Equitable behavior interventions and support |
| | 2G. Family engagement |
| | 2H. Community engagement |
| **Organizational Measures** | 3A. Governing Council membership and training |
| | 3B. Equitable enrollment process |
| | 3C. Support for teachers and staff |
| | 3D. Compliance with PED requirements |
| **Financial Measures** | 4A. Board of Finance |
| | 4B. Finance Committee |
| | 4C. Generally accepted accounting principles |
| | 4D. Responsiveness to audit findings |
| | 4E. School budget |

# School-Specific Measures

| Performance Area | Data Sources | Success Criteria | Red Flag Criteria |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1A**<br>**Mission implementation** | Data provided by school; interviews and observations conducted during site visit by CSD staff | The school's implementation of the mission is *clear and apparent* as evidenced by at least three of the following:<br>● Positive responses to relevant items on a survey completed by at least 75% of staff or students[2]<br>● Generally positive responses to relevant interview questions from staff, students, and families<br>● Multiple expressions of the mission in the school's physical environment<br>● Observations of mission-aligned instruction<br>● Another measure directly related to the school's mission (e.g. # of community service hours for a school with a community service focus) | School shows very little evidence of mission implementation (i.e. does not provide any of the evidence listed in the success criteria). |
| **School-Specific Focus: [School names a result they will contribute to during their contract period. With this result in mind, school describes a practice, initiative, or strategy they wish to implement, evaluate, and learn from. Schools are encouraged to use this section of the framework to highlight an effort in their school that is new, innovative, and promising. This is an opportunity to showcase ideas that others statewide can learn from as we collectively work to improve education for New Mexico's students.]** | | | |
| **1B**<br>**Measure #1: [How much did we do?]** | School identifies a valid data source and submits data annually to CSD | School defines a measure of Quantity of Effort answering the Results-Based Accountability™ question, "How much did we do?"[3]<br>AND<br>Sets annual targets for the measure<br>AND<br>Submits data for the year that shows they met their target | School fails to submit data for their school-specific measure<br>OR<br>Falls far below their annual target with no improvement from their baseline for 2 consecutive years |

---

[2] To meet this criteria, schools are to use survey items provided by the CSD or, with approval from the PEC, a different set of survey items designed by the school or an external party.

[3] For more guidance on defining performance measures using a Results-Based Accountability approach, visit https://clearimpact.com/results-based-accountability/example-performance-measures-can-use-program-service/.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1C**<br>**Measure #2: [How well did we do it?]** | School identifies a valid data source and submits data annually to CSD | School defines a measure of Quality of Effort answering the Results-Based Accountability question, "How well did we do it?"<br><u>AND</u><br>Sets annual targets for the measure<br><u>AND</u><br>Submits data for the year that shows they met their target | School fails to submit data for their school-specific measure<br><u>OR</u><br>Falls far below their annual target with no improvement from their baseline for 2 consecutive years |
| **1D**<br>**Measure #3: [Is anyone better off?]** | School identifies a valid data source and submits data annually to CSD | School defines a measure of Effect answering the Results-Based Accountability question, "Is anyone better off?"<br><u>AND</u><br>Sets annual targets for the measure<br><u>AND</u><br>Submits data for the year that shows they met their target | School fails to submit data for their school-specific measure<br><u>OR</u><br>Falls far below their annual target with no improvement from their baseline for 2 consecutive years |

# Educational Measures

| Performance Area | Data Sources | Success Criteria | Red Flag Criteria |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2A Academic outcomes** | Review of PED Accountability System Scores by CSD staff in collaboration w/ appropriate PED division(s); supplemental data provided by school | School meets the expectations of the state accountability system used for all public schools in the state, to include student academic performance, growth, achievement gaps, attendance, and, for high schools, graduation rate and postsecondary readiness.<br>OR<br>Provides evidence of academic proficiency or growth using alternative assessments deemed acceptable by PEC (e.g., growth on short-cycle assessment across/within years; performance or portfolio-based assessment meeting high-quality criteria) | School is flagged by the accountability system used for all public schools in the state as amongst the lowest performing schools in the state for a period of 3 consecutive years<br>AND<br>Does not provide evidence of academic proficiency or growth using alternative assessments deemed acceptable by CSD. |
| **2B Recurrent enrollment** | Analysis conducted by appropriate PED division(s) | School successfully maintains year-to-year 80th-day enrollment overall and for historically underserved student groups[4] at a rate that matches or exceeds the district in which the school is located<br>OR<br>Provides evidence that the school serves a unique population of highly mobile students (attending more than two schools per year). | School's year-to-year enrollment from 80th day to end of year overall OR for historically underserved student groups exceeds the district in which the school is located by 10 percentage points or more. |
| **2C Special populations** | Data provided by school; information provided by appropriate PED division(s); interviews and observations conducted during site visit by CSD staff | Appropriate divisions at PED report to CSD that the school is in compliance with requirements for serving English Learners and students with disabilities<br>AND<br>School provides services to English Learners (ELs) and students with disabilities based on individual needs, as evidenced by at least three of the following:<br>● Positive responses to relevant items on a survey completed by at least 75% of staff or students[5]<br>● Generally positive responses on relevant interview questions from staff, students, and families | Appropriate divisions at PED report to CSD that there are validated concerns about the school's services for English Learners and students with disabilities<br>OR<br>School shows very little evidence of providing services to ELs and students with disabilities based on individual needs (i.e. does not |

---

[4] As defined in the *Yazzie/Martinez v. State of New Mexico* ruling: Low-income, Native American, English language learners, and students with disabilities.
[5] See footnote 1

| Performance Area | Data Sources | Success Criteria | Red Flag Criteria |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | • Observations of differentiated instruction for ELs and students with disabilities<br>• Hours of training provided to staff on serving ELs and students with disabilities<br>• Results from an evaluation conducted by an external party | provide any of the evidence listed in the success criteria) |
| **2D Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness (CLR)** | Data provided by school; interviews and observations conducted during site visit by CSD staff | The vast majority of students feel welcome and safe at the school, and have experiences that honor the culture, language, and identity of historically underserved populations, as evidenced by at least three of the following:<br>• Positive responses to relevant items on a survey completed by at least 75% of staff or students[6]<br>• Generally positive responses on relevant interview questions from staff, students, and families<br>• Courses or projects that use students' culture, language, and identity as a vehicle for learning (e.g. students learn literature and history of historically underserved populations; students from historically underserved populations spoke in the language(s) of their own cultural groups)<br>• Hours of professional development with a CLR focus<br>• Results from an evaluation conducted by an external party | School shows very little evidence of CLR (i.e. does not provide any of the evidence listed in the success criteria). |
| **2E Student-staff relationships** | Data provided by school; interviews and observations conducted during site visit by CSD staff | The vast majority of students are supported through positive relationships with staff, as evidenced by at least three of the following:<br>• Positive responses to relevant items on a survey completed by at least 75% of staff or students[7]<br>• Generally positive responses on relevant interview questions from staff, students, and families<br>• Advisory system that includes one-on-one meetings with an | School shows very little evidence of student-staff relationships (i.e. does not provide any of the evidence listed in the success criteria). |

---

[6] See footnote 1
[7] See footnote 1

| Performance Area | Data Sources | Success Criteria | Red Flag Criteria |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | advisor or other adult for all students<br>● Hours of professional development with a focus on providing social-emotional support for students<br>● Ratio of students to mental health professionals (e.g. social workers and counselors) is 250:1 or better<br>● Results from an evaluation conducted by an external party | |
| **2F Equitable Behavior Interventions and Support** | Data provided by school; information provided by appropriate PED division(s); interviews and observations conducted during site visit by CSD staff | School provides evidence of a non-discriminatory behavior support system that uses alternatives to out-of-school suspension, as evidenced by at least three of the following:<br>● Positive responses to relevant items on a survey completed by at least 75% of staff or students[8]<br>● Generally positive responses on relevant interview questions from staff, students, and families<br>● Observations of the school using restorative practices or other alternative to punitive behavior management<br>● Fewer than 5% of students are out-of-school suspended within a year overall and disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, disability, and EL status (student groups must have >20 students to be included in the analysis)<br>● Results from an evaluation conducted by an external party<br>AND<br>Appropriate divisions at PED report to CSD that there are no validated concerns about the school using disciplinary practices that are violate students' civil rights | School shows very little evidence of student-staff relationships (i.e. does not provide any of the evidence listed in the success criteria)<br>OR<br>Appropriate divisions at PED report to CSD that there are validated concerns about the school's disciplinary practices |
| **2G Family engagement** | Data provided by school; interviews and observations conducted during site visit by CSD staff | School engages with families in multiple ways and communicates with families about student strengths, progress, and needs, as evidenced by at least three of the following:<br>● Positive responses to relevant items on a survey completed by at least 75% of staff or students[9]<br>● Generally positive responses on relevant interview questions from staff, students, and families | School shows very little evidence of family engagement (i.e. does not provide any of the evidence listed in the success criteria) |

---

[8] See footnote 1
[9] See footnote 1

| Performance Area | Data Sources | Success Criteria | Red Flag Criteria |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | <ul><li>Data on the frequency of different types of family engagement practices</li><li>Data on the number of students whose families are involved in family engagement practices (e.g. attendance at family events)</li><li>Records that show communication with family members that uses more than one method (e.g. text, email, in-person) in the family's preferred language</li><li>Results from an evaluation conducted by an external party</li></ul> | |
| **2H Community engagement** | Data provided by school; interviews and observations conducted during site visit by CSD staff | School engages with community members and partner organizations in multiple ways throughout the school year, as evidenced by at least three of the following:<ul><li>Positive responses to relevant items on a survey completed by at least 75% of staff or students[10]</li><li>Generally positive responses on relevant interview questions from staff, students, and families</li><li>Data on the frequency of different types of community engagement practices</li><li>Data on the number of students completing projects involving a community member[11]</li><li>School has relationships with at least 3 organizations that have been formalized at the school level[12]</li><li>Results from an evaluation conducted by an external party</li></ul> | School shows very little evidence of community engagement (i.e. does not provide any of the evidence listed in the success criteria) |

---

[10] See footnote 1

[11] This includes internships and community service projects, for example.

[12] "Formalizing" a relationship in this case means the organization has sustained involvement beyond a relationship with an individual staff member, as evidenced by a signed agreement with the school, partner participation in an ongoing school activity (e.g. member of an advisory council), or students or staff participating in an ongoing partner activity (e.g., internship or after-school program).

# Organizational Measures

| Performance Area | Data Sources | Success Criteria | Red Flag Criteria |
|---|---|---|---|
| **3A**<br>**Governing Council membership and training** | Desktop monitoring | School's governing board membership stays within range designated in bylaws; if it drops below, all vacancies are filled within 45 days (75 with extension)<br>AND<br>No evidence of nepotism or violations of conflict of interest policies on the governing council<br>AND<br>All members of the governing council complete all required training hours. | Three or more vacancies are not filled within 45 days (75 with extension)<br>OR<br>Clear evidence of nepotism or violations of conflict of interest policies on the governing council<br>OR<br>Three or more members do not complete all required training hours |
| **3B**<br>**Equitable enrollment process** | Review of school website by CSD staff, and review of additional materials provided by schools upon request | As of the 40th day, the school is within its enrollment cap and serving only authorized grade levels<br>AND<br>School's enrollment processes, including lottery, provide all families nondiscriminatory access by (1) providing enrollment information and forms in multiple languages, (2) not requesting extraneous information at any point in the enrollment process, and (3) allowing for multiple modes of enrollment requests (verbal, email, mail, etc.)<br><br>*Exception:* Schools whose charter details efforts to serve a specific group of students alternatively demonstrate that their enrollment processes are designed to encourage enrollment of specified group of students without any evidence of bias within this group | As of the 40th day, the school exceeds its enrollment cap or is serving a grade not authorized in their contract<br>OR<br>A review of school enrollment processes, including lottery, finds evidence of intentional enrollment bias (e.g. requirements/suggestions for submission of transcripts and/or teacher recommendations) |
| **3C**<br>**Support for teachers and staff** | Interviews and observations conducted during site visit by CSD staff; supplemental | School provides evidence that all teachers and staff are supported with professional development and meaningful feedback on their performance, as evidenced by at least three of the following:<br>● Positive responses to relevant items on a survey completed by at least 75% of staff[13] | School evidence suggests that fewer than 75% of teachers and staff have received an evaluation within the past two years |

---

[13] See footnote 1

| Performance Area | Data Sources | Success Criteria | Red Flag Criteria |
|---|---|---|---|
| | data provided by school | • Generally positive responses on relevant interview questions from staff<br>• Hours provided to staff for structured collaboration with colleagues<br>• Data on the length, frequency, and participation in professional development of different types<br>• Evidence of annual written performance evaluations for all staff<br>• Results from an evaluation conducted by an external party | |
| **3D Compliance with PED requirements** | Questionnaire or other reporting mechanism completed by appropriate divisions at PED | Divisions at PED report to CSD that the school complies with reporting requirements<br>AND<br>Report to CSD that there are no violations or validated concerns about the school in areas they monitor, including but not limited to:<br>• Assessment administration<br>• School improvement plans, if applicable<br>• Federal and state grant requirements (e.g., Perkins, Title funding)<br>• Teacher/staff credentialing and compensation<br>• Facilities<br>• Health and safety | One or more divisions at PED report to CSD that the school in *not* in compliance with reporting requirements<br>AND/OR<br>Report to CSD that there are violations or validated concerns about the school in areas they monitor, as listed in the success criteria |

# Financial Measures

| Performance Area | Data Sources | Success Criteria | Red Flag Criteria |
|---|---|---|---|
| **4A**<br>**Board of Finance** | Documentation provided by school and monitored by CSD | School maintained a Board of Finance during the audited fiscal year | School did not maintain a Board of Finance during the audited fiscal year (i.e. Board of Finance is revoked) |
| **4B**<br>**Finance Committee** | Desktop monitoring or document review by CSD | Meeting minutes provide clear evidence that the Governing Council has a Finance Committee that (1) reviews internal controls and (2) makes monthly reports to the Council. | No evidence of an active Finance Committee |
| **4C**<br>**Generally accepted accounting principles** | Audit report for previous fiscal year | 0-2 total audit findings<br>AND<br>No material weakness<br>AND<br>No significant deficiency<br>AND<br>No waste or fraud findings | Five or more total audit findings<br>OR<br>Any material weakness finding<br>OR<br>Any significant deficiency finding<br>OR<br>Two or more waste or fraud findings |
| **4D**<br>**Responsiveness to audit findings** | Audit reports for previous fiscal year | No more than one repeat audit findings across two consecutive years | Three or more repeat findings across two consecutive years |
| **4E**<br>**School budget** | PED Budget Bureau school status report | The school's budget shows cash carryover of 25% (?). | The school's budget shows cash carryover of less than 15% (?). |

# Appendix: Example of a Single-Point Rubric[14]

| What could improve? | Success Criteria | What is evidence of success? | N/A | M/E | W | FB[15] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Performance Area: Breakfast in Bed** | | | | | | |
| *Runny eggs* | **Food:** All food is at the correct temperature, adequately seasoned, and cooked to the eater's preference. | *Well seasoned with salt and pepper Served scrambled as requested* | | | X | |
| | **Beverage:** Coffee or tea is provided if requested by recipient's  are prepared to the eater | *N/A – Eater did not want coffee or tea* | X | | | |
| | **Presentation:** Food is served on a clean tray, with napkin and silverware. Some decorative additions may be present. | *Photos show presentation was strong, including a vase of flowers* | | X | | |
| *Survey shows recipient was extremely uncomfortable in how they were awakened. No seat was provided, and recipient has only ten minutes to eat.* | **Comfort:** Recipient is woken gently, assisted in seat adjustment, and given reasonable time and space to eat. | | | | | X |

---

[14] Adapted from https://www.cultofpedagogy.com/holistic-analytic-single-point-rubrics/

[15] Reviewer should reference the Performance Framework and reserve the Falls Far Below rating only for those measures where Red Flag Criteria are met.