



FRANCIS W. PARKER CHARTER ESSENTIAL SCHOOL

YEAR 27 CORE CRITERIA SITE VISIT REPORT

Devens, MA
February 10, 2022

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
75 Pleasant Street
Malden, MA 02148
Phone: (781) 338-3227
Fax: (781) 338-3220



This document was prepared by the
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Jeffrey C. Riley
Commissioner

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation.

Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.

© 2022 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."

This document printed on recycled paper

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu



TABLE OF CONTENTS

About Site Visits	1
Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction	3
School Profile	3
School History	4
Demographics	5
Methodology.....	6
Ratings, Findings, and Evidence	8
Faithfulness to Charter	8
Criterion 1: Mission and Key Design Elements	8
Criterion 2: Access and Equity	11
Criterion 3: Compliance	14
Academic Program Success.....	15
Criterion 5: Student Performance.....	15
Criterion 6: Program Delivery	20
Organizational Viability	25
Criterion 9: Governance	25
Appendix A: Finance	28

ABOUT SITE VISITS

In conducting site visits, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (Department) is carrying out the requirements of the charter school regulations (603 CMR 1.00), which outline the ongoing review of charter schools. Site visits take place at least once during a charter term and may be conducted at additional times when deemed necessary by the Department. Site visits vary in length depending on the size, location, age, and/or specific conditions of a particular school.

The [Charter School Performance Criteria](#) (Criteria) form the foundation of the site visit process. The Criteria give definition to the three areas of charter school accountability defined in 603 CMR 1.00: faithfulness to charter, academic program success, and organizational viability. During the site visit, the school is assessed on all or a subset of the performance indicators contained in the Criteria. The types of site visits conducted by the Department and the methods used to assess a school's performance are described in the [Site Visit Protocol](#).

The product of each site visit is a site visit report such as this one. Site visit reports are one of the means by which the Department documents each charter school's performance and progress over time, corroborating and augmenting the information reported each year in the school's annual report. Site visit reports generated by the Department are important components of the body of evidence used by the commissioner and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (Board) to make a renewal determination or inform other authorizing actions pertaining to the school.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Massachusetts Charter School Performance Criteria		
Faithfulness to Charter		Rating¹
Criterion 1: Mission and Key Design Elements <i>In Year 27, school stakeholders share a common understanding of the school's mission. The school is operating in a manner that is faithful to its mission and is implementing its key design elements.</i>		● Exceeds
Criterion 2: Access and Equity <i>Parker seeks to ensure access to the program and equity for all students eligible to attend the school. The school provides information to the public regarding non-discriminatory enrollment practices and the availability of special education and English learner programs. The school provides translated materials for families whose first language is not English</i>		● Meets
Criterion 3: Compliance <i>The board of trustees operates in a manner that is not fully in compliance with the Open Meeting Law (OML).</i>		Not Rated ²
Academic Program Success		
Criterion 5: Student Performance³	2019 Overall Classification	Not requiring assistance or intervention
	Progress Toward Improvement Targets	59%
	2019 Accountability Percentile	78
Criterion 6: Program Delivery		
Key Indicator 6.2: Instruction <i>Site visitors observed instruction reflecting high expectations for all students in all classrooms. Observed instruction reflected the school's definition of cultural proficiency. All observed classroom environments were conducive to learning</i>		Not Rated ⁴
Key Indicator 6.4: Supports for All Learners <i>The school has a proactive, data-based system to effectively identify all students' strengths and needs for academic, behavioral, and social-emotional development. The school implements a tiered support model that effectively addresses the strengths and needs of all students, across all student groups. The school uses data to evaluate and modify its support programming to ensure student success.</i>		● Meets
Organizational Viability		
Criterion 9: Governance <i>The board of trustees fulfills most of their legal and fiduciary responsibilities. The board of trustees fosters a culture of collaboration. The board of trustees engages in strategic and continuous improvement planning.</i>		● Meets

INTRODUCTION

SCHOOL PROFILE

Francis W. Parker Charter Essential School (Parker)			
Type of Charter	Commonwealth	Location	Devens
Regional or Non-Regional	Regional	Districts in Region	See below ⁵
Year Opened	1995	Year(s) Renewed	2000, 2005, 2010, 2015, 2020
Maximum Enrollment	400	Current Enrollment	386 ⁶
Chartered Grade Span	7-12	Current Grade Span	7-12
Students on Waitlist	57 ⁷	Current Age of School	27
<p>Mission Statement:</p> <p>The Parker School's mission is “to move the child to the center of the education process and to interrelate the several subjects of the curriculum in such a way as to enhance their meaning for the child” (Charter, October 1994). As a member of the Coalition of Essential Schools, the Parker School will realize this mission through educational practice guided by the Ten Common Principles of Essential Schools:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The school should focus on helping adolescents learn to use their minds well. Schools should not attempt to be “comprehensive” if such a claim is made at the expense of the school’s central intellectual purpose. 2. The school’s goals should be simple: that each student master a limited number of essential skills and areas of knowledge. While these skills and areas will, to varying degrees, reflect the traditional academic disciplines, the program’s design should be shaped by the intellectual and imaginative powers and competencies that students need, rather than necessarily by “subjects” as conventionally defined. The aphorism “Less Is More” should dominate: curricular decisions should be guided by the aim of thorough student mastery and achievement rather than by an effort merely to cover content. 3. The school’s goals should apply to all students, while the means to these goals will vary as those students themselves vary. School practice should be tailor-made to meet the needs of every group or class of adolescents. 			

¹ Rating Key:

- **Exceeds:** The school fully and consistently meets the criterion and is a potential exemplar in this area.
- **Meets:** The school generally meets the criterion and/or minor concern(s) are noted.
- **Partially Meets:** The school meets some aspects of the criterion but not others and/or moderate concern(s) are noted.
- **Falls Far Below:** The school falls far below the criterion and/or significant concerns are noted.

² Due to the number of items required for a public school and charter school to be in compliance with state and federal regulations and guidance, the Department does not rate this category as a composite.

³ The school’s most recent student performance data in the statewide accountability system is for 2019. Statewide assessments were not administered in 2020. The Department also did not issue accountability determinations in 2021.

⁴ This site visit report does not include a rating for *Key Indicator 6.2: Instruction* due to the limited scope of the visit.

⁵ Acton-Boxborough, Ashburnham-Westminster, Athol-Royalston, Ayer, Bedford, Berlin-Boylston, Carlisle, Chelmsford, Clinton, Concord, Concord-Carlisle, Fitchburg, Gardner, Grafton, Groton-Dunstable, Harvard, Hudson, Leominster, Lincoln, Lincoln-Sudbury, Littleton, Lowell, Lunenburg, Marlborough, Maynard, Narragansett, Nashoba, Newton, Northboro-Southboro, North Middlesex, Orange, Oxford, Princeton, Quabbin, Ralph C. Mahar, Shirley, Shrewsbury, Southborough, Sudbury, Tyngsborough, Wachusett, Wayland, Westborough, West Boylston, Westford, Westminster, Weston, Winchendon, and Worcester

⁶ This is the number as of October 1, 2021. Source: [Profiles](#)

⁷ This is the number as of October 1, 2021. Source: [Massachusetts Charter School Waitlist Initial/Updated Report for 2020-21](#)

4. Teaching and learning should be personalized to the maximum feasible extent. Efforts should be directed toward a goal that no teacher have direct responsibility for more than 80 students. To capitalize on this personalization, decisions about the details of the course of study, the use of students' and teachers' time and the choice of teaching materials and specific pedagogies must be unreservedly placed in the hands of the principal and staff.
5. The governing practical metaphor of the school should be student-as-worker rather than the more familiar metaphor of teacher-as-deliverer-of-instructional-services. Accordingly, a prominent pedagogy will be coaching, to provoke students to learn how to learn and thus to teach themselves.
6. Students entering secondary school studies are those who can show competence in language and elementary mathematics. Students of traditional high school age but not yet at appropriate levels of competence to enter secondary school studies will be provided intensive remedial work to assist them quickly to meet these standards. The diploma should be awarded upon a successful final demonstration of mastery for graduation: an "exhibition." This exhibition by the student of his or her grasp of the central skills and knowledge of the school's program may be jointly administered by the faculty and by higher authorities. As the diploma is awarded when earned, the school's program proceeds with no strict age grading and with no system of "credits earned" by "time spent" in class. The emphasis is on the students' demonstration that they can do important things.
7. The tone of the school should explicitly and self-consciously stress values of unanxious expectation ("I won't threaten you but I expect much of you"), of trust (until abused) and of decency (the values of fairness, generosity and tolerance). Incentives appropriate to the school's particular students and teachers should be emphasized, and parents should be treated as essential collaborators.
8. The principal and teachers should perceive themselves as generalists first (teachers and scholars in general education) and specialists second (experts in but one particular discipline). Staff should expect multiple obligations (teacher-counselor-manager) and a sense of commitment to the entire school.
9. Ultimate administrative and budget targets should include, in addition to total student loads per teacher of eighty or fewer pupils, substantial time for collective planning by teachers, competitive salaries for staff and an ultimate per pupil cost not to exceed that at traditional schools by more than 10 percent. To accomplish this, administrative plans may have to show the phased reduction or elimination of some services now provided students in many traditional comprehensive secondary schools.
10. The school should demonstrate non-discriminatory and inclusive policies, practices, and pedagogies. It should model democratic practices that involve all who are directly affected by the school. The school should honor diversity and build on the strengths of its communities, deliberately and explicitly challenging all forms of inequity and discrimination.

SCHOOL HISTORY

- Francis W. Parker Charter Essential School (Parker) received its charter in 1994 and opened in 1995 with 122 students in grades 7 and 8. The school was established by local parents, teachers, and community members to embody the principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools. The school added a grade each year until it reached its maximum grade span in the 1999-2000 school year.
- In November 2016, the Board approved an amendment to add the town of West Boylston to the charter region.
- Parker is organized in three divisions rather than grade levels. Division 1 is roughly the equivalent of grades 7 and 8, Division 2 is roughly the equivalent of grades 9 and 10, and Division 3 is roughly the equivalent of grades 11 and 12. The school organizes instruction into four interrelated domains: arts and humanities; mathematics, science and technology; Spanish; and wellness.

- The board of trustees oversees the principal, who has been at the school since 2011. The principal oversees the academic dean, domain leaders, the special education coordinator, the student success and 504 coordinator, the director of Sizer Teachers Center, and a number of other staff members. The domain leaders oversee teachers in each of the four domains mentioned above. The Sizer Teachers Center is a professional development center located at the school's campus.
- In September 2021, the current principal announced they would be leaving in June 2022. In January 2022, the board of trustees hired a new principal, who will begin in July 2022.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity (2021-22)⁸	
Race/Ethnicity	Percentage of Student Body
African American	2.1
Asian	2.3
Hispanic	4.1
Native American	0.0
White	88.1
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	0.0
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	3.4

Selected Populations (2021-22)⁹	
Title	Percentage of Student Body
First Language not English	2.6
English Language Learner	0.0
Low-income	12.7
Students with Disabilities	14.8
High Needs	25.4

⁸ Source: [Profiles](#)

⁹ Source: [Profiles](#)

METHODOLOGY

As stated above, the [Charter School Performance Criteria](#) (Criteria) form the foundation of the site visit process. The Criteria give definition to the three areas of charter school accountability defined in 603 CMR 1.00: faithfulness to charter, academic program success, and organizational viability. During the site visit, the school is assessed on all or a subset of the performance indicators contained in the Criteria. The *Executive Summary* indicates the criteria and key indicators included within the scope of this visit.

The following participants conducted the visit:

- Patrick Buckwalter, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), Office of Charter Schools and School Redesign (OCSSR)
- Janice Pamphile, DESE, OCSSR

The visit was conducted on February 10, 2022. Some focus groups were conducted remotely.

Team members used the [Site Visit Protocol](#) to plan for and conduct the visit. Prior to the visit, team members reviewed documents and other information related to each of the criteria and key indicators listed in the *Executive Summary*. On the day of the visit, team members held focus group interviews and conducted classroom observations using a form developed by the Office of Charter Schools and School Redesign.

Key documents and other information reviewed by the team:

- The school's most recent annual report
- The school's website
- The school's most recent Summary of Review
- Recruitment materials
- Translated materials
- Student enrollment data
- Student indicator data
- Staff qualifications
- Student academic performance data
- A written description of the school's system of supports for all learners provided by the school
- The school's District Curriculum Accommodation Plan
- The school's special education policies and procedures manual
- Aggregated teacher, student, and family survey data
- Board of trustees meeting minutes and other board materials

Focus group interviews held by the team:

- Board of trustees: The team interviewed six board members, including the chair, vice-chair, treasurer, two parent representatives, and a teacher representative. This focus group was conducted remotely.
- School leaders/administrators: The team interviewed the principal; the academic dean; the dean of students; the mathematics, science, and technology domain leader; the arts and humanities

domain leader; the director of the new teachers collaborative; the Spanish domain leader; and the special education coordinator.

- Teachers: The team interviewed nine general education teachers, including teachers representing divisions one through three and the following content areas: Spanish, arts and humanities, mathematics, science, technology, and wellness. The team also interviewed one special education teacher.

The team's analysis of the evidence related to each of the criteria and key indicators included in the scope of the visit is presented below.

RATINGS, FINDINGS, AND EVIDENCE

FAITHFULNESS TO CHARTER

CRITERION 1: MISSION AND KEY DESIGN ELEMENTS

The school is faithful to its mission, implements the key design elements outlined in its charter, and substantially meets its accountability plan goals.

● Exceeds

Finding: In Year 27, school stakeholders share a common understanding of the school’s mission. The school is operating in a manner that is faithful to its mission and is implementing its key design elements.

School stakeholders described the school’s mission in ways that reflect a common understanding.

- The school’s mission is, “to move the child to the center of the education process and to interrelate the several subjects of the curriculum in such a way as to enhance their meaning for the child.” As a member of the Coalition of Essential Schools, the Parker School seeks to realize this mission through educational practice guided by the Ten Common Principles of Essential Schools.
- Board members, school administrators, and teachers described the school’s mission in ways that are consistent with the mission statement. All stakeholders reported that the school aims to move the child to the center of the education process and highlighted elements of the Ten Common Principles. Board members and school administrators reported that teachers interrelate different subjects in the curriculum in a personalized manner. School administrators and teachers reported that teachers differentiate and personalize learning to ensure students’ needs and interests stay at the center of their education. Teachers reported that teachers are coaches, and students are workers who advocate for their own education and play an active role in their learning.

In describing how the mission is realized in the operation of the school, stakeholders described aspects of all key design elements articulated in the school’s Accountability Plan. Evidence of the school’s implementation of each key design element is discussed below.

Parker will remain an Essential School, guided by the Ten Common Principles of Essential Schools. (KDE 1)

- Board members and school administrators reported that the board and staff use the ten principles to make decisions about the school program. Board members reported that the ten principles guide their decision-making process, and the full board reviews the ten principles often. Board members reported that the ten principles guided their search process for the next school leader. School administrators reported that staff use the Ten Common Principles when making decisions about the teacher to student ratio in classrooms, the classroom instruction, the organizational structure, the school budget, and the general programming.
- According to the school’s June 2021 faculty survey (n=51), most faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the Ten Common Principles influence their daily practice, and the Ten Common Principles of Essential Schools guide school administrators in decision-making processes.

Students will demonstrate mastery through public exhibitions of their work. (KDE 2)

- Board members, school administrators, and teachers reported that all students participate in public exhibitions during their time at the school. All stakeholders reported that during public exhibitions, students present their work to their peers, community members, and families. Board members, school administrators, and teachers reported that students participate in gateway exhibitions where students display past work or an independent project to demonstrate their growth and explain why they are ready to progress to the next division. School administrators reported that there are also smaller exhibitions through domain-specific projects, like the “Noche Sabrosa” for students in grade 8 Spanish.
- According to the school’s 2020-21 Annual Report, 100 percent of students moving between divisions (n=221) completed public exhibitions of mastery (i.e., gateways), and 100 percent of students (n=56) who earned a diploma completed a public exhibition, such as the senior project exhibition.

Students will learn to use their minds well in a skills-based curriculum. (KDE 3)

- School administrators and teachers reported that student learning is evaluated using schoolwide standards and rubrics drawn from the school’s criteria for excellence. School administrators reported that students’ skills are assessed multiple times over the year. School administrators reported that students are expected to demonstrate mastery over time which requires spending ample time reflecting and revising their own work and strengthening their skills and understanding.
- According to the school’s 2020-21 Annual Report, 91 percent of students responded on the annual student survey, and 92 percent of students who responded agreed or strongly agreed that they were working towards a portfolio of work in their academic classes that meets Parker’s Criteria for Excellence in twelve different skill areas.
- During classroom observations, site visitors observed teachers guiding student inquiry by encouraging students to ask questions about the curriculum and reflect on their work. See *Key Indicator 6.2: Instruction* for more details.

Developing individual potential is accomplishment: students will develop their individual potential and develop habits of learning. (KDE 4)

- Board members, school administrators, and teachers reported that all students develop a personal learning plan (PLP) on an annual basis. Teachers reported that PLPs include a student’s individual academic and social goals, and there is a second meeting later in the year for students to reflect on their goals and evaluate their progress. School administrators reported that teachers and family members are involved in the PLP process as well.
- Board members, school administrators, and teachers reported that the advisory program is essential in helping students develop habits of learning. School administrators reported that the advisory program focuses on coaching students on understanding and applying the habits of learning, including inquiry, expression, critical thinking, collaboration, organization, attentiveness, involvement, and reflection.
- According to the school’s 2020-21 Annual Report, 87 percent of students agreed or strongly agreed that they have a Personal Learning Plan that includes at least one goal unique to them and one goal related to the habits of learning.

Teachers will regularly engage in collective planning and develop individual reflective practice. (KDE 5)

- Board members, school administrators, and teachers reported that staff regularly meet within their domains and divisions and attend weekly all-faculty meetings. School administrators reported that teachers are given two hours to collaborate four days per week. All stakeholders reported that teachers also meet with community partners, collaborate across divisions and domains, and engage in a critical friend group (CFG) to reflect and develop individual practice. A CFG is a small group of teachers who share critical feedback regarding each other's teaching practices. According to the school's June 2021 faculty survey, 96 percent of faculty (n=51) agreed or strongly agreed that participation in the critical friends group helps deepen their teaching practice.

Accountability Plan

Parker's approved Accountability Plan sets goals for the school's current charter term and includes 6 objectives and 11 related measures. Charter schools endeavor to meet the Accountability Plan goals by the end of the charter term. In its Annual Report for 2020-21, Parker reported that it met 10 out of 11 goals. Please see the school's [2020-21 Annual Report](#) for more information.

CRITERION 2: ACCESS AND EQUITY	
The school ensures access and equity for all students eligible to attend the school.	● Meets

Finding: Parker seeks to ensure access to the program and equity for all students eligible to attend the school. The school provides information to the public regarding non-discriminatory enrollment practices and the availability of special education and English learner programs. The school provides translated materials for families whose first language is not English.

- The school has received approval from the Department for its Recruitment and Retention Plan for the 2021-22 school year. The 2021-22 Recruitment and Retention Plan includes enhanced strategies to recruit English learners and students who are economically disadvantaged.
- The school provides sufficient information to the public regarding non-discriminatory enrollment practices and the availability of specialized programs and services at the school to meet the needs of students with disabilities and English learners. Recruitment materials, the application for admission, and the school’s website include a non-discrimination statement and a notice that the school provides services for students with disabilities and English learners.
- The school provides translated materials for families whose first language is not English. The school offers the application for admission as well as policy and recruitment flyers in Spanish. The school’s website has a translation function that allows the content to be viewed in multiple languages.

Finding: The school has been partially successful in recruiting a demographically comparable¹⁰ population and mostly successful in retaining students.

- Enrollment of students with disabilities was consistently above the Comparison Index in 2018 through 2022.
- Enrollment of English learners and students in the low-income¹¹ group was below gap narrowing targets¹² in 2018 through 2022.
- Attrition rates¹³ for all students were below the third quartile in 2018 through 2022. Attrition rates for students in the high needs group were below the third quartile in 2018 through 2021 but above the third quartile in 2022.

¹⁰ A school’s enrollment of a particular student group is determined to be comparable if the percentage is equal to or greater than the Comparison Index, a figure derived from data of students who reside within the charter school’s sending district(s). The Comparison Index is explained in further detail [here](#). Please note that although comparisons of student group enrollment data in a charter school to that of other public schools in a geographic area can provide some information regarding comparability of student populations, it is presented for reference only and primarily to determine trends within the charter school itself and to guide further inquiry. The student group composition of a charter school is not required to be a mirror image of the schools in its sending districts and region. The Department urges caution in drawing any conclusions regarding comparability of student group populations between schools and districts based on aggregate statistics alone. Enrollment of students in traditional public schools differs significantly from enrollment of students in charter schools.

¹¹ In 2021, the Department changed the criteria for identifying students in the economically disadvantaged student group and renamed the student group as low-income. The new criteria are explained in further detail [here](#).

¹² Gap narrowing targets are provided for schools where enrollment is below the Comparison Index. Gap narrowing targets are explained in further detail [here](#).

¹³ Attrition rates are the percentage of attrition from the end of one school year to the beginning of the next school year.

- Stability rates¹⁴ were above the first quartile in 2018 through 2022 for all students and for students in the high needs group.

Please see the [Charter Analysis and Review Tool \(CHART\)](#) and [Profiles](#) for more information.

In the tables below, percentages that meet Department expectations are highlighted in green, while percentages that do not meet Department expectations are highlighted in red.¹⁵

Recruitment

Students with Disabilities (Percent Enrolled)					
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Parker	14.1	13.9	14.6	16.0	14.8
Comparison Index	12.1	12.2	12.7	12.6	12.7
Gap Narrowing Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

English Learners (Percent Enrolled)					
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Parker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Comparison Index	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.4
Gap Narrowing Target	2.5	2.8	3.2	3.5	4.0

Economically Disadvantaged (2018-2021)/ Low-Income (2022) (Percent Enrolled)					
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Parker	6.3	7.1	8.3	10.0	12.7
Comparison Index	19.7	19.3	20.8	24.4	31.0
Gap Narrowing Target	8.6	10.3	12.1	13.8	19.5

Retention

¹⁴ Stability rates measure how many students remain in a school throughout the school year.

¹⁵ With respect to recruitment, percentages at or above the Comparison Index or gap narrowing target are highlighted in green; those below the gap narrowing target are highlighted in red. With respect to attrition, percentages at or below the third quartile are highlighted in green; those above the third quartile are highlighted in red. With respect to stability, percentages at or above the first quartile are highlighted in green; those below the first quartile are highlighted in red.

All Students (Percent Attrition)					
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Parker	4.5	4.6	6.8	3.8	9.0
Median	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.2	6.0
Third Quartile	8.2	8.3	8.7	7.1	9.7

High Needs (Percent Attrition)					
	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Parker	5.8	8.8	6.1	3.9	16.7
Median	7.4	7.3	7.4	6.2	8.1
Third Quartile	10.3	10.6	10.1	9.1	11.7

All Students (Stability Rate Percentage)					
	2017	2017	2019	2020	2021
Parker	94.7	97.2	95.5	98.5	96.0
Median	96.3	96.2	96.3	96.7	96.7
First Quartile	92.6	92.5	92.6	93.1	94.5

High Needs (Stability Rate Percentage)					
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Parker	91.1	98.8	93.1	96.7	95.0
Median	93.0	93.1	93.6	93.8	94.7
First Quartile	89.7	89.5	89.9	90.9	92.6

Finding: The school's rates of in-school and out-of-school suspension were consistently below the third quartile for all comparison schools in 2017 through 2020.

In the tables below, percentages that meet Department expectations are highlighted in green, while percentages that do not meet Department expectations are highlighted in red.¹⁶

¹⁶ Percentages at or below the third quartile are highlighted in green; those above the third quartile are highlighted in red. The third quartile is in the middle number between the median and the highest number for all comparison schools. Comparison schools include all of the public schools in the charter school's district or region (if the school is a regional school) that serve at least one grade level of students that overlaps with the grade levels served by the charter school.

In-School Suspension (Percentage)				
	2017	2018	2019	2020
Parker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Median	0.6	0.9	1.2	0.5
Third Quartile	2.3	3.5	4.1	2.4

Out-of-School Suspension (Percentage)				
	2017	2018	2019	2020
Parker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Median	1.3	2.4	2.5	1.5
Third Quartile	4.3	5.2	6.0	4.8

CRITERION 3: COMPLIANCE	
The school operates in compliance with the terms of its charter and applicable federal and state laws and regulations regarding public charter schools.	Not Rated¹⁷

Finding: The board of trustees operates in a manner that is not fully in compliance with the Open Meeting Law (OML).

- Board meeting minutes do not consistently provide a sufficient summary of the discussion of each subject and do not consistently include a list of documents and other exhibits used at the meetings, all requirements of the OML.

¹⁷ Due to the number of items required for a public school and charter school to be in compliance with state and federal regulations and guidance, the Department does not rate this category as a composite.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM SUCCESS

CRITERION 5: STUDENT PERFORMANCE ¹⁸		
The school consistently makes progress in student academic achievement for all students as defined by the statewide accountability system.	2019 Overall Classification	Not requiring assistance or intervention
	Progress Toward Improvement Targets	59%
	2019 Accountability Percentile	78

Finding: In 2017, schools such as Parker that administered the Next-Generation MCAS assessment in grades 3 through 8 were not assigned gap narrowing goals. In 2018, Parker partially met targets for indicators included in the new statewide accountability system. In 2019, Parker made substantial progress toward targets.

The purpose of the statewide accountability system is to provide clear, actionable information about school performance. The accountability indicators used for each school depend on the grades served and the assessments administered. More detailed information related to student performance is included in [Profiles](#). Please note that in general, caution is required when making comparisons across years when there were changes to the state accountability system. As a result of significant changes to the state's accountability system in 2018, comparisons between accountability results from 2018 and 2019 and historical accountability data should not be made.

Accountability and Assistance Level/Overall Classification

Prior to 2018, all Massachusetts schools and districts with sufficient data were classified into one of five accountability and assistance levels (1 to 5), with the highest performing in Level 1 and lowest performing in Level 5. Beginning in 2018, all Massachusetts districts and schools with sufficient data were classified into one of two accountability categories: districts and schools requiring assistance or intervention, and districts and schools without required assistance or intervention.

Accountability and Assistance Level	Overall Classification	
	2017	2018
No Level: Students in this school participated in 2017 Next-Generation MCAS tests	Not requiring assistance or intervention: Partially meeting targets Progress Toward Improvement Targets: 62%	Not requiring assistance or intervention: Substantial progress toward targets Cumulative Progress Toward Improvement Targets: 59%

¹⁸ The school's most recent student performance data in the statewide accountability system is for 2019. Statewide assessments were not administered in 2020. The Department also did not issue accountability determinations in 2021.

School Percentile/Accountability Percentile

Prior to 2018, a school percentile between 1 and 99 was reported for schools with at least four years of data. This number is an indication of the school's overall performance relative to other schools that serve the same or similar grades. School percentiles were not calculated for schools that administered the Next Generation MCAS assessment in grades 3 through 8 in spring 2017.

School Percentile
2017
-

Beginning in 2018, an accountability percentile between 1 and 99 was reported for most schools. This number is an indication of the school's overall performance relative to other schools that administer similar assessments and is calculated using up to two years of data for all accountability indicators.

Accountability Percentile	
2018	2019
84	78

Next-Generation MCAS Tests

Next-Generation MCAS tests were given in English language arts and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 starting in 2017. Starting in 2019, Next-Generation MCAS tests were also given in science in grades 5 and 8 and in English language arts and mathematics in grade 10. Scaled scores range from 440 to 560. Students meet expectations in the scaled score range of 500 to 529 and exceed expectations in the scaled score range of 530 to 560.

Please note that in the table below, the school's data is for students in grades 7, 8, and 10 only. Parker does not enroll students in grades 3 through 6.

Next-Generation MCAS Tests												
Grade and Subject	2017				2018				2019			
	Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations		Avg. Scaled Score		Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations		Avg. Scaled Score		Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations		Avg. Scaled Score	
	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State	School	State
Grades 3-8 English Language Arts	57	49	504.4	499.0	63	51	505.2	500.5	61	52	505.4	501.2
Grades 3-8 Mathematics	54	48	503.7	498.8	59	48	502.5	498.4	55	49	502.7	499.2
Grades 8 Science									75	46	511.7	498.6
Grade 10 English Language Arts									86	61	515.7	506.2
Grade 10 Mathematics									69	59	508.7	505.1

Composite Performance Index

The Composite Performance Index (CPI) is a 100-point index that serves as a measure of the extent to which all students are progressing toward proficiency. When all students score Proficient or Advanced on the legacy MCAS assessment, the CPI will be 100. The legacy MCAS assessment was administered for the last time in 2018 in science in grades 5 and 8 and in English language arts and mathematics in grade 10.

Composite Performance Index						
Grade and Subject	2017		2018		2019	
	School	State	School	State	School	State
Grade 8 Science and Tech/Eng	75.8	70.6	71.9	68.3		
Grade 10 English Language Arts	100.0	96.5	100.0	96.2		
Grade 10 Mathematics	97.5	89.9	99.1	89.5		
Grade 10 Science	96.2	89.4	96.6	89.3	94.0	89.1

Student Growth Percentile

The Department uses Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) to demonstrate progress in student achievement each year. SGPs are generated based on student performance on statewide assessments, including MCAS and/or the Next-Generation MCAS. In 2018, DESE began including average SGP in all assessment and accountability reports instead of median SGP. In general, SGPs in the range of 1 to 39 are associated with lower growth, SGPs in the range of 40 to 60 are associated with typical growth, and SGPs in the range of 61 to 99 are associated with higher growth.

Please note that in the table below, the school's data is for students in grades 7, 8, and 10 only. Parker does not enroll students in grades 3 through 6.

Student Growth Percentile			
Grade and Subject	Next-Generation MCAS		
	Median SGP	Average SGP	
	2017	2018	2019
Grades 3-8 English Language Arts	44.0	42.8	43.9
Grades 3-8 Mathematics	49.0	35.6	36.9
Grade and Subject	MCAS		Next-Generation MCAS
	Median SGP	Average SGP	
	2017	2018	2019
Grade 10 English Language Arts	67.0	60.6	59.4
Grade 10 Mathematics	37.0	64.2	43.2

Graduation and Dropout Rates

The 4-year graduation rate is the percentage of students in an annual cohort who graduate with a regular high school diploma within four years.

4-Year Graduation Rate (Percent Graduated)				
	2018 cohort	2019 cohort	2020 cohort	2021 cohort
Parker	93.8	96.6	92.5	91.7
Statewide	87.9	88.0	89.0	89.8

The 5-year graduation rate is the percentage of students in an annual cohort who graduate with a regular high school diploma within five years. Data for the 2020 cohort is the most recent available because it includes students in that cohort who graduated as late as 2021.

5-Year Graduation Rate (Percent Graduated)			
	2018 cohort	2019 cohort	2020 cohort
Parker	98.4	100.0	98.1
Statewide	89.7	90.1	91.0

Dropout rates are reported for high school students who drop out of high school.

Dropout Rate (Percent Dropout)				
	2018	2019	2020	2021
Parker	0.0	0.4	0.0	1.2
Statewide	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.5

CRITERION 6: PROGRAM DELIVERY

The school delivers a high quality academic program that meets the needs of all students.

Key Indicator 6.2: Instruction¹⁹

The school staff has a common understanding of high-quality instruction. Instructional practices are aligned to this common understanding. Instructional practices are based on high expectations for all students and reflect cultural proficiency. Instruction fosters student engagement. Classroom environments are conducive to learning.

Not Rated²⁰

Finding: Site visitors observed instruction reflecting high expectations for all students in all classrooms. Observed instruction reflected the school's definition of cultural proficiency. All observed classroom environments were conducive to learning.²¹

Observed instruction reflected high expectations for all students in all classrooms.

- During classroom observations, site visitors observed teachers in 13 out of 13 classrooms utilizing instructional practices that reflect high expectations for all students. Site visitors observed teachers communicating high standards for student work and behavior, encouraging students to keep trying without giving up, and consistently reinforcing the expectations that all students can meet high standards through effort. Site visitors observed teachers providing wait time or reteaching concepts if students struggled to answer a question, and site visitors observed teachers communicating high standards for student work by providing students with rubrics. Site visitors observed students on task and engaging with instruction.

Observed instruction reflected the school's definition of cultural proficiency.

- Prior to the site visit, school administrators indicated that site visitors should see examples of the following instructional practices that the school believes reflect cultural proficiency: classroom climate is characterized by respectful relationships, behaviors, tones, and discourse; students acknowledge the needs and perspectives of others; and students contribute to an overall tone of decency and trust in the school.
- During the site visit, teachers reported that it is the school's mission to put the child at the center of their education, and therefore teachers need to know, honor, and respect students' backgrounds and their individual qualities. School administrators and teachers reported that while students discuss current issues in classrooms, they are also learning about the history, trends, and other important context of those events. School administration and teachers reported that the students in division one participated in an immigration panel where guests, including an immigrant lawyer, discussed their immigration experiences. Teachers reported that the advisory program allows students space and flexibility to engage in topics that are of importance to them. For example, teachers reported that student government started an initiative where students can create a display that highlights people of color who inspire them. Teachers gave the example of musicians, such as Ray Charles and Yoyo-Ma.

²⁰ This site visit report does not include a rating for *Key Indicator 6.2: Instruction* due to the limited scope of the visit.

²¹ The site visit team gathered evidence related to a subset of the elements included in *Key Indicator 6.2: Instruction*.

- School administrators reported that staff at the school evaluate the curriculum critically to ensure students can see themselves in the texts. School administrators provided an example where students looked at skin color and its social construct in relation to science during a genetics class.
- During classroom observations, site visitors observed respectful relationships between students and teachers and students and their peers, teachers asking students to consider other perspectives, and students treating each other with decency and trust. For example, in one classroom, a student suggested that the teacher help another student who needed support first, and in another classroom, a student and teacher discussed racial and systemic inequalities as the student prepared to write an essay. Site visitors also observed classroom libraries with texts representing main characters with diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds and written by authors of colors; flags of different countries; posters highlighting African American/Black women in science; and pride flags and posters. a display of books outside of the library including titles such as “How to be an Anti-Racist, All-American Boys, Black Girl Unlimited, and The True Story of a Part-Time Indian.”

All observed learning environments were conducive to learning.

- All 13 classroom environments observed by site visitors were conducive to learning. Site visitors observed respectful relationships, behaviors, and discourse. The team observed smooth transitions between classrooms and activities, indicating that there are well-established routines. Site visitors observed teachers giving both verbal and non-verbal reminders of expectations and conducting brief check-ins with students to address behavior. The team also observed that students seemed comfortable taking academic risks and volunteering to speak or answer questions in class. Site visitors observed teachers positively affirming students for taking academic risks and encouraging students to keep trying if they were grappling with the content. Site visitors observed teachers offering students the opportunity to choose different work in the classroom; for example, a teacher allowed a student to switch the focus of their classwork in the middle of the class. Site visitors observed teachers creating mini breaks in classrooms and allowing students the autonomy to time their own breaks before continuing their work. During classroom observations, site visitors observed students working together with partners or small groups and engaging in discussions about the content of the lesson. For example, in some classes, students worked on presentations in small groups, and in other classes students gave each other feedback on their projects.

Key Indicator 6.4: Supports for All Learners	
The school has a proactive system to effectively identify and address all students' strengths and needs for academic, behavioral, and social-emotional development through a tiered support model. Data and progress monitoring are used to ensure that all students across all subgroups have equal access and equitable support, interventions, and resources to achieve, grow, and advance. The school regularly uses data to evaluate and modify its support programming to ensure student success.	● Meets

Finding: The school has a proactive, data-based system to effectively identify all students' strengths and needs for academic, behavioral, and social-emotional development. The school implements a tiered support model that effectively addresses the strengths and needs of all students, across all student groups. The school uses data to evaluate and modify its support programming to ensure student success.

The school has a proactive, data-based system to effectively identify all students' strengths and needs for academic, behavioral, and social-emotional development.

- A written description of the system of supports for all learners provided by the school states, and school administrators and teachers confirmed, that the school uses a variety of assessments to identify students' academic needs. Teachers reported that teachers administer the i-Ready screeners for reading and mathematics when students first enter the school. School administrators and teachers reported, and school documents confirmed, that teachers administer daily and weekly formative assessments and summative skills-based assessments 3 to 10 times per semester in all content areas.
- A written description of the system of supports for all learners provided by the school states, and school administrators and teachers confirmed, that the school administers a schoolwide social-emotional survey to gather aggregated data on whether students' academic and social-emotional needs are being met. All stakeholders reported that advisors check in daily with students to identify any academic, behavioral, or social-emotional needs.
- School administrators and teachers reported that weekly student engagement and performance is monitored using a schoolwide tool called red, yellow, and green (RYG). Using the RYG tool, each student in each class receives a status check about their engagement for the week. This report is sent to students and advisors weekly and to parents and guardians monthly to help identify students' behavioral and social-emotional needs.

The school implements a tiered support model that effectively addresses the strengths and needs of all students. The school's support and intervention model is focused on personalized supports for all students that are largely determined by the student's advisor, personalized learning plan, and weekly RYG reports.

- The school submitted documents that outline Tier 1 supports that are offered to all students. Tier 1 academic supports for all students include curricular choice, team-teaching model, rubrics, access to extra help during the school day, organizational templates, a formative assessments and feedback cycle, flexible grouping, and assistive technologies. Tier 1 behavioral and social-emotional supports for students include advisory lessons and check-ins, teacher check-ins, movement and brain breaks, student redirection, teacher and advisor meetings, and access to student support personnel. During classroom observations, site visitors observed

teachers redirecting students as needed, students taking brain breaks in class, students asking to take laps as a break, teachers checking in with individual students, the use of small fidget toys and stuffed animals, and different seating arrangements to meet the needs of students.

- According to a written description of the system of supports for all learners provided by the school, and confirmed by school administrators and teachers, the school implements a tiered support model that effectively addresses the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional strengths and needs of all students. The school has a tiered system of support that is based upon advisors and teachers making decisions about a student's needs for additional support based on each student's individualized goals. If a student is not making progress on their goals or PLP, or if the RYG data shows any areas of concern, the student's advisor will consult with other teachers to provide the student with supports beyond Tier 1 interventions. Teachers reported that if a student has consistent reds in their RYG report, then teachers provide more intensive interventions, and school administrators reported that teachers can refer students to the student support team for behavioral and social-emotional supports. School administrators reported staff use the "kid-talk" protocol to discuss how individual students are doing academically, behaviorally, and socially. School administrators reported that the student services and clinical staff team meet weekly for kid-talk, division teachers meet weekly to discuss students in their cohort, and teachers and advisors conduct a monthly kid-talk. School administrators reported that the student services team consists of the academic dean, academic support teachers, the special education coordinator, the college and transition counselor, the school nurse, the dean of students, the school counselor, and the school psychologist. School administrators reported that Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions are implemented for at least 8 weeks before making further recommendations for additional interventions or referring the student to be evaluated for special education services. The teacher and advisor also assess the student's progress each week to ensure the intervention is effectively meeting the student's needs.
- The school provides Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Tier 2 academic interventions include small group work, reteaching, targeted skills work, and teachers working with individual students during independent reading. Tier 2 social-emotional interventions include school-based counseling, student and teacher conferences as needed, and behavior contracts. Some Tier 3 interventions are similar to Tier 2 interventions but are administered more frequently and are further personalized to meet the needs of individual students. Other Tier 3 interventions include one-to-one instruction and support either in or outside of the classroom, behavior plans, and referral to outside agencies.
- School administrators and teachers reported that the tiered support model is understood and consistently implemented with fidelity by school staff. Teachers reported that part of the mission of the school is to move the student to the center of their education and personalize the education experience for students. Teachers also reported that there is a culture of collaboration and communication among staff, and staff discuss how to continuously adjust to meet the needs of each student. School administrators reported that there is an emphasis on building trust with students to encourage students to take academic and social risks at the school knowing that their teachers will support them in the process. School administrators also reported that through the new teacher training program, teachers are trained on how to support students in the classroom and are trained on how to have challenging conversations with students.
- Site visitors observed teachers demonstrating responsibility for the learning of all students in all classrooms. In those classrooms, students were given curricular choice, there were multiple adults in the classroom, students were using computers, calculators, rubrics, word walls, and

organizational templates. Site visitors also observed team-teaching, flexible groupings, different seating arrangements, students using fidget toys, teachers checking-in and circling back with students.

The school uses data to evaluate and modify its support programming to ensure student success.

- School administrators and teachers reported that the school has made recent changes to the supports and interventions provided to students. School administrators and teachers reported that the school recently revised their RYG internal weekly monitoring system in response to data from the 2020-21 school year and the experiences of multiple stakeholders, including students, parents, and advisors. School administrators reported that during remote learning, the RYG system was shared weekly with students, families, teachers, and advisors. The school then surveyed parents, teachers, and students who shared responses to inform changes to the RYG tool. School administrators reported that during the 2021-22 school year, the school changed the RYG tool so that weekly progress reports were shared with advisors and students weekly and shared with parents and guardians once per month.

ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY

CRITERION 9: GOVERNANCE	
Members of the board of trustees uphold their responsibilities under Massachusetts law and regulations to act as public agents authorized by the state and provide competent and appropriate governance to ensure the success and sustainability of the school.	● Meets

Finding: The board of trustees fulfills most of their legal and fiduciary responsibilities. The board of trustees fosters a culture of collaboration. The board of trustees engages in strategic and continuous improvement planning.

The board of trustees fulfills most of its legal and fiduciary responsibilities. The board operates in a manner that is not fully in compliance the Open Meeting Law (OML).

- The board generally acts in compliance with its bylaws. The board currently has 12 members, which is within the range of 9 to 25 members permitted. The bylaws require a chair, vice chair, treasurer, and clerk. Board members have an elected chair, vice chair, treasurer, and clerk. Board bylaws require the board to be compromised of three faculty members, one of whom is the principal, and three parents of current students. The board reported, and the Board Members Management System (BMMS) confirms, that the board consists of three faculty members, including the principal, and three parents of current students. The bylaws require a governance and finance committee and state that the board of trustees may create additional committees as deemed necessary. Board members reported the following active committees: governance; finance; development; diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI); facilities; school leader evaluation and support; and an ad hoc search committee. Board members reported that most committees meet monthly, but each committee meets as necessary. The bylaws require the board to meet at least nine times during the school year, and at least quarterly. Board meeting minutes for January 2021 to December 2021 indicate the board met 10 times.
- The board operates in a manner that is not fully in compliance the Open Meeting Law (OML). Board meeting minutes consistently include the date, time, location, a list of members present or absent, and a record of decisions made and actions taken, all requirements of the OML. Board meeting minutes do not consistently include a summary of the discussion of each subject and a list of all documents and other exhibits used, as required by the OML. Board members reported that committees keep minutes, and the board submitted meeting minutes for the DEI, facilities, finance, governance, development, and school leader search committees. Committee meeting minutes do not consistently include a sufficient summary of the discussion of each subject or a list of documents and other exhibits used, as required by the OML.
- Board meeting minutes include evidence that the board approved appropriate school policies, including the school's 2021-2023 Student Opportunity Act Plan, the school's calendar for the 2020-21 school year, the technology reserve policy, and staff bonuses and stipends.
- Board members reported they oversee the school's efforts to be faithful to the mission by receiving reports from the principal during board meetings. Board meeting minutes confirm that the head of school provides key updates to the board at each board meeting, including updates specific to the school program, strategic priorities, and weekly reporting on student engagement.

- The board demonstrates general oversight of the school's academic performance. Board members reported that the board reviews academic performance on an annual basis, including MCAS data, graduation rates, information on whether students are completing cycles on time, and general information about how students are meeting their goals. However, principal reports submitted by the school show that the board reviews the average responses of the RYG dashboard during board meetings. The school also submitted data from the social-emotional survey administered to students, and school administrators reported that this data will be presented to the board at an upcoming meeting. The social-emotional learning survey data is disaggregated by student groups, including student with disabilities, low-income students, racial subgroups, and high needs students.
- The board demonstrates appropriate oversight of the head of school. A written description of the board's head of school evaluation process states, and board members confirmed, that the head of school is evaluated annually. Board members reported that the school leader support and evaluation committee oversees the head of school evaluation process throughout the year and incorporates board members and staff feedback in the head of school's draft summative evaluation. The head of school also completes a self-evaluation. A final version of the evaluation is presented to the full board for review and approval. Board meeting minutes confirm that the school leader support and evaluation committee provided updates to the full board throughout the year, and the head of school's evaluation was brought to the full board for a vote.
- The board oversees the financial health of the school through the finance committee. Meeting minutes confirm that the board receives a financial report at each board meeting and regularly reviews the school budget. Board members reported that the finance committee works closely with the auditor before the audit is presented to the full board for a vote. Board members also reported that the board uses a 1-3-5 plan to make short-term annual projections and prepare projections for the next 10 years to determine how much they will need to fundraise.
- Board meeting minutes confirm that the board engages in governance tasks rather than management of day-to-day operations at the school.

The board of trustees fosters a culture of collaboration.

- Board members reported that the board regularly communicates with other members of the school community. Board members reported that all meeting minutes are publicized to share what was discussed during board meetings. Board members reported, and the school's website confirms, that during the school leader search, the board provided frequent written updates to the school community about the process. School administrators reported that board members attend school events and programs, including gateways and senior panels.
- The board has clear and well-understood systems for decision-making. A review of board meeting minutes from January to December 2021 shows that the board engages in discussion of a topic before putting forth a motion, which is seconded, and then voted upon. Board members reported that they conduct much of the board's work at the committee level before bringing ideas to the board for review and decision-making.
- Board of trustees meetings have structures in place to foster open discussions to ensure public accountability. Board members reported that meetings are open to the public, and board meeting agendas and minutes confirm that every meeting includes a time for public comment. Meeting notices, agendas, meeting minutes, and meeting links for the board and committees are shared and made public via the school's website. Board meeting minutes include actions taken by the board, but do not consistently include a sufficient summary of the discussion of each subject.

The board engages in strategic and continuous improvement planning.

- Board members reported that the current strategic plan for the 2021-22 school year is due for a review. Board members reported that the next strategic plan will be developed in collaboration with the new head of school. Board meeting minutes from the January 2021 board retreat showed that the board discussed the strategic plan themes and goals and identified new goals for the 2021-22 school year. Board meeting minutes show that the strategic plan areas of focus include facilities, development, fundraising and partnerships, technology, teacher innovation and discovery, diversity, and dissemination. Principal reports submitted by the school show that the board discusses progress on the strategic goals for the year at every meeting.
- The board has clear plans for the succession of board leadership. Board members explained, and a review of bylaws confirmed, that the board has clear term limits in place for board members, including the board chair. Board members reported that they are constantly anticipating their needs and planning for what will be needed in the future. Board members reported that they try to have the rising chair serve as a vice chair for a year to assist with the transition, and the same process happens at the committee level.
- The board has clear plans for the succession of school leadership. The school recently underwent a search for the next principal. Board members reported, and board meeting minutes confirm, that the school identified a transition team, involving staff and current board members, and then hired a search firm to assist with the process. Board members reported that committees of the board pulled together information to support the transition, and that staff at the school will help the new principal become acclimated to their new role.
- Board members described processes for recruiting, selecting, and training new members. Board members reported that the recruitment process is usually led by the governance committee, and members of the school community help the board map the skills that are needed. Board members reported that board members reach out to their professional circles, and once someone is identified as a perspective candidate, they are invited to attend school events and engage in discussions with the board to get to know the school and the work of the board. Board members reported they have candidates serve on a committee first before they join the board, which is permitted by the bylaws. Board members reported that the board provides a formal orientation for trustees before the season starts in September to get them acclimated to the board and requirements of the OML.

APPENDIX A: FINANCE

Massachusetts Charter School Financial Dashboard The Office of Charter Schools and School Redesign



Francis W. Parker Charter Essential School

Indicators

Audit Review

Financial Highlights

Data Downloads



Financial Indicators

The metrics below measure potential financial risk, using the following indicators:

● Low Risk ▲ Moderate Risk ◆ High Risk

Metric	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	5 Year Avg	FY21 MA Avg
Current Ratio	13.8 ●	11.0 ●	14.0 ●	15.7 ●	8.5 ●	12.6 ●	5.6 ●
Unrestricted Days Cash	140 ●	77 ●	96 ●	85 ⓘ	79 ●	95 ●	104 ●
% of Program Paid by Tuition	92% ●	89% ▲	89% ▲	92% ●	93% ●	91% ●	95% ●
% of Program Paid by Tuition & Federal Grants	93% ●	91% ●	91% ●	94% ●	96% ●	93% ●	99% ●
% of Total Revenue Expended on Facilities	12% ●	11% ●	9% ●	9% ●	8% ●	10% ●	12% ●
% Change in Net Assets	0.4% ●	2.6% ●	4.0% ●	3.6% ●	8.3% ●	2.2% ●	6.9% ●
Debt to Asset Ratio	0.06 ●	0.06 ●	0.05 ●	0.04 ●	0.06 ●	0.05 ●	0.38 ●

Contextual Commentary from School:

FY15 Comment - The school's change in net asset percentage is often close to or possibly a little below due to the annual amortization of a prepaid rent asset. Cash was spent at the time, and therefore this transaction does not have cash impact but does have the appearance of a reduction in net assets. The FY15 percentage of program paid for by tuition/grants is lower than in past years due to some unbudgeted private fundraising in celebration of the school's 2th anniversary among other purposes.

Unrestricted Days Cash Note for FY19:



Due to a delay in June tuition payments, there was a significant negative affect on Unrestricted Days Cash. For this reason, a risk indicator will not be applied for FY19. As a result, the 5-year avg for this metric will only be 4 years, FY16-FY18, FY20.

Francis W. Parker Charter Essential School

Indicators

Audit Review

Financial Highlights

Data Downloads



Financial Audit Review

Audit Measure	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Is the audit free of Questioned Costs?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Is the audit free of Instances of Noncompliance under GAAS?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Is the audit free of findings of Significant Deficiency?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Is the audit free of findings of Material Weakness?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Did the audit include an unqualified opinion?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Contextual Commentary from School:

School did not submit comment.

Financial Metric	Definitions	Low Risk	Moderate Risk	Potentially High Risk
1. Current Ratio	Current Ratio is a measure of operational efficiency and short-term financial health. CR is calculated as current assets divided by current liabilities.	>= 1.5	Between 1.0 (inclusive) and 1.5	< 1.0
2. Unrestricted Days Cash	The unrestricted days cash on hand ratio indicates how many days a school can pay its expenses without another inflow of cash. Calculated as Cash and Cash Equivalents divided by ((Total Expenses-Depreciated Expenses)/365). Please note that the Department of Revenue was late making June, 2019 tuition payments to many charter schools.	>= 60 days	Between 30 (inclusive) and 60 days	< 30 days
3. Percentage of Program Paid by Tuition	This measures the percentage of the schools total expenses that are funded entirely by tuition. Calculated as (Tuition + In-Kind Contributions) divided by Total Expenses (expressed as a percentage). Note: In-Kind Contribution are added to the numerator in this ratio to balance out In-Kind Expenditures which will be captured in the Total Expenses in the denominator, and ratios over 100% are set to 100%.	>= 90%	Between 75% (inclusive) and 90%	< 75%
4. Percentage of Program Paid by Tuition & Federal Grants	This measures the percentage of the schools total expenses that are funded by tuition and federal grants. Calculated as (Tuition + In-Kind Contributions + Federal Grants) divided by Total Expenses (expressed as a percentage). Note: In-Kind Contribution are added to the numerator in this ratio to balance out In-Kind Expenditures which will be captured in the Total Expenses in the denominator, and ratios over 100% are set to 100%.	>= 90%	Between 75% (inclusive) and 90%	< 75%
5. Percentage of Total Revenue Expended on Facilities	This measures the percentage of Total Revenue that is spent on Operation & Maintenance and Non-Operating Financing Expenses of Plant. Calculated as Operation & Maintenance plus Non-Operating Financing Expenses of Plant divided by Total Revenues (expressed as a percentage).	<= 15%	Between 15% and 30% (inclusive)	> 30%
6. Change in Net Assets Percentage	This measures a school's cash management efficiency. Calculated as Change in Net Assets divided by Total Revenue (Expressed as a percentage).	Positive %	Between -2% (inclusive) and 0%	< -2%
7. Debt to Asset Ratio	Measures the extent to which the school relies on borrowed funds to finance its operations. Calculated as Total Liabilities divided by Total Assets.	<= .9	Between .9 and 1 (inclusive)	> 1
FY20 MA AVG Column	All financial metrics indicated in this column are averages of each calculated metric across all charter schools.			