



**Charter School Authorizer Evaluation Report
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools
2020 Pilot**

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation Report: 2020 Pilot

Authorizer: Metro Nashville Public Schools

About the 2020 Pilot:

In 2019, the General Assembly charged the State Board of Education (State Board) with conducting periodic evaluations of authorizers to determine authorizer compliance and evaluate quality. Tennessee is the fourth state in the U.S. to implement authorizer evaluations and the State Board partnered with SchoolWorks, an education consulting group with experience in authorizer evaluations, to develop an evaluation system based on the State Board's [Quality Charter Authorizing Standards](#).

As part of the development process, the State Board gathered feedback from operators, authorizers, and charter school stakeholders on its Quality Charter Authorizing Standards, conducted focus groups to review feedback, connected with the three other states that have an established authorizer evaluation system, and established a task force that included authorizers and operators to share in the development of the evaluation process. After building the process, guidance documents, and evaluation rubric, the State Board focused on the first true test of its work – the Fall 2020 pilot evaluation.

Participation in the pilot was voluntary, yet encouraged, and open to all authorizers. Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools (MNPS) and the Achievement School District (ASD) took advantage of the opportunity and opted into a full evaluation as part of the pilot. The State Board celebrates these authorizers for their willingness to participate. The pilot evaluation was an opportunity for the State Board, MNPS and the ASD to gain valuable feedback and further refine practices without risk of consequence. Additionally, authorizing staff from Shelby County Schools, MNPS, and the newly formed Tennessee Public Charter School Commission elected to participate as an evaluator during the pilot evaluations. Authorizing staff will continue to have the option to serve as an evaluator during any evaluation that is not their own. The option to serve as an evaluator is another opportunity for authorizers to gain deeper insight into the evaluation process and connect with fellow authorizers on their processes and practices.

This evaluation report shares the results of the MNPS's pilot evaluation with an important caveat – the outcomes provide meaningful feedback and an opportunity for reflection ahead of the formal evaluations beginning in Fall 2021. The outcomes shall not be received as punitive or an opportunity to diminish the processes and systems currently in place, but rather a necessary component of a formative process. Since the establishment of the State Board's Quality Charter Authorizing Standards in 2018, the State Board believes it is our responsibility to work together with our authorizers to further align to the standards. MNPS's willingness to participate in the pilot evaluations demonstrates their commitment to the standards and continuous improvement.

As a result of this pilot, and pursuant to State Board rule that is scheduled for final approval by the State Board at its February 5, 2021 Board meeting, the State Board is prepared to implement its formal evaluation of authorizers beginning in Fall 2021.¹ Updates to the State Board's evaluation materials will reflect lessons learned from the pilot, including further clarification of what's required of an authorizer during an evaluation as well as how to evaluate an authorizer's documentation against the Quality Charter Authoring Standards. These materials will continue to evolve over time as our authorizers strengthen their practices. The pilot served as a valuable step to prepare the State Board and Tennessee authorizers for the official Fall 2021 high stakes authorizer evaluations. The State Board believes that quality authorizing leads to quality charter schools and increased educational opportunities for students, which is the ultimate goal of the authorizer evaluations.

¹ State Board rule 0520-14-01-.08 is anticipated to become effective before formal evaluations begin in Fall 2021.

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation Report: 2020 Pilot

Authorizer: Metro Nashville Public Schools

Evaluation Schedule

Pilot evaluations were conducted in Fall 2020 with the results serving as a baseline to gauge thresholds for overall ratings in subsequent evaluations. Once the final State Board rule regarding authorizer evaluations becomes effective, the State Board will begin formal evaluation of authorizers in Fall 2021. Evaluations will be staggered and occur bi-annually—three (3) authorizers will be evaluated in school year 2021-22 and three (3) authorizers will be evaluated in 2022-23; a two-year evaluation sequence repeats into the future.

The Cohort Evaluation Schedule

School Year	Authorizers
2020-21	<i>PILOT</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Metro Nashville Public Schools</i> ○ <i>Achievement School District</i>
2021-22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Shelby County Schools ○ Knox County Schools ○ Hamilton County Schools
2022-23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tennessee Public Charter School Commission ○ Metro Nashville Public Schools ○ Achievement School District

Evaluation Process

The evaluation is based on the 24 Tennessee Quality Charter Authorizing Standards organized in six (6) categories: Agency Commitment and Capacity; Application Process and Decision Making; Performance Contracting; Ongoing Oversight and Evaluation; Revocation and Renewal Decision Making; and Advanced Standards. The evaluation process rating is based on the evaluation team’s consideration of standards with the Advanced Standards category providing the opportunity for bonus points.

Characteristics of the Process:

- The evaluation team included authorizer representative, an outside consultant, and State Board staff. A Quality Editor evaluated and verified the evidence and rating for each standard.
- The evaluation team objectively evaluated the evidence for the authorizer by comparing it against the rubric.
- Evidence considered for the evaluation was limited to the documents submitted by the authorizer, the school leader interview, and the documentation debrief with the authorizer. Beginning with the first formal evaluation in 2021, the State Board will also consider any findings and recommendation reports and final decisions for any appeals that occurred within the two-year review term.

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation Report: 2020 Pilot

Authorizer: Metro Nashville Public Schools

- Evaluators defaulted to a rating of zero (0) – the lowest score – when no documents or verbal evidence was provided for a given standard. Evaluators examined all evidence and determined which performance level of the rubric best represented the authorizer’s practice and assigned each standard a rating of zero (0) through four (4) as represented in Table 1.
- The final product of each evaluation is a completed Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Report that includes final scores and evaluative comments for each standard of the rubric, an overall evaluation rating, as defined in Table 2, and any required follow-up actions. While the Fall 2020 pilot evaluation included final scores, evaluative comments and an overall evaluation rating, authorizers did not receive any required follow-up actions.
- The evaluative comments provide brief statements to describe the nature of the documented evidence in relation to each sub-standard of the rubric. Comments also note cases in which the authorizer did not provide relevant documents.
- While the State Board and SchoolWorks developed the process to ensure a consistent and normed evaluation, evaluations of the 24 rubric standards were conducted solely by the evaluation team and represent an independent evaluation of the authorizer’s practices in relation to the standards in the rubric.

Table 1. Standard Ratings

0	1	2	3	4
Verbal Evidence and/or Documentation DOES NOT Address <u>or</u> Satisfy the Standard	Verbal Evidence and/or Documentation Addresses <u>and</u> Satisfies LESS THAN 50% of the Standard	Documentation Addresses MOST but Satisfies LESS THAN 50% of the Standard	Documentation Addresses <u>and</u> Satisfies MOST of the Standard	Documentation Addresses <u>and</u> Satisfies ALL of the Standard

Table 2. Overall Ratings

Score	Rating
3.50 – 4.00	Exemplary
3.00 – 3.49	Commendable
2.00 – 2.99	Satisfactory
1.00 – 1.99	Approaching Satisfactory
0 – 0.99	Unsatisfactory/Incomplete

Executive Summary:

General Information	
Authorizer:	Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools (MNPS)
About the Authorizer:	MNPS is a district-level authorizer in Davidson County. MNPS's first charter school opened in 2009 and its charter schools currently serve approximately 13% of the district's students.
# Operational Schools: # Students Enrolled:	29 schools in the 2019-20 school year <i>12,703 students in the 2019-20 school year</i>
# Approved School(s) in Development (planned opening year):	0 schools in development
Closed Schools (name and year closed):	2 schools closed since September 1, 2018 <i>Nashville Academy of Computer Science</i> <i>New Vision Academy</i>
Evaluation Summary	
<p>Key Areas of Strength in the Evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The authorizer implements a quality new start application process, aligned with TDOE guidelines, and includes recruitment of internal and external reviewers, a capacity interview, and rigorous approval criteria for all applicants. • The authorizer's performance framework defines the standards by which a school is measured, and its annual outcomes are routinely communicated to schools. • The authorizer executes a comprehensive charter agreement that sets forth the clear terms and rights and responsibilities of the authorizer and the charter school. <p>Key Areas of Concern in the Evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The authorizer lacks clear systems of oversight and for monitoring compliance to its schools which may negatively impact the authorizer's ability to consistently apply interventions when needed. • The authorizer's monthly site visits and standardized data collection regardless of school performance creates undue administrative burden on its charter schools. • The authorizer did not submit evidence of the criteria used to drive high stakes decisions for renewals and amendment petitions which may lead to inconsistencies that expose the authorizer to criticism and leave charter schools without a clear understanding of the standards to which they are held. The Quality Charter Authorizing Standards require authorizers to set clear criteria to help authorizers make transparent and consistent high stakes decisions. • The authorizer requires its open and operating charter schools to submit an application fee upon renewal. It is unclear if this is permitted by state law, which only provides for an application fee for new-start charter applications. 	

Overall Ratings Summary:

Standards		Rating (0-4)	Section Average
1a	Planning and Commitment to Excellence	2	2.33
1b	Human Resources	2	
1c	Financial Resources	3	
2a	Application Proposal Information, Questions, and Guidance	3	2.83
2b	Fair, Transparent, Quality-Focused Procedures	2	
2c	Rigorous Approval Criteria	4	
2d	Rigorous Decision Making	2	
2e	Elements for Existing School Operators or Replicators (if applicable)	4	
2f	Elements for Applicants Proposing to Contract with Educational Service Providers, including Charter Management Organizations (if applicable)	2	
3a	Charter Agreement Term, Negotiation, and Execution	3	2.00
3b	Rights and Responsibilities	3	
3c	Performance Standards	2	
3d	Provisions for Educational Service Provider (ESP) Contracts (if applicable)	1	
3e	ESP Contracts Additional Provisions.	1	
4a	Performance Evaluation and Compliance Monitoring	2	2.00
4b	Respecting School Autonomy	2	
4c	Protecting Student Rights	2	
4d	School Intervention	2	
4e	Public Reporting	2	
5a	Revocation	N/A	2.00
5b	Renewal Decisions Based on Merit and Inclusive Evidence	2	
5c	Cumulative Report and Renewal Application	2	
5d	Fair, Transparent Process	2	
5e	Closure	2	
6a	Advanced Standards (Bonus)	2	2.00
Overall Rating		2.25 Satisfactory	

Standard 1a - Planning and Commitment to Excellence							
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>		
i. Supports and advances the purposes of charter school law.				X			
ii. Ensures that the authorizer’s local Board of Education or Authorizing Board, leadership, and staff understand and are committed to the quality charter authorizing principles and standards and developing as authorizing professionals.			X	X			
iii. Defines external relationships and lines of authority to protect its authorizing functions from conflicts of interest and political influence.			X	X			
iv. Implements policies, processes, and practices that streamline and systematize its work toward stated goals and executes its duties efficiently while minimizing administrative burdens on schools.			X	X			
v. Evaluates its work regularly against National and State standards for quality authorizing and recognized effective practices and develops and implements timely plans for improvement when necessary.			X				
vi. States a clear mission for quality authorizing.			X	X	X		
vii. Makes authorizing decisions that will result in positive student outcomes, in accordance with State law.				X			
0	1	2	3	4			
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>			
• Addresses none of the sub-standards, and	• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards	• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards			
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards			
			0	1	2	3	4
			<i>Rating</i>				

Evaluative Comments:

- i. While the charter school application, annual report, and school choice portal on the authorizer's website demonstrate that the authorizer supports purposes 1, 2, 4 and 6 of the charter school law, the documentation does not provide evidence of advancing these purposes as demonstrated by the authorizer's denial of a high-performing charter school's amendment application to expand. Additionally, no evidence was provided to demonstrate support or advancement of the use of different and innovative teaching methods or creating new professional opportunities for teachers.
- ii. While the Board training, charter school authorization handbook, and annual report demonstrate that the authorizer's local Board of Education understands several of the authorizer's processes, including reviewing new start applications, renewal applications, amendment petitions, and closure and revocation procedures, the authorizer's documentation does not include evidence of how these processes are aligned to the quality authorizing standards, that the full Board participated, or how the local Board of Education is developing as authorizing professionals. Additionally, while the narrative states that the authorizing staff has a NACSA membership, the documentation only includes conference and training registrations for one (1) of the four (4) core authorizing staff members.
- iii. While the organizational charts for the authorizer as a whole and the charter office staff provide evidence of the lines of authority within the authorizer, there is no documentation of a conflicts of interest policy or signed conflicts of interest forms for the staff or Board members outside of the reference in the narrative to ensure that authorizing functions are protected from conflicts of interest or political influence.
- iv. The support handbook provides evidence of the stated purpose of the charter schools' office, including ensuring high-quality authorization, supporting schools, and encouraging innovation. However, there is no specifically stated goal around minimizing administrative burden or protecting autonomy. Moreover, the authorizer's policy around tiers of support that requires monthly visits to charter schools, regardless of their tier, does not decrease administrative burdens on the schools.
- v. While the narrative states that the authorizer evaluates its practices at the end of each year and upon completion of each application cycle, no documented evidence was provided.
- vi. As stated in the annual report, the authorizer's mission is to "authorize excellent schools that change lives."
- vii. While the revocation of three (3) low-performing charter schools demonstrates that the authorizer makes decisions that will result in positive student outcomes, the denial of an amendment petition for a high-performing charter school does not align with making authorizing decisions that will result in positive student outcomes.

Standard 1b – Human Resources										
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>					
i.	Through intra- or inter-agency collaborations, contractual relationships and/or staff, enlists expertise and competent leadership for all areas essential to charter school oversight—including, but not limited to: education leadership; instruction; assessment; local community needs; special education, English learners and other diverse learning needs; performance management and accountability; law; finance; facilities; and nonprofit governance and management.		X	X						
ii.	Employs competent personnel at a staffing level appropriate and sufficient to carry out all authorizing responsibilities in accordance with National and State standards and commensurate with the scale of the charter school portfolio.		X	X						
iii.	Demonstrates an ongoing commitment to developing and retaining authorizing staff members and provides regular professional development for the agency’s leadership and local Board of Education or Authorizing Board to achieve and maintain high standards of professional authorizing practice and to enable continual agency improvement.		X	X						
0		1		2		3		4		
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		
• Addresses none of the sub-standards, and		• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and		• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,		• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards		• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards		
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards		• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards		
						0	1	2	3	4
						Rating				
Evaluative Comments:										
i. While the narrative describes a core team and extended core team to enlist expertise across all areas essential to charter school oversight, job descriptions and resumés are not provided for all positions described (i.e., no resumés for the Accountant II and no job descriptions nor resumés for the English Learner coaches).										
ii. While the director and coordinator job descriptions encompass authorizing responsibilities at large, there is a lack of additional documentation on how the authorizer staffs and funds authorizing responsibilities, such as oversight of English Learners or oversight of Federal programs.										

- iii. While the documentation includes evidence of trainings for one of the authorizing staff members, the documentation does not include any evidence that the remaining three (3) members of the core team, five (5) additional members of the extended core team, or local Board of Education receive on-boarding training or professional development to ensure high standards of professional authorizing practice and continual improvement.

Pilot

Standard 1c - Financial Resources										
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>					
i.	Determines the financial needs of the authorizing office and devotes financial resources to fulfill its authorizing responsibilities in accordance with National and State standards, commensurate with the scale of the charter school portfolio, and in accordance with Tennessee statute, including all relevant requirements for use of the authorizer fee.	X	X	X						
ii.	Structures its funding in a manner that avoids conflicts of interest, inducements, incentives, or disincentives that might compromise its judgment in charter approval and accountability decision making.			X	X					
iii.	Deploys funds effectively, transparently, and efficiently with the public and student interests in mind.	X	X	X						
iv.	Annually reports the authorizing obligations fulfilled using the authorizer fee in accordance with State law.		X	X	X					
0		1		2		3		4		
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		
• Addresses none of the sub-standards, and		• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and		• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,		• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards		• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards		
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards		• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards		
						0	1	2	3	4
						<i>Rating</i>				
Evaluative Comments:										
i. While the authorizer fee report lists expenses paid for by the authorizing fee, including personnel costs, a student information system, and hourly staff devoted to the review of the annual charter school performance reports, the report does not include clear descriptions for the use of funds, such as percentages of salary or what financial resources are used to fulfill its authorizing responsibilities including ongoing support services, monitoring and oversight, charter school application approval processes, interim reviews, or renewal processes. Additionally, the authorizer requires its charter schools to submit an application fee upon renewal which is potentially inconsistent with state law.										
ii. There is no evidence of an unaddressed financial conflicts of interest.										
iii. While the authorizer fee report and the Personnel Activity Report (PAR) forms discussed in the document debrief demonstrate an efficient use of the authorizing fee funds, the documentation does not include evidence of an effective or transparent use due to the absence of an authorizing budget, a										

detailed report that outlines staff member responsibilities funded for by the authorizer fee, as well as staff members funded off Title and Federal funds, or documentation of shared communication with charter schools.

- iv. The authorizer fee report details the authorizer's use of its authorizer fee funds on allowable expenses in alignment with State law and State Board rule.

Pilot

Standard 2a - Application Proposal Information, Questions, and Guidance							
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>		
i.	Issues a charter application information packet or request for proposals (RFP) that: a. States any chartering priorities the authorizer may have established; b. Presents comprehensive application questions to elicit the information needed for rigorous evaluation of applicants' plans and capacities; and c. Provides clear guidance and requirements regarding application content and format, while explaining evaluation criteria.		X	X	X		
ii.	Welcomes proposals from first-time charter applicants, as well as existing school operators/replicators, while appropriately distinguishing between the two kinds of applicants in proposal requirements and evaluation criteria.			X	X		
iii.	Encourages expansion of charter schools that demonstrate academic success, financial viability, organizational health, and capacity for growth.			X			
iv.	Encourages replication of charter schools that demonstrate academic success, financial viability, organizational health, and capacity for growth.			X			
v.	Considers diverse educational philosophies and approaches.			X	X		
vi.	Requires applicants to demonstrate capacity to serve students with diverse needs, such as students with disabilities or learning exceptionalities and English learners.			X	X		
0	1	2	3	4			
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>			
• Addresses none of the sub-standards, and	• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards	• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards			
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards			
Rating			0	1	2	3	4
						X	
Evaluative Comments:							

- i. The authorization handbook, charter school application, and scoring rubric provide the chartering priorities (i.e., advance academic achievement for underperforming students, increase enrollment diversity, record of success with improving academic achievement in literacy and with English learners and students with disabilities), comprehensive application questions, and evaluation criteria.
- ii. The authorization handbook states that the authorizer welcomes applicants, and the scoring rubric provides the evaluation criteria that distinguishes between first-time applicants and existing operators.
- iii. While the charter school application and scoring rubric include the requirements and approval criteria for applicants interested in expansion, the documentation does not include evidence of the authorizer encouraging expansion of charter schools who are academically and financially successful. The charter school handbook does provide evidence of allowing charter school amendments; however, there is no specific evidence of encouraging expansion of successful charter schools in the handbook.
- iv. While the charter school application and scoring rubric include the requirements and approval criteria for applicants interested in replication, the documentation does not include evidence of the authorizer encouraging replication of charter schools.
- v. The charter school application contains questions related to characteristics of the academic program and educational philosophy without prescribing a particular direction. The scoring rubric contains criteria related to a research-based academic plan that aligns to the target population and mission, without prescribing the approach.
- vi. The charter school application contains questions related to serving students with diverse needs and the scoring rubric contains criteria related to preparedness and capacity for serving special populations.

Standard 2b - Fair, Transparent, Quality-Focused Procedures.										
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>					
i.	Implements a charter application process that is open, well-publicized, and transparent, and is organized around clear, realistic timelines.	X	X	X						
ii.	Allows sufficient time for each stage of the application and school pre-opening process to be carried out with quality and integrity.		X	X						
iii.	Explains how each stage of the application process is conducted and evaluated.	X	X	X						
iv.	Communicates the education needs of the district, the charter authorizing processes, approval criteria, and decisions clearly to the public.			X						
v.	Informs applicants of their rights and responsibilities and promptly notifies applicants of approval or denial, while explaining the factors that determined the decision so that applicants can decide if they wish to revise their plans based in part on that information and resubmit in the future.			X						
0		1		2		3		4		
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses none of the sub-standards, and 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards, 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 100% of the sub-standards 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfies none of the sub-standards 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards 		
						0	1	2	3	4
						<i>Rating</i>				

Evaluative Comments:

- While the authorization handbook outlines an application process that is open, transparent, and organized around realistic timelines by including a specific overview of the timeline from submission of a letter of intent through local Board of Education consideration, there is no evidence to indicate that the information is well-publicized for members of the general public, such as through posting on a website.
- While the authorization handbook includes an application timeline that allows sufficient time for each stage of the application process, confirmation of a decision letter within 10 days of either the initial or amended application vote is not explicitly included.
- While the authorization handbook explains how each stage of the application process is conducted and the scoring rubric was provided to demonstrate how the application is evaluated, the authorization handbook is in draft form and no other evidence was submitted.

- iv. While the authorization handbook includes the education needs of the district and the authorizing process, and the scoring rubric include the approval criteria, there is no evidence of these documents being publicly available.
- v. While the Board minutes make evident the reasons for denial, the documentation does not include evidence of the authorizer informing applicants of their rights and responsibilities or notifying applicants of the approval or denial of their applications following the Board vote.

Pilot

Standard 2c - Rigorous Approval Criteria							
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>		
i.	Requires all applicants to present a clear and compelling mission, a quality educational program, a demonstration of community support, a solvent and sustainable budget and contingency financial plans, a clear demonstration of the effectiveness of the model for the target student population, effective governance and management structures and systems, founding team members demonstrating diverse and necessary capabilities in all phases of the school's development, and clear evidence of the applicant's capacity to execute its plan successfully.	X	X	X	X		
ii.	Establishes distinct requirements and criteria for applicants who are existing school operators or replicators.			X	X		
iii.	Establishes distinct requirements and criteria for applicants proposing to contract with educational service providers (ESPs), including charter management organizations.			X	X		
0	1	2	3	4			
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>			
• Addresses none of the sub-standards, and	• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards	• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards			
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards			
			0	1	2	3	4
			<i>Rating</i>				
Evaluative Comments:							
i.	The charter school application and scoring rubric make evident each of the requirements for applicants cited in this sub-standard, and the school leader interview confirmed the inclusion of a capacity interview during the application process to ensure that applicants have the capacity to execute their plans successfully.						
ii.	The charter school application includes required questions for applicants who are existing school operators or replicators (e.g., existing academic plan, performance management) and the scoring rubric establishes the criteria for approval.						
iii.	The charter school application contains required questions for applicants proposing to contract with educational service providers (ESPs), and the scoring rubric establishes the criteria for approval.						

Standard 2d - Rigorous Decision Making										
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>					
i.	Grants charters only to applicants that have demonstrated competence and capacity to succeed in all aspects of their particular school model, consistent with the stated approval criteria.		X	X						
ii.	Rigorously evaluates each application through thorough review of the written proposal, a substantive in-person interview with each qualified applicant, and all appropriate due diligence to examine the applicant’s experience and capacity, conducted by knowledgeable and competent evaluators.		X	X						
iii.	For both written application reviews and applicant interviews, engages highly competent teams of internal and external evaluators with relevant educational, organizational (governance and management), financial, and legal expertise, as well as thorough understanding of the essential principles of charter school autonomy and accountability.	X								
iv.	Provides orientation or training to application evaluators (including interviewers) to ensure consistent evaluation standards and practices, the elimination of real or perceived conflicts of interest, the observance of essential protocols, and the fair, unbiased treatment of all applicants.	X		X	X					
v.	Ensures that the application-review process and decision making are free of conflicts of interest and requires full disclosure of any potential or perceived conflicts of interest between reviewers or decision makers and applicants.			X						
vi.	Approves applications that include a detailed plan for school opening, operation, and fiscal stability, with little substantive work left for later development.			X						
0		1		2		3		4		
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		
• Addresses none of the sub-standards, and		• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and		• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,		• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards		• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards		
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards		• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards		
Rating						0	1	2	3	4
								X		
Evaluative Comments:										

- i. The scoring rubric establishes the criteria for applicants to demonstrate the competence and capacity to operate a charter school, and the Board meeting minutes demonstrate that the authorizer ensures charters are only granted to applicants who have met the stated criteria; however, only one application cycle was included for the review term.
- ii. While the narrative and authorization handbook describe an evaluation process that includes a thorough review and a capacity interview, there is no further documentation provided to affirm that such interviews and other due diligence were conducted for the two selected applications.
- iii. As described during the document debrief, the authorizer employs district staff with specific expertise to assist in charter application reviews; however, the documentation does not include evidence of highly-competent teams of internal and external evaluators with relevant expertise and an understanding of the principles of charter school autonomy and accountability.
- iv. The charter review team training demonstrates that the authorizer provides training to application evaluators to ensure consistent evaluations.
- v. The conflicts of interest forms make evident that the authorizer ensures the elimination of any conflicts of interest among its evaluators; however, only one application cycle was included for the review term, and the documentation did not make evident if all evaluators were included in the submitted forms.
- vi. While the documentation includes evidence of the authorizer denying applicants who did not have a detailed plan presented in their application, the documentation did not include both application cycles included within the review term.

Standard 2e - Elements for Existing School Operators or Replicators (if applicable).						
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>	
i.	Provide clear evidence of their capacity to operate new schools successfully while maintaining quality in existing schools;		X	X	X	
ii.	Document their educational, organizational, and financial performance records based on all existing schools;		X	X	X	
iii.	Explain any never-opened, terminated, or non-renewed schools (including terminated or non-renewed third-party contracts to operate schools);			X	X	
iv.	Present their growth plan, business plan, and most recent financial audits;			X	X	
v.	Meet high standards of academic, organizational, and financial success to earn approval for replication; and		X	X	X	
vi.	Document any current or past litigation and the resolution of such litigation.			X	X	
0		1	2	3	4	
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses none of the sub-standards, and Satisfies none of the sub-standards 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards, Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards 	
Rating		0	1	2	3	4
						X
Evaluative Comments:						
<p>i. Section 2.11 – Network Vision, Growth Plan and Capacity of the charter school application and scoring rubric demonstrate that the authorizer requires existing school operators or replicators to provide evidence of their capacity to operate new schools while maintaining quality in existing schools.</p> <p>ii. Section 4 – Portfolio Review/Performance Record of the charter school application and scoring rubric demonstrate that the authorizer requires existing school operators or replicators to document their education, organizational, and financial performance of all existing schools.</p> <p>iii. Section 2.11 and Section 4 of the charter school application and scoring rubric make evident that the authorizer requires existing school operators or replicators to explain any never-opened, terminated, or non-renewed schools.</p> <p>iv. Section 2.11, Section 3 – Financial Plan and Capacity, and Section 4 of the charter school application and scoring rubric make evident that the authorizer requires existing school operators or replicators to present a growth plan, business plan, and recent financial audits.</p>						

- v. The criteria stated in Section 4 of the scoring rubric makes evident that the authorizer requires replicators to meet high standards of academic, organizational, and operational performance for approval.
- vi. Existing school operators or replicators are required to document any current or past litigation and its resolution in Section 4 of the charter school application.

Pilot

Standard 2f - Elements for Applicants Proposing to Contract with Educational Service Providers, including Charter Management Organizations (if applicable).					
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>
i.	Evidence of the service provider’s educational and management success;				
ii.	A description of the process for selecting the ESP;			X	X
iii.	A draft (or existing) service/management contract that sets forth proposed key terms, including: roles and responsibilities of the school Governing Board, the school staff, and the service provider; the services and resources to be provided; performance-evaluation measures and mechanisms; detailed explanation of compensation to be paid to the provider; financial controls and oversight; investment disclosure; methods of contract oversight and enforcement; and conditions for contract renewal and termination; and		X	X	
iv.	Disclosure and explanation of any existing or potential conflicts of interest between the school Governing Board and proposed service provider or any affiliated business entities.			X	
0 <i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		1 <i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	2 <i>Documentation:</i>	3 <i>Documentation:</i>	4 <i>Documentation:</i>
• Addresses none of the sub-standards, and		• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and		• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards		• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards
				0	1
				2	3
				4	
				X	

Evaluative Comments:

- i. The charter school application does not require applicants to submit evidence of the ESP’s educational and management success.
- ii. Section 2.9 – Additional Operations of the charter school application requires applicants to describe the process for selecting the ESP, if applicable.
- iii. While Section 2.14 – Charter School Management Contracts of the charter school application requires applicants to include the specific criteria stated in this sub-standard, the section is not required for all applicants.
- iv. While Section 2.14 of the charter school application requires applicants to disclose and explain any real or perceived conflicts of interest between the Governing Board and service provider, the section is not required for all applicants.

Standard 3a - Charter Agreement Term, Negotiation, and Execution					
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>
i.	Executes a charter agreement with a legally incorporated Governing Board independent of the authorizer.			X	X
ii.	Grants charter agreements for an initial term of ten operating years with a high-stakes review every five years, in addition to annual performance reports.		X	X	X
iii.	Defines material and non-material terms of the charter agreement.			X	
iv.	Ensures mutual understanding and acceptance of the terms of the charter agreement by the school's Governing Board.				
v.	Allows—and requires charter agreement amendments for—occasional material changes to a school's plans but does not require amending the charter agreement for non-material modifications.	X	X	X	X
0	1	2	3	4	
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	
• Addresses none of the sub-standards, and	• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards	• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards	
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards	
			0	1	2
					3
					4
					X
Evaluative Comments:					
i. The executed charter agreements explicitly name the incorporated Governing Board and the authorizer within the contract. ii. According to the executed charter agreement, the initial term is ten operating years (1.2 Effective Date), with a high-stakes review every five years (1.4 Charter School Performance), and annual performance reports (1.4 Charter School Performance). iii. Section 10. Amendments of the executed charter agreement defines the material (i.e., changes in mission, location, signing authority, enrollment) and non-material (i.e., budget, school leader, members of governing body) terms; however, the terms are not inclusive of all listed in the State Board Rule (i.e., change in transportation status, change in CMO). iv. The executed charter agreements are signed by staff of the charter school rather than the school's Governing Board and, therefore, do not demonstrate mutual understanding and acceptance of the agreement's terms.					

- v. Section 10. Amendments of the executed charter agreements and the amendment petitions provided demonstrate that the authorizer allows for material changes and does not require amendments for non-material modifications of the agreement.

Pilot

Standard 3b - Rights and Responsibilities.							
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>		
i. Executes charter agreements that clearly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. State the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer; b. State and respect the autonomies to which schools are entitled—based on statute, waiver, or authorizer policy—including those relating to the school’s authority over educational programming, staffing, budgeting, and scheduling; c. Define performance standards, criteria, and conditions for renewal, intervention, revocation, and non-renewal, while establishing the consequences for meeting or not meeting standards or conditions; d. State the statutory, regulatory, and procedural terms and conditions for the school’s operation; e. State reasonable pre-opening requirements or conditions for new schools to ensure that they meet all health, safety, and other legal requirements prior to opening and are prepared to open smoothly; f. State the responsibility and commitment of the school to adhere to essential public-education obligations, including admitting and serving all eligible students as long as space is available, and not expelling or counseling out students except pursuant to a legal discipline policy approved by the authorizer; and g. State the responsibilities of the school and the authorizer in the event of school closures. 			X	X			
ii. Ensures that any fee-based services that the authorizer provides are set forth in a services agreement that respects charter school autonomy and treats the charter school equitably compared to district schools, if applicable; and ensures that purchasing such services is explicitly not a condition of charter approval, continuation, or renewal.				X	X		
0	1	2	3	4			
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses none of the sub-standards, and Satisfies none of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards, Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards 			
<i>Rating</i>			0	1	2	3	4

				X	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Evaluative Comments:

- i. While all seven (7) areas of the sub-standard are addressed within the executed charter agreements, performance standards are not defined for intervention, nor is there documentation that explains how the framework will be used to make these decisions. Additionally, while the agreements reference a pre-opening checklist as an exhibit of the agreement, the documentation was not provided. Further, while Section 11.3 Closure and Dissolution of the charter agreement describes the school and authorizer working cooperatively and winding down of operations as a role of the school, responsibilities of the authorizer are not clearly defined.
- ii. The executed charter agreements include 9.2 Fee for Services Agreement which clearly states, "Failure of the Charter School to enter such an agreement shall not be grounds for revocation or non-renewal of this Agreement".

Pilot

Standard 3c – Performance Standards					
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>
i. Executes charter agreements that plainly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Establish the performance standards under which schools will be evaluated, using objective and verifiable measures of student achievement as the primary measure of school quality, in accordance with State law; b. Define clear, measurable, and attainable academic, financial, and organizational performance standards and targets that the school must meet as a condition of renewal, including, but not limited to, State and Federal measures. (See Paragraph ii., Performance standards detailed information.); c. Include expectations for appropriate access, education, support services, and outcomes for students with disabilities; d. Define the sources of academic data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation, including State-mandated and other standardized assessments, student academic growth measures, internal assessments, qualitative reviews, and performance comparisons with other public schools in the District and State; e. Define the sources of financial data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation, grounded in professional standards for sound financial operations and sustainability; f. Define the sources of organizational data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation, focusing on fulfillment of legal obligations, fiduciary duties, and sound public stewardship; and g. Include clear, measurable performance standards to judge the effectiveness of alternative model schools, as defined by State law—requiring and appropriately weighting rigorous mission-specific performance measures and metrics that credibly demonstrate each school’s success in fulfilling its mission and serving its special population. 			X	X	
ii. Performance standards detailed information. Performance standards enable schools and authorizers to know the outcomes for which authorizers will hold schools accountable. They are the basis for school evaluation and should be incorporated in the charter agreement, commonly as an attachment. Academic, financial, and organizational performance standards should include clearly defined and measurable indicators, measures, metrics, and targets that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Academic Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set expectations for student academic achievement status or proficiency, including comparative proficiency; 			X	X	

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Set expectations for student academic growth, including adequacy of growth toward State standards; 3. Incorporate State and Federal accountability systems, including State grading and/or rating systems; 4. Set expectations for postsecondary readiness, including graduation rates (for high schools); and 5. Provide schools an option to incorporate mission-specific performance measures for which the school has presented valid, reliable, and rigorous means of assessment approved by the authorizer. <p>b. Financial Performance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enable the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school’s financial stability and viability based on short-term performance; and 2. Enable the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school’s long-term financial sustainability. <p>c. Organizational Performance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the essential elements of the educational program for which the authorizer will hold the school accountable; 2. Define financial management and oversight standards based on generally-accepted accounting principles; 3. Hold school Governing Boards accountable for meeting statutory and Board-established operating and reporting requirements; 4. Ensure school compliance with student and employee rights and obligations; and 5. Establish expectations related to the school environment, including health and safety, transportation, facilities, and appropriate handling of records. 				
--	--	--	--	--

0	1	2	3	4		
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses none of the sub-standards, and • Satisfies none of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and • Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards, • Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards • Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses 100% of the sub-standards • Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards 		
Rating		0	1	2	3	4
				X		

Evaluative Comments:

- i. While performance framework is listed as an exhibit of the executed charter agreements, the exhibits are not included with the contracts; moreover, while a 2018 TDOE performance framework is referenced in the narrative and included with documentation, the selected contracts have terms beginning in 2013 and 2014; therefore, it is unclear to which frameworks they are held accountable. Additionally, sources for attendance data, financial data, and organizational data are also not clear in the 2018 TDOE performance framework.
- ii. While it is unclear which performance framework the two selected schools are ultimately accountable for per their executed charter agreement, the 2018 TDOE performance framework contains most of the outlined performance standards, outside of providing an option to incorporate mission-specific metrics and defining the essential elements of the educational program.

Pilot

Standard 3d - Provisions for Educational Service Provider (ESP) Contracts (if applicable).							
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>		
i. Includes, for any school that contracts with an ESP provider for the management of its educational program, finances, or school operations, additional contractual provisions that ensure rigorous, independent contract oversight by the school Governing Board and the school's financial independence from the external provider.			X				
ii. Reviews the proposed ESP contract with the school Governing Board as a part of application review to ensure that it is consistent with applicable law, authorizer policy, and the public interest.		N/A					
0	1	2	3	4			
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses none of the sub-standards, and Satisfies none of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards, Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards 			
Rating			0	1	2	3	4
				X			
Evaluative Comments:							
i. While the narrative states that only one of its charter networks contracts with an ESP and the authorizer is working to update the charter agreement, the documentation does not include a draft charter agreement with the additional contractual provisions stated in this sub-standard to ensure rigorous, independent oversight by the school. ii. N/A – The authorizer has not reviewed a proposed ESP contract as part of the application review.							

Standard 3e - ESP Contracts Additional Provisions.					
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>
i.	Clearly establish the primacy of the charter agreement over the ESP contract;				
ii.	Clearly identify the school Governing Board as the party ultimately responsible for the success or failure of the school, and clearly define the ESP as a vendor of services;				
iii.	Prohibit the third party from selecting, approving, employing, compensating, or serving as school Governing Board members;				
iv.	Provide for sufficient transparency around the spending of public monies; and				
v.	Require all instructional materials, furnishings, and equipment purchased or developed with public funds to be the property of the school, not the ESP, in compliance with State law.				
vi.	Contracts between the ESP and the school Governing Board should present: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The roles and responsibilities of the school Governing Board and the service provider, including all services to be provided under the contract; b. The performance measures, consequences, and mechanisms by which the school Governing Board will hold the provider accountable for performance, aligned with the performance measures in the charter agreement; c. All compensation to be paid to the provider, including all fees, bonuses, and what such compensation includes or requires; d. Terms of any facility agreement that may be part of the relationship; e. Financial reporting requirements and provisions for the school Governing Board's financial oversight; f. All other financial terms of the contract, including disclosure and documentation of all loans or investments by the provider to the school, and provision for the disposition of assets in accordance with law; g. Assurances that the school Governing Board, at all times, maintains independent fiduciary oversight and authority over the school budget and ultimate responsibility for the school's performance; h. Provisions for contract termination; and i. Respective responsibilities of the Governing Board and service provider in the event of school closure, including transparency in the school's revenues and expenditures, as well as those managed by the ESP. 			X	
0		1	2	3	4
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>

• Addresses none of the sub-standards, <i>and</i>	• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards <i>and</i>	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards	• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards			
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards			
<i>Rating</i>			0	1	2	3	4
				X			

Evaluative Comments:

- i. The primacy of the agreement over an ESP contract is not stipulated in the executed charter contracts.
- ii. The executed charter agreements do not define the Governing Board as the entity ultimately responsible for the success or failure of the school and the ESP as a vendor for services.
- iii. The executed charter agreements do not specifically prohibit the third party from selecting, approving, employing, compensating, or serving as school Governing Board members.
- iv. There is no evidence within the executed charter agreements of a requirement of the ESP to provide financial transparency.
- v. The executed charter agreements do not require all instructional materials, furnishings, and equipment purchased or developed with public funds to be the property of the school, not the ESP, in compliance with State law.
- vi. While the ESP contract addresses roles and responsibilities, payment, performance goals aligned to the contract, the Governing Board's responsibility for fiscal policy, and provisions for termination, the contract does not address the Board's ultimate responsibility for school performance nor its responsibilities in the event of school closure.

Standard 4a - Performance Evaluation and Compliance Monitoring					
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>
i.	Implements a comprehensive performance accountability and compliance monitoring system that is defined by the charter agreement and provides the information necessary to make rigorous and standards-based renewal, revocation, and intervention decisions.		X	X	
ii.	Defines and communicates to schools the process, methods, and timing of gathering and reporting school performance and compliance data.		X	X	
iii.	Implements an accountability system that effectively streamlines Federal, State, and local performance expectations and compliance requirements while protecting schools' legally entitled autonomy and minimizing schools' administrative and reporting burdens.		X	X	
iv.	Provides clear technical guidance to schools as needed to ensure timely compliance with applicable rules and regulations.		X	X	X
v.	Visits each school, as appropriate and necessary, for collecting data that cannot be obtained otherwise and in accordance with the contract, while ensuring that the frequency, purposes, and methods of such visits respect school autonomy, minimize administrative burdens, and avoid operational interference.	X	X	X	
vi.	Evaluates each school annually on its performance and progress toward meeting the standards and targets stated in the charter agreement, including essential compliance requirements, and clearly communicates evaluation results to the school's Governing Board and leadership.	X	X	X	
vii.	Requires and reviews annual financial audits of schools, conducted by a qualified independent auditor.		X	X	
viii.	Communicates regularly with schools as needed, including both the school leaders and Governing Boards, and provides timely notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies.		X	X	
ix.	Provides an annual written report to each school, summarizing its performance and compliance to date and identifying areas of strength and areas needing improvement.	X	X	X	
x.	Presents and enforces stated consequences for failing to meet performance expectations or compliance requirements.		X	X	X
0		1	2	3	4
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>
• Addresses the standard, but		• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards	• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards

• Satisfies none of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards					
			0	1	2	3	4		
			<i>Rating</i>						

Evaluative Comments:

- i. The executed charter agreements and performance frameworks demonstrate that the authorizer implements a performance accountability framework and compliance monitoring with tiered supports; however, the charter agreement lacks specific information on how the authorizer will make rigorous and standards-based decisions using the performance framework. Additionally, while the authorization handbook references standards for sub-standard performance of a charter school and corresponding intervention actions, there is no clear reference to these standards in the charter agreement.
- ii. While the authorization handbook, site visit protocol, and resource handbook provide evidence of how some data are collected, it is not inclusive of all aspects of the performance framework, nor is there further evidence of sharing this information with schools.
- iii. The performance framework documents evidence that the authorizer utilizes Federal and State accountability through the indicators reported in the academic program, to streamline accountability for the schools. Moreover, the tiered levels of support described in the authorizer handbook documents an alignment between Federal monitoring and performance monitoring. However, the monthly school visits described in the tiers of support and the site visit protocols do not minimize the administrative burden for schools.
- iv. According to the narrative, the principal connection communication email is shared weekly with schools and the Federal budget presentation provides further evidence of technical guidance provided by the authorizer.
- v. While the authorizer's practice of visiting schools at least once annually is described in the authorization handbook and the spring visit schedule, the documentation also states that schools receive monthly visits based on their assigned tiers of support which does not minimize the administrative burden or operational interference. Additionally, the documentation provided does not include evidence of implementation for site visits that occurred during the review term.
- vi. While the performance evaluations for each school are included in the annual report, the documentation does not include the two annual reports from the review term or evidence of communication of the results with the schools' Governing Board or leadership.
- vii. While two sample financial audits were provided and the performance framework contains ratings on financial indicators, the audits are not for the selected schools, nor does the documentation affirm that audits were used to evaluate the financial indicators.
- viii. The narrative describes weekly email communication, two of which were submitted; however, a sample notice of concern from 2015 for a school that showed weak academic performance and then not again until 2019 does not support timely notice of performance deficiencies.
- ix. While the annual report documents the authorizer's annual review of its schools, the documentation does not include two the annual reports from the review term or evidence of active communication with schools regarding annual reports.
- x. According to the notices of concern and summary review, the authorizer documents and communicates with its schools that are failing to meet performance expectations or compliance requirements, and the support plan makes evident that the authorizer follows through on stated consequences (i.e., creating a year-long support plan).

Standard 4b - Respecting School Autonomy								
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>			
i.	Respects the school's authority over its day-to-day operations.			X	X			
ii.	Collects information from the school in a manner that minimizes administrative burdens on the school, while ensuring that performance and compliance information is collected with sufficient detail and timeliness to protect student and public interests.		X	X				
iii.	Periodically reviews compliance requirements and evaluates the potential to increase school autonomy based on flexibility in the law, streamlining requirements, demonstrated school performance, or other considerations.							
iv.	Refrains from directing or participating in educational decisions or choices that are appropriately within a school's purview under the charter law or contract.	X						
0	1	2	3	4				
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses none of the sub-standards, and Satisfies none of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards, Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards 				
				0	1	2	3	4
						X		
Evaluative Comments:								
i. There is no evidence showing the authorizer has compromised school autonomy over its daily operations, as defined in the executed charter agreements. ii. While the narrative and performance framework reference school performance data that is collected by the authorizer, the site visit protocol and tiers of support which require monthly visits and similar questionnaires asked of schools prior to each visit does not minimize administrative burden. iii. The documentation does not include evidence of a periodic review of the compliance requirements or any evaluation of the potential to increase school autonomy. iv. The support plan does not make evident how/if the school was involved in the creation of the plan or how the prescribed supports aligned with the areas of concern identified by the authorizer.								

Standard 4c - Protecting Student Rights							
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>		
i.	Ensures that schools admit students through a random selection process that is open to all students, is publicly verifiable, and does not establish undue barriers to application (such as mandatory information meetings, mandated volunteer service, or parent contracts) that exclude students as provided by Federal, State, and local law.			X			
ii.	Ensures that schools provide equitable access and inclusive services to all students as required by applicable Federal and State law, including, but not limited to, students with disabilities, English learners, homeless students, students in foster care, migrant students, and gifted students.			X			
iii.	Ensures clarity in the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in serving students with disabilities		X	X	X		
iv.	Ensures that schools' student discipline policies and actions are legal, fair, and equitable and that no student is suspended, expelled, or counseled out of a school outside of that process, and that schools have a clear process for addressing parent/community grievances.			X			
0		1	2	3	4		
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses none of the sub-standards, and 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 100% of the sub-standards 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfies none of the sub-standards 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards 		
Rating			0	1	2	3	4
					X		
Evaluative Comments:							
i. While the executed charter agreements ensure that students are admitted through a random selection process in accordance with State law, the documentation does not include evidence that the authorizer ensures its schools implement a process in accordance with the agreement.							
ii. While the performance framework includes metrics for evaluating a school's compliance with providing access and services to students with disabilities and who are English learners, the documentation does not include evidence of ensuring compliance for all students, including students who are homeless, migrant, gifted, and in foster care.							

- iii. According to the narrative and exceptional education compliance reports, the authorizer relies on its exceptional education coaches to meet with the schools and evaluate the school's special education compliance monthly.
- iv. The visit protocol and Annenberg data demonstrate that, as part of the authorizer's monthly meetings with its schools, the authorizer reviews discipline data; however, the documentation does not include evidence that the authorizer ensures that the schools' discipline policies are legal, fair, and equitable and that schools have a clear process for addressing grievances.

Pilot

Standard 4d – School Intervention										
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>					
i.	Establishes and clearly communicates to schools at the outset an intervention and problem-solving policy that states the general conditions that may trigger intervention and the types of actions and consequences that may ensue.	X	X	X						
ii.	Gives schools clear, adequate, evidence-based, and timely notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies.		X	X						
iii.	Allows schools reasonable time and opportunity for remediation in non-emergency situations.	N/A								
iv.	Applies professional discretion when intervention is needed and considers context and a range of effective solutions.			X						
v.	Where intervention is needed, engages in intervention strategies that clearly preserve school autonomy and responsibility (identifying what the school must remedy without prescribing solutions) while clearly stating possible consequences for noncompliance.		X	X						
0		1		2		3		4		
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		<i>Documentation:</i>		
• Addresses none of the sub-standards, and		• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and		• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,		• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards		• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards		
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards		• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards		• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards		
						0	1	2	3	4
						<i>Rating</i>				
Evaluative Comments										
i. While the authorization handbook includes the authorizer’s procedures for sub-standard performance of a charter school, there is no evidence of sharing the documentation with schools, although the authorizer stated during the document debrief that the handbook is updated and issued to schools annually.										
ii. The letter of concern dated April 26, 2019 includes concerns such as, “Employee benefits were paid late in 2017-2018 and had to be deducted from the BEP in the fall of 2018,” which does not demonstrate timely notification of a contract violation or performance deficiency. Additionally, the letter of concern does not provide the charter school with clear connections between the violation and the corresponding contract agreement or performance framework indicator.										

- iii. N/A – The documentation does not include any communication with schools regarding non-emergency situations and, therefore, is insufficient to ascertain if reasonable time for remediation was provided.
- iv. While a sample notice of probation states that the school and authorizer will work collaboratively on a corrective action plan and a subsequent support plan was provided, it cannot be ascertained whether context and a range of solutions were considered based on the documentation provided.
- v. While the support plan contains consequences for not fulfilling the plan (e.g., second year of probation or closure), it is unclear from the documentation whether the required steps in the support plan were prescribed and what role the school played in its drafting. Furthermore, while some notices of concern or probation contained consequences, at least one notice of concern (April 26, 2019) did not.

Pilot

Standard 4e – Public Reporting						
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>	
i. Produces an annual public report that provides clear, accurate performance data for the charter schools it oversees and reports on individual school and overall portfolio performance according to the framework set forth in the charter agreement in accordance with State law.		X	X	X		
0 <i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	1 <i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	2 <i>Documentation:</i>	3 <i>Documentation:</i>	4 <i>Documentation:</i>		
• Addresses none of the sub-standards, and	• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards	• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards		
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards		
		0	1	2	3	4
Rating				X		
Evaluative Comments:						
i. While the annual report from the 2018-19 school year provided clear performance data for its charter schools, the documentation did not include the second annual report from the SY2017-18 school year, as required by the review term. Additionally, the authorizer stated during the document debrief that the annual report was publicly shared, but no further evidence of communication was provided.						

Standard 5a - Revocation							
Sub-standards							
		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>		
i. Revokes a charter during the charter term if there is clear evidence of extreme underperformance or violation of law or the public trust that imperils students or public funds, in accordance with State law.		N/A					
0	1	2	3	4			
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses none of the sub-standards, and Satisfies none of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards, Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards 			
		Rating	0	1	2	3	4
			N/A				
Evaluative Comments:							
i. N/A – Given the State Board’s role in the revocation documentation submitted for review, the State Board refrains from providing an evaluative rating for this standard.							

Standard 5b - Renewal Decisions Based on Merit and Inclusive Evidence							
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>		
i.	Bases the renewal process and renewal decisions on thorough analyses of a comprehensive body of objective evidence defined by the performance framework in the charter agreement.		X	X			
ii.	Grants renewal only to schools that have achieved the standards and targets stated in the charter agreement, are organizationally and fiscally viable, and have been faithful to the terms of the contract and applicable law.	N/A					
iii.	Does not make renewal decisions on the basis of political or community pressure or solely on promises of future improvement.	N/A					
0	1	2	3	4			
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses none of the sub-standards, and Satisfies none of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards, Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards 			
Rating			0	1	2	3	4
					X		
Evaluative Comments:							
i. While the authorizer did not have any schools up for renewal during the review term, the authorizer does have five (5) schools involved in the renewal process currently; however, there is no evidence of communication regarding the specific criteria that will be used to drive renewal decisions. ii. N/A – The authorizer did not have any schools facing renewal during the 2018-19 or 2019-20 school years. iii. N/A – The authorizer did not have any schools facing renewal during the 2018-19 or 2019-20 school years.							

Standard 5c - Cumulative Report and Renewal Application									
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>				
i. Provides to each school, in advance of the renewal decision, a cumulative performance report that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Summarizes the school’s performance record over the charter term; and b. States the authorizer’s summative findings concerning the school’s performance and its prospects for renewal. 									
ii. Requires any school seeking renewal to apply for it through a renewal application, which provides the school a meaningful opportunity and reasonable time to respond to the cumulative report; to correct the record, if needed; and to present additional evidence regarding its performance.		X		X					
0	1	2	3	4					
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses none of the sub-standards, and Satisfies none of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards, Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards 					
			0	1	2	3	4		
			<i>Rating</i>						
Evaluative Comments:									
i. While the authorizer has not completed a renewal process during the review term, the authorizer has five (5) schools currently facing renewal and, as outlined in State law, is required to provide a performance report to any school seeking renewal three (3) months prior to the renewal application submission (January 1, 2020 for the current cycle); this documentation was not submitted for review. Additionally, the annual report includes performance framework results which state that a school is “on track to...” or “off track to...” but the documentation does not make evident to what this refers or provide the criteria used to make this status determination.									
ii. The authorization handbook includes a renewal application and timeline in accordance with State law and, as described in the document debrief, the authorizer aligns its process with guidance from the TDOE; however, evidence of a cumulative report or opportunity for a school seeking renewal to correct the record was not provided for review.									

Standard 5d - Fair, Transparent Process.							
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>		
i.	Clearly communicates to schools the criteria for charter revocation, renewal, and non-renewal decisions that are consistent with the charter agreement, including any policy changes thereto.		X	X			
ii.	Promptly notifies each school of its renewal (or, if applicable, revocation) decision, including written explanation of the reasons for the decision.						
iii.	Promptly communicates renewal or revocation decisions to the school community and public within a timeframe that allows parents and students to exercise choices for the upcoming school year.			X			
iv.	Explains in writing any available rights of legal or administrative appeal through which a school may challenge the authorizer's decision, including appeal to the State Board of Education.						
v.	Regularly updates and publishes the process for renewal decision making, including guidance regarding required content and format for renewal applications.			X			
0	1	2	3	4			
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>			
• Addresses none of the sub-standards, and	• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards	• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards			
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards			
Rating			0	1	2	3	4
					X		
Evaluative Comments:							
i. While the authorization handbook clearly states the criteria for revocation, which is consistent with the executed charter agreements, no further documentation was provided to demonstrate the criteria for renewal and non-renewal decisions, as well as clear communication with schools about such criteria.							
ii. The documentation does not include evidence of prompt notification of its revocation decision, including reasons for the decision. The authorizer did not have schools facing renewal during the review term.							

- iii. The 08.27.19 minutes includes evidence of communication to the school community and public of the Board's decision to revoke three (3) charter agreements, effective December 14, 2019; however, the documentation does not include evidence of the timeframe of this communication; these minutes are not immediately available to the public. The authorizer did not have schools facing renewal during the review term.
- iv. The documentation does not include any written communication with its revoked charter schools regarding available rights of appeal. The authorizer did not have schools facing renewal during the review term.
- v. While the authorization handbook includes guidance for the renewal process, no further evidence was provided to make evident how the handbook is communicated or when it was last updated.

Pilot

Standard 5e - Closure							
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>		
i. In the event of a school closure, oversees and works with the school Governing Board and leadership in carrying out a detailed closure protocol that ensures timely notification to parents; orderly transition of students and student records to new schools; and disposition of school funds, property, and assets in accordance with law.		X	X	X			
0	1	2	3	4			
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses none of the sub-standards, and Satisfies none of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards, Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses 100% of the sub-standards Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards 			
Rating			0	1	2	3	4
					X		
Evaluative Comments:							
i. One school voluntarily closed during the 2019-20 school year; while a closure protocol document was submitted, a transition team document shows some evidence of student identification and asset inventory, and a Board report provides information on where some students planned to attend after the closure. No further documentation was provided to ascertain assurance of timely notification to parents, orderly transition of records, and disposition of funds and assets.							

Standard 6a - Advanced Standards (Bonus)							
Sub-standards		<i>School Leader Interview and/or Document Debrief</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Documentation addresses</i>	<i>Documentation Fully Satisfies</i>		
a.	Ensures authorizing is visible, adequately resourced, and the people responsible for day-to-day authorizing functions have input over decision making.			X			
b.	Presents and implements an intentional strategic vision and plan for chartering, including clear priorities, goals, and timeframes for achievement.			X			
c.	Evaluates its work regularly against its chartering mission and strategic plan goals and implements plans for improvement when falling short of its mission and strategic plan.						
d.	Provides an annual public report on the authorizer's program and performance in meeting its strategic plan goals.			X			
e.	Broadly invites and solicits charter applications while publicizing the authorizer's strategic vision and chartering priorities, without restricting or refusing to review applications that propose to fulfill other goals.			X			
0	1	2	3	4			
<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>School Leader Interview, Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>	<i>Documentation:</i>			
• Addresses none of the sub-standards, and	• Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards,	• Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards	• Addresses 100% of the sub-standards			
• Satisfies none of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards	• Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards			
			0	1	2	3	4
			<i>Rating</i>				
Evaluative Comments:							
<p>a. An organizational chart which reveals a core charter office staff of four (4), and the authorization fee report demonstrates an adequacy of resources; however, no further documentation supports visibility to authorizing or input over decision making.</p> <p>b. While the annual report and support handbook include the authorizer's chartering vision and goals, the documentation does not include evidence of implementation or clear timeframes for achievement.</p> <p>c. The documentation does not include evidence that the authorizer regularly evaluates its work against its mission and goals or implements plans for improvement.</p> <p>d. The annual report documents how the authorizer provides a report on the program and performance of its portfolio; however, the documentation does not include evidence that the report is publicly shared or a reflection on how its progressing toward its stated goals.</p>							

- e. While the authorization handbook outlines the authorizer's charter priorities and the application content does not appear to restrict the types of applications submitted, there is no further evidence of broad invitation and solicitation.

Pilot