



Charter School Authorizer Evaluation Report

Knox County Schools

2025

About Charter School Authorizer Evaluations

In 2019, Tennessee’s General Assembly charged the State Board of Education (“State Board”) with conducting periodic evaluations of authorizers to determine authorizer compliance and evaluate quality. Tennessee was the fourth (4th) state in the U.S. to implement an authorizer evaluation process and now is recognized for its high-quality process around the country. 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 Standards¹.

As part of its development process, State Board staff engaged with Tennessee charter school authorizers, charter school stakeholders, and similar state agencies responsible for this work and conducted a pilot evaluation in Fall 2020. Upon the conclusion of the pilot, the State Board finalized its [Rule 0520-14-01-.08](#) and [Policy 6.113](#) on charter school authorizer evaluations and began implementing the evaluation cycle in Fall 2021. The State Board’s evaluation process centers around its belief that quality authorizing leads to quality charter schools and increased educational opportunities for all students in Tennessee.

Evaluation Schedule

Authorizers are assigned to an evaluation cohort (Table 1) and undergo an evaluation at least biennially. If an authorizer receives an “Exemplary” rating for two (2) consecutive evaluations, the authorizer is exempt from undergoing an evaluation during the next evaluation year. If an authorizer receives an “Unsatisfactory/Incomplete” rating during an evaluation, the authorizer is required to participate in another authorizer evaluation in the school year immediately following the rating. An exemption or required additional evaluation does not change an authorizer’s assigned evaluation cohort.

Table 1. Cohort Evaluation Schedule

Cohort	Authorizers
Cohort 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hamilton County Schools ○ Knox County Schools ○ Memphis-Shelby County Schools ○ Rutherford County Schools
Cohort 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Achievement School District ○ Metro Nashville Public Schools ○ Tennessee Public Charter School Commission

Evaluation Process

Authorizers are evaluated to assess authorizer compliance with the requirements of state law and the rules and regulations of the State Board, and to ensure alignment with the Quality Charter Authorizing Standards. The State Board’s evaluation rubric is organized into five (5) categories: Agency Commitment and Capacity; Application Process and Decision Making; Performance Contracting; Ongoing Oversight and Evaluation; and Amendment, Renewal and Revocation Decision Making. An authorizer’s overall rating represents a summary of outcomes across a variety of indicators within these categories.

¹ [State Board Policy 6.111](#)

Characteristics of the Process

- Each authorizer is evaluated by an evaluation team with experience in charter school authorizing or authorizer evaluations. The State Board also enlists the support of a quality editor responsible for verifying the evidence and ratings for each standard and ensuring consistency across evaluations.
- Evaluations focus on evidence from within a two (2) year review term², which includes documentation provided by the authorizer, an interview with charter school leaders from the authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools, and a documentation debrief with the authorizer. The evaluation team also considers final decisions for any appeals that occurred within the review term, as applicable.
- The evaluation team objectively evaluates the collective evidence against the evaluation rubric to determine a rating (Table 2) between zero (0) and four (4) for each standard and an overall evaluation rating (Table 3) that best represents the authorizer’s performance for that review term. The final product of each evaluation is this Evaluation Report, which includes sub-standard and standard ratings, accompanying feedback, and a final evaluation score.
- Authorizer evaluations are conducted solely by the evaluation team and represent an independent evaluation of the authorizer’s practices in relation to the State Board’s Quality Charter Authorizing Standards.
- Following approval by the State Board, the final evaluation report is provided to the authorizer and publicly posted on the State Board’s [website](#).

Table 2. 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 <u>but</u> satisfies 50% OR LESS of the standard	Documentation addresses <u>and</u> satisfies MORE THAN 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses <u>and</u> satisfies 100% of the standard

Table 3. 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

² The evaluation review term for the 2025 evaluation includes documentation from September 1, 2022 - August 31, 2025.

Executive Summary

About the Authorizer	<p>Knox County Schools (KCS) is the district authorizer in Knox County, Tennessee. KCS currently has 2 charter schools in operation serving 596 students, which is approximately 1% of the district’s total student population. KCS does not currently have any charter schools in development.</p>
Evaluation Summary	<p>Identified Areas of Strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The authorizer develops and regularly administers charter authorizer training for its authorizing staff, district leadership, and decision-makers to ensure an understanding and commitment to quality authorizing principles and standards and that its authorizing functions are protected from potential conflicts of interest and political influence. Evidence demonstrates that the authorizer views its charter schools as partners in achieving the district’s mission of “every student future ready”. • The authorizer actively adjusts its accountability and compliance monitoring systems to effectively streamline and systematize ongoing reporting and communication structures for its charter schools. • The authorizer clearly defines its key authorizing functions in board-approved policies and process documents that demonstrate a balance of autonomy and accountability while ensuring consistent implementation. As one charter leader stated, “There are no surprises”. <p>Identified Areas for Growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The authorizer must ensure consistency across its charter agreements in defining annual performance expectations and establishing necessary terms for providing fee-based services to its charter schools regardless of whether there is an active service agreement in place. • The authorizer lacks clearly defined and communicated processes for ensuring equitable access and inclusive services for all students beyond students with disabilities and English learners. • The authorizer must ensure its board-approved policies are reviewed on a regular cadence to reflect ongoing legislative changes and updates to State Board rules. <p>Overall Evaluation Rating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.62 out of 4, Exemplary <p>Required Follow Up Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public recognition by the State Board and highlighting of the authorizer’s best practices • Submission of a self-assessment in the 2026-27 school year, as required for all authorizers in a non-evaluation year

Overall Ratings Summary

Standard		Rating (0-4)
1a	Planning and Commitment to Excellence	4
1b	Human Resources	4
1c	Financial Resources	4
2a	Proposal Information, Questions, and Guidance	4
2b	Fair, Transparent, Quality-Focused Process	3
2c	Rigorous Approval Criteria	N/A
2d	Rigorous Decision Making	N/A
3a	Charter Agreement Negotiation and Execution	3
3b	Terms, Rights and Responsibilities	3.67
3c	Performance Standards	3
3d	Provisions for Educational Service Provider (ESP) (if applicable)	N/A
4a	Performance Evaluation and Compliance Monitoring	3.85
4b	Respecting School Autonomy	4
4c	Protecting Student Rights	3
4d	School Intervention	4
4e	Public Reporting	4
5a	Amendments to the Charter Agreement	4
5b	Renewal Process	4
5c	Renewal Decisions Based on Merit and Inclusive Evidence	3.67
5d	Revocation	3
5e	Closure	3
Overall Rating		3.62 Exemplary

Standard Ratings and Evaluative Comments

Standard 1a - Planning and Commitment to Excellence	0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards					
i. Ensures that the authorizer’s decision-makers, leadership, and staff understand and are committed to these quality charter authorizing principles and standards.					4
ii. Ensures external relationships, funding structures, and lines of authority to protect its authorizing functions from conflicts of interest and political influence that might compromise its judgement in charter approval and accountability decision-making.					4
iii. States a clear mission for quality authorizing and develops goals and timely plans for improvement in response to regular evaluation of its work against national and state authorizing standards.					4
iv. Implements policies, processes, and practices that streamline and systematize its work toward stated goals and executes its duties efficiently.					4
v. Makes authorizing decisions that are likely to result in positive student outcomes, based on an accumulation of evidence, data, and expertise, and in accordance with state law.					4
Standard Rating					4

Evaluative Comments:
<p>i. Meeting agendas, attendance logs, presentation decks, and online training modules demonstrate that the authorizer conducts professional development sessions with decision-makers, leadership, and staff to ensure an understanding and commitment to the quality authorizing principles and standards.</p> <p>ii. Board policy B-220 defines external relationships, funding structures, and lines of authority to protect its decision-making from conflicts of interest and political influence that might compromise its judgment, with decision-makers submitting statements explaining perceived or identified conflicts, as needed. The policy also addresses disclosure of personal interest in non-voting matters by requiring supervisory personnel to annually file conflict of interest disclosure statements. A blank copy of the form and evidence of submission by supervisory personnel were also provided.</p> <p>iii. The charter school handbook defines a mission and vision for authorizing, which is “to create diverse and future-focused environments that empower every student to take ownership of their learning, shape their future, and contribute meaningfully to their community”. In response to its 2023 evaluation, the authorizer established goals and plans for improvement, documenting progress in its 2024 self-assessment and developing professional development trainings aligned to areas within the standards where gaps were identified.</p>

- iv. Board policies, the charter school handbook, site visit documentation, annual review reports, intervention notices, and evidence of adjusting a monitoring and reporting process for the purpose of streamlining document the authorizer's implementation of its policies, processes, and practices, and directly aligns with stated goals to further streamline and systematize its work.
- v. Documentation related to the authorizer's renewal decision during the evaluation review term demonstrates that it makes authorizing decisions that are likely to result in positive student outcomes. The renewal decision was based on a collection of evidence and data gathered throughout the school's charter term, supported by its renewal review committee, and in accordance with state law. While having no impact on the score and as further explained in the evaluative comments for sub-standards under 5b and 5c, the authorizer's performance framework lacked organizational indicators for several years and therefore impacted the amount of comprehensive evidence available to decision-makers in its renewal decision. This concern was addressed in previous evaluations and has since been resolved.

Standard 1b - Human Resources	0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards					
i. Through intra- or inter-agency collaborations, contractual relationships and/or staff, enlists competent staff with relevant expertise for all areas essential to charter school oversight—including, but not limited to, education leadership; instruction and 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.					4
ii. Demonstrates an on-going commitment to developing and retaining authorizing staff members and provides regular professional development for the authorizer’s leadership and staff to achieve and maintain high standards of professional authorizing practice and to enable continual agency improvement.					4
iii. Ensures authorizing is visible and the people responsible for day-to-day authorizing functions have clear opportunities to provide input with leadership and decision-makers and input is given significant weight in decision-making.					4
Standard Rating					4

Evaluative Comments:
<p>i. The authorizer enlists competent staff with relevant expertise for all areas essential to charter school oversight, as supported by resumes, work trackers, the organizational chart, and authorizer fee reports.</p> <p>ii. Through in-person and virtual training offerings, the authorizer demonstrates an on-going commitment to developing and retaining authorizing staff by participating in regular professional development, utilizing reflection worksheets to ensure direct application to each team member’s specific role in supporting its charter schools. Documentation of these practices includes presentation decks, meeting agendas, attendance trackers, conference registrations, and attendee notes.</p> <p>iii. Board training slide decks, board meeting materials, and staff recommendations for board consideration demonstrate opportunities for the authorizing staff to provide input with leadership and decision-makers. Charter school leaders agreed that authorizing staff have opportunities to provide input with leadership and direct all communication through the authorizing office. Additionally, the authorizer’s documentation includes evidence that multiple members of the authorizer’s leadership team have experience working in charter schools prior to serving in their current leadership roles and understand the responsibilities of an authorizer. Furthermore, documentation related to review committee appointments further demonstrates the authorizing staff’s direct opportunities to provide input with leadership and decision-makers.</p>

Standard 1c – Financial Resources		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
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 law, including all relevant requirements for use of the authorizer fee.					4
ii.	Deploys funds effectively, transparently, and efficiently with the public and student interests in mind.					4
iii.	Annually reports the authorizing obligations fulfilled using the authorizer fee in accordance with state law.					4
Standard Rating						4
Evaluative Comments:						
i.	The authorizer’s projected budgets from the 2022-23 and 2023-24 school years document its collection of \$35,000 per charter school, as allowable in state law, and expected use of the funds to cover its authorizing expenses, including personnel costs, membership dues, and monitoring services. While having no impact on the score, it is recommended that the authorizer carry the total amount of authorizing expenses stated in its fee reports into its budget to further align its financial expenditure reporting practices.					
ii.	The authorizer’s annual fee reports from the 2022-23 and 2023-24 school years document its effective use of all collected funds and the amount each year in which its annual expenses exceeded the collected revenue, noting “All additional expenses beyond revenues are absorbed by KCS as an in-kind contribution”. The fee reports are transparently posted on the authorizer’s website and the authorizer’s narrative describes an efficient process for spending the funds in a similar manner as its district-run schools.					
iii.	The authorizer’s annual fee reports from the 2022-23 and 2023-24 school years include clear descriptions of its authorizing obligations fulfilled using the collected funds and are publicly posted on its website in accordance with state law. While having no impact on the score, the authorizer must ensure that use of the authorizer fee is limited to fully or partially funded positions of district personnel or consultants with authorizer-related responsibilities (i.e., monitoring and oversight) that directly tie to the authorizer’s responsibilities outlined in its charter agreement, including indicators on its performance framework. Positions of district personnel or consultants supporting charter schools on LEA-related responsibilities, such as child nutrition, may not be funded using the authorizer fee. Authorizers will be held to this expectation in future evaluation cycles, and the State Board will support authorizers in furthering their understanding of the differences between the role of the LEA versus that of the authorizer.					

Standard 2a - Proposal Information, Questions, and Guidance Sub-standards	0	1	2	3	4
i. Develops and issues a charter application information packet or request for proposals (RFP) that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) States the authorizer’s mission and any chartering priorities the authorizer may have established; b) Provides the state’s required comprehensive application and rubric to elicit the information needed for rigorous evaluation of applicants’ plans and capacities; and c) Communicates clear guidance, requirements and timelines with prospective operators regarding the application content and format, while explaining evaluation criteria. 					4
Standard Rating					4
Evaluative Comments:					
i. The authorizer develops and issues a charter application information packet, as evidenced by its request for proposals and application protocol, that states its mission and chartering priorities, provides hyperlinks to the state’s application and scoring rubric, and communicates clear submission requirements and timelines in accordance with state law. Additionally, the authorizer offers technical assistance to applicants in the form of virtual training and via email communication throughout the application process.					

Standard 2b - Fair, Transparent, Quality-focused Process		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Implements a charter application process that is defined in policy, open, well-publicized, and transparent, and is organized around clear, realistic timelines.				3	
ii.	Allows sufficient time for each stage of the application and school pre-opening process to be carried out with quality and integrity and explains how each stage of the application process is conducted and evaluated.	N/A				
iii.	Engages, for both written application reviews and applicant interviews, highly competent teams of internal and external evaluators with relevant academic, organizational (governance and management), financial, and legal expertise, as well as thorough understanding of the essential principles of charter school autonomy and accountability.	N/A				
iv.	Provides orientation or training to application evaluators (including interviewers) to ensure consistent evaluation of standards, practices, and the fair and unbiased treatment of all applicants.	N/A				
Standard Rating						3
Evaluative Comments:						
i.	Board policy I-450 defines the authorizer’s charter application process, with further details provided in its charter schools handbook, request for proposal, and email communication with potential applicants. The documentation demonstrates that the authorizer’s process is open to all interested applicants, publicized via the authorizer’s website, and transparent about the application requirements and evaluation standards. However, the current board policy contains conflicting language related to application process timelines and submission requirements when compared to the authorizer’s handbook and recent legislative changes. The authorizer provided a draft version of proposed updates to the policy, which indicate that the authorizer is in the process of updating the language accordingly.					
ii.	N/A – The authorizer did not receive any charter school applications during the evaluation review term.					
iii.	N/A – The authorizer did not receive any charter school applications during the evaluation review term.					
iv.	N/A – The authorizer did not receive any charter school applications during the evaluation review term.					

Standard 2c - Rigorous Approval Criteria Sub-standards	0	1	2	3	4
i. Utilizes the state’s required application and rubric which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 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 and students with diverse needs, effective governance and management structures and systems, founding team members demonstrating diverse and necessary capabilities in all phases of the school’s development; b) Establishes distinct requirements and criteria for applicants who are existing school operators or replicators including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear evidence of their capacity to operate new schools successfully while maintaining quality in existing schools; 2. Documentation of their educational, organizational, and financial performance records based on all existing schools; 3. Explanation for any never-opened, closed, revoked, or non-renewed schools (including closed, revoked or non-renewed third-party contracts to operate schools); 4. Presentation of their growth plan, business plan, and most recent financial audits; 5. Evidence of meeting high standards of academic, organizational, and financial success to earn approval for replication; and 6. Document any current or past litigation and the resolution of such litigation. c) Establishes distinct requirements and criteria for applicants proposing to contract with educational service providers (ESPs), including charter management organizations by requiring applicants to provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence of the service provider’s educational and management success; 2. A description of the process for selecting the ESP; 3. 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 				N/A	

<p>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</p> <p>4. 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.</p> <p>d) Considers diverse educational philosophies and approaches.</p> <p>e) Requires applicants to demonstrate capacity to serve students with diverse needs, including students with disabilities or learning exceptionalities, English learners, at-risk students, and gifted students.</p>	
<p>ii. Requires all applicants to participate in a capacity interview to elicit evidence-based explanations which allow the applicant to demonstrate clear evidence of capacity to execute its plan successfully.</p>	N/A
Standard Rating	
N/A	
Evaluative Comments:	
<p>N/A – The authorizer did not receive a charter school application during the evaluation review term.</p>	

Standard 2d - Rigorous Decision Making	0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards					
i. Grants charters only to applicants that have demonstrated competence and capacity to succeed in all aspects of their particular charter school model, consistent with the stated approval criteria.			N/A		
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.			N/A		
iii. 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 applicants, the reviewers, and the decision makers.			N/A		
iv. Promptly notifies applicants of its application decision, explaining in writing any available rights of legal or administrative appeal through which a school may challenge the authorizer’s decision and including written explanation of the evidence-based 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.			N/A		
v. Does not make application decisions on the basis of political or community pressure.			N/A		
Standard Rating					N/A
Evaluative Comments:					
N/A – The authorizer did not receive a charter school application during the evaluation review term.					

Standard 3a - Charter Agreement Negotiation, and Execution		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Executes a charter agreement between the authorizer and a legally incorporated governing board independent of the authorizer.			2		
ii.	Ensures mutual understanding and acceptance of the terms of the charter agreement by the school's governing board.					4
Standard Rating						3
Evaluative Comments:						
i.	Signatures from the authorizer and the charter school's president, as formally delegated by the governing board and documented via governing board meeting minutes, for selected school A demonstrate that the agreement was executed between the authorizer and a legally incorporated governing board. However, the charter agreement for selected school B contains a signature from the chief executive officer rather than the governing board, and the signatory delegation documentation was insufficient as it limited the officer's authority to file a letter of intent to apply and did not address signing the agreement. Additionally, the agreement for selected school B was signed more than six months after its application was approved, which extends beyond the execution expectations for this sub-standard. The authorizer acknowledged this delay, citing staffing changes and legal deliberation as the cause.					
ii.	Governing board meeting minutes for selected school A and email communication between the authorizer and selected school B prior to execution document the authorizer's efforts and engagement with its charter schools to ensure mutual understanding and acceptance of the terms of the agreements. Additionally, the authorizer described, and charter school leaders echoed, a process of engaging in discussions for the agreements executed during this evaluation review term.					

Standard 3b – Terms, Rights and Responsibilities		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Grants charter agreements for an initial term of ten operating years with the authorizer conducting a high-stakes review every five years and producing annual performance reports.					4
ii.	Explicitly defines material terms of the charter agreement.					4
iii.	Allows – and requires charter agreement amendments for – occasional material changes to a school’s plans but does not require a formal amendment process for modifications to non-material terms of the charter agreement.					4
iv.	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 so long as space is available, and not expelling or counseling out students except pursuant to a legal discipline policy; and g. State the responsibilities of the school and the authorizer in the event of school closures. 					4
v.	Ensures that purchasing any fee-based services that the authorizer provides is explicitly not a condition of charter approval, continuation, or renewal.			2		
vi.	For any fee-based services that the authorizer provides, the authorizer develops a separate services agreement that respects charter school autonomy and treats the charter school equitably compared to district schools, if applicable.					4

Standard Rating

3.67

Evaluative Comments:

- i. Section 1.2 of the charter agreements for selected schools A and B states that the agreement shall expire on June 30 of the tenth year after the date of opening. The agreements also require the authorizer to conduct a high-stakes review in the fifth year of the charter term and to produce annual performance reports based on the results of an evaluation against its performance framework.
- ii. The charter agreements for selected schools A and B define the material terms throughout the agreement (i.e., “location”, “student enrollment and retention”, “assessments”), and the agreements contain all material components of the approved application, as required by state law, through the incorporation of the approved application as an exhibit to its respective agreement.
- iii. Multiple sections within the charter agreements for the selected schools reference the governing board’s right to amend the agreement for material changes to the schools’ plans (i.e., “enrollment”, “amendments”). Additionally, the “amendments” section of the agreements state that changes to the non-material terms require authorizer notification but not an amendment and affirms that any educational program matters not explicitly identified remain within the purview of the charter school.
- iv. The charter agreements for the selected schools include all required components of this sub-standard with references to use of its performance framework to inform renewal and non-renewal decisions. Additionally, the “revocation” section of the agreements generally outlines its use of a progressive intervention process, as required in state law.
- v. While the authorizer’s narrative affirms that the selected schools are not obligated to enter into a fee-based service agreement with the authorizer and several sections within the charter agreements for the selected schools grant the right to enter into a fee-based service agreement, the language does not clearly state that purchasing services from the authorizer is not a condition of charter approval, continuation, or renewal, as required by this sub-standard. This language was previously present in the authorizer’s charter agreement reviewed during its 2023 evaluation, and has since been removed.
- vi. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) for retirement benefits documents the authorizer’s development of a separate service agreement for fee-based services provided by the authorizer. The MOU appears to respect charter school autonomy and define terms that suggest consistent and equitable treatment while affirming legal requirements.

Standard 3c - Performance Standards Sub-standards	0	1	2	3	4
i. Executes charter agreements with a performance framework incorporated in the agreement, commonly as an attachment, that plainly establishes the standards under which schools will be evaluated and includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Objective and verifiable measures of student achievement as the primary measure of school quality, in accordance with state law; b. 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; c. Expectations for appropriate access, education, support services, and outcomes for students with disabilities; 				3	
ii. The performance framework includes 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. Define the sources of academic data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation; 2. Set expectations for student academic achievement status or proficiency, including comparative proficiency; 3. Set expectations for student academic growth, including adequacy of growth toward state standards; 4. Incorporate state and federal accountability systems, including state grading and/or rating systems; 5. Set expectations for postsecondary readiness, including graduation rates (for high schools); and 6. 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 (optional). b) Financial Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the sources of financial data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation, including the school's annual financial audit conducted by a qualified independent auditor; 				3	

<p>2. Enable the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school’s financial stability and viability based on short-term performance; and</p> <p>3. Enable the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school’s long-term financial sustainability.</p> <p>c) Organizational Performance</p> <p>1. Define the sources of organizational data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation;</p> <p>2. Define the essential elements of the educational program for which the authorizer will hold the school accountable;</p> <p>3. Define financial management and oversight standards based on generally accepted accounting principles;</p> <p>4. Hold school governing boards accountable for meeting statutory and board-established operating and reporting requirements;</p> <p>5. Ensure school compliance with student and employee rights and obligations; and</p> <p>6. Establish expectations related to the school environment, including health and safety, transportation, facilities, and appropriate handling of records.</p>					
Standard Rating					3

Evaluative Comments:

i. While the charter agreements for selected schools A and B include a performance framework as an exhibit of the agreement and the frameworks establish the standards under which schools will be evaluated, the agreement for selected school B incorporates a performance framework that does not appear to be that of the authorizer, as the document includes references to and branding of another authorizer, as well as is different from the revised performance framework approved by its decision-makers in 2022. The authorizer acknowledged this as an error, stated that it has been discussed with the selected school, and has plans to revise the performance framework to align with the state’s new model and to correct the agreement by the end of the current school year.

ii. While the authorizer’s current performance framework, approved in 2022, defines the measurable indicators, metrics, and targets for academic, financial, and organizational performance and includes sources for each section either within the framework or via a supplemental document, the indicators across the financial section are misaligned. An overview on page 8 and a chart on page 10 include different indicators and weights used for scoring, thus making it difficult to identify which financial indicators are monitored and evaluated and how the indicators are scored. The authorizer noted in its narrative that it will be updating its performance framework to align with the newly updated model performance framework released by the state, which will include the option to incorporate mission-specific performance measures.

Standard 3d - Provisions for Educational Service Provider (ESP) (if applicable) Sub-standards	0	1	2	3	4
i. Includes, for any school that contracts with an ESP provider for the management of its educational program, finances, or school operations, provisions within the charter agreement that: ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Clearly establish the primacy of the charter agreement over the ESP contract; iii. 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; iv. Prohibit the ESP from selecting, approving, employing, compensating, or serving as school governing board members; v. Provide for sufficient transparency around the spending of public monies; and vi. 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. 	N/A				
ii. Reviews the proposed ESP contract with the charter school’s governing board to ensure that it is consistent with applicable law, authorizer policy and the public interest, and requires, prior to contract execution, the contract between the ESP and the charter school’s governing board to articulate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. The roles and responsibilities of the school governing board and the ESP, including all services to be provided under the contract; iii. The performance measures, consequences, and mechanisms by which the school governing board will hold the SEP accountable for performance, aligned with the performance measures in the charter agreement; iv. All compensation to be paid by the ESP, including all fees, bonuses, and what such compensation includes or requires; v. Terms of any facility agreement that may be part of the relationship; vi. Financial reporting requirements and provisions for the school governing board’s financial oversight; vii. All other financial terms of the contract, including disclosure and documentation of all loans or investments by the ESP to the school, and provision for the disposition of assets in accordance with law; 	N/A				

³ The standard does not apply to contracts with ESPs that do not have substantial responsibility for education, operational, and financial operations such as for payroll, textbooks, curriculum, etc.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> viii. 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; ix. Provisions for contract termination; and x. Respective responsibilities of the governing board and ESP in the event of school closure, including transparency in the school’s revenues and expenditures, as well as those managed by the ESP. 	
Standard Rating	N/A
Evaluative Comments:	
<p>N/A – Neither of the selected schools currently contracts with an educational service provider.</p>	

Standard 4a – Performance Evaluation and Compliance Monitoring		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Implements a comprehensive performance accountability and compliance monitoring system that is defined by the charter agreement, outlined in policy, and provides the information necessary to make rigorous and standards-based renewal, revocation, and intervention decisions.				3	
ii.	Defines and communicates to schools the process, methods, and timing of gathering and reporting school performance and compliance data.					4
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.					4
iv.	Solicits feedback from its schools and utilizes the results to provide clear technical guidance to schools as needed to ensure timely compliance with applicable rules and regulations.					4
v.	Conducts at least one formal on-site review to each school annually, uses the evidence collected to inform the school's annual evaluation, and provides schools with a report summarizing the review.					4
vi.	Proactively communicates the purpose of any proposed on-site visit and ensures visits are used 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.					4
vii.	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.					4
Standard Rating						3.85
Evaluative Comments:						

- i. While the charter school handbook articulates a comprehensive performance accountability and compliance monitoring system and documentation related to reporting requirements, site visits, and annual evaluations demonstrate that the system is implemented, the current board policy does not define this system, as required by this sub-standard. The authorizer did, however, provide draft revisions to the policy with language that outlines a comprehensive system of accountability and monitoring and states that information gathered through these processes directly inform decision-making and affirmed that the policy will be before its decision-makers for approval this school year.
- ii. The authorizer's charter school handbook, weekly email communication, and a reporting platform recently purchased by the authorizer demonstrate how the authorizer defines and communicates its process, methods, and timing of gathering and reporting school performance and compliance data. The documentation makes evident that the authorizer communicates this information in advance and that it's aligned to the performance accountability and compliance monitoring system evaluated in sub-standard i.
- iii. Through the use of its charter school handbook and reporting platform, the authorizer streamlines expectations and compliance requirements for its schools, using weekly emails and monthly meetings for reminders, and providing training to ensure ease of use of its reporting platform. The authorizer's accountability system follows an annual routine, and its reporting requirements are clearly tied to federal, state, and local performance expectations to protect schools' autonomy and minimize administrative burdens. Charter school leaders affirmed that these practices and cited instances in which the authorizer made changes to further streamline requirements.
- iv. The authorizer regularly solicits feedback from its charter schools as part of its monthly charter school meetings and through its weekly email communication. Email communication and training materials offer examples of the authorizer providing technical assistance, as requested by the schools, through optional training led by the authorizer. Additionally, the authorizer shared specific instances in which they collected feedback from its charter schools and offered technical guidance and optional support in response (i.e., response to intervention, governing board obligations, training requirements).
- v. The charter school handbook and site visit protocol document the authorizer's intent to conduct at least one formal site visit to each school annually, and site visit reports for the selected schools during the evaluation review term were provided to affirm this practice. Additionally, the current site visit protocol and 2024-25 school year site visit summary reports detail how the information captured during a site visit and the feedback provided to the schools are directly tied to the authorizer's performance framework.
- vi. As documented by the authorizer's charter school handbook, site visit protocol, and email communication, the authorizer proactively communicates the purpose of its annual site visits and provides questions and document requests in advance to ensure its visits are used for collecting data that cannot be obtained otherwise, relying more on questions that respond to the data than questions that ask for the data during a visit. The annual frequency, state purpose that is directed back to a school's evaluation, and methods for gathering information make evident that the authorizer respects school autonomy, intentionally designs processes that minimize administrative burdens, and seeks to avoid operational interference.
- vii. Performance reviews from the 2022-23 and 2023-24 school years document the authorizer's annual evaluation of school performance and progress toward meeting the standards and targets stated in the charter agreement. The performance reports include evidence of communicating the results to charter school leadership and providing the school with an opportunity to respond before going before the authorizer's decision-makers for review and approval. Governing board meeting minutes document the board's review of the performance report.

Standard 4b - Respecting School Autonomy		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Respects the school’s authority over its day-to-day operations by refraining from directing or participating in educational decision or choices that are within a school’s purview under the charter law or contract and does not conflict with the authorizer’s additional responsibilities as the local education agency.					4
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.					4
iii.	Regularly 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.					4
Standard Rating						4
Evaluative Comments:						
i.	Email communication regarding site visits, site visit reports, monthly meeting agendas, and the weekly charter email newsletter document the authorizer respecting school authority over the day-to-day operations. These documents provide evidence of the authorizer offering optional training, collaborating with its schools on meeting items, and refraining from directing or participating in education decisions or choices when providing feedback after an on-site visit. Charter school leaders affirmed that the authorizer respects school autonomy.					
ii.	A general reporting calendar that is included in the charter school handbook, as well as a compliance reporting platform purchased in June 2025 provide evidence of the authorizer collecting information in a manner that minimizes administrative burdens. The documentation makes evident that the authorizer provides clearly stated deadlines, details regarding the requests, and a singular submission method to ensure information is collected with sufficient detail and timeliness.					
iii.	The authorizer’s recent purchase of a reporting platform to streamline submissions as well as meeting agendas and notes, which document regular discussions among staff regarding opportunities for process improvements serve as examples of the authorizer’s regular review of compliance requirements. Charter school leaders provided examples of the authorizer increasing school autonomy, such as through its development of a list of training requirements and by streamlining district communication to run through the authorizing office.					

Standard 4c - Protecting Student Rights		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
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.			2		
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, at-risk students, and gifted students.				3	
iii.	Ensures clarity in the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in serving students with disabilities.					4
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.				3	
Standard Rating						3
Evaluative Comments:						
i.	While the authorizer provided lottery verifications and the narrative notes that both of its authorized schools use SchoolMint for their application process, a screenshot of one of the applications revealed questions that should be asked during a student's enrollment once selected, not during the initial application, to ensure the selection process is open to all. Specifically, the application screenshot included questions related to special education status, free and reduced lunch status, current school zone, and inquiring how the applicant heard about the school. These questions have the potential to impede a random selection process, and documentation provided by the authorizer does not demonstrate that the authorizer fulfilled its responsibility to ensure schools implement a random selection process that is open to all.					
ii.	The site visit protocol affirms that the authorizer evaluates compliance for students with disabilities and English learners. These groups are also included in the performance framework and annual authorizer evaluations. However, the remaining student groups identified in this sub-standard are less present in the authorizer's oversight processes outside of the 2023-24 site visit report for selected school A. The authorizer provided supplemental narratives describing additional efforts to oversee these subgroups, such as staff providing monitoring throughout the year and confirming alignment with state law. However, little documentation related to implementation of these efforts for all these groups throughout the evaluation review term was provided. The authorizer did share its plans to name these subgroups as part of its evaluation metrics in its performance framework by the end of the school year.					

- iii. Section 2.3 of the charter agreement for the selected schools detail the specific responsibilities of the authorizer (i.e., overseeing procedural compliance, collaborating with the school in the identification and referral processes) and of the charter school (i.e., delivering special education services, having a qualified special education coordinator) in serving students with disabilities. Additionally, the authorizer's charter work tracker for district staff, email communication with its charter schools, division team meetings, and professional development offerings also serve as evidence of how the authorizer ensures clarity in the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in serving students with disabilities. Charter school leaders described improvements in this area since its 2023 evaluation and reported clarity in the roles and responsibilities.
- iv. The authorizer observes and discusses school culture and tracks student attrition as per its site visit protocol and site visit reports. School discipline policies are evaluated in annual performance reviews and language related to counseling out is explicitly stated in its charter agreements. However, how the authorizer tracks suspension and expulsion data and related compliance is less clear. Furthermore, while the authorizer provided evidence of collecting school handbooks, one handbook states that its grievance procedure would be available in the main office without further information and the authorizer's documentation does not demonstrate that the authorizer addressed this issue with the school to ensure that the school implements a grievance procedure that is clear to parents and the school community.

Standard 4d - School Intervention		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
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.					4
ii.	Utilizes ongoing oversight and evaluation processes to determine when intervention in non-emergency situations is needed.					4
iii.	Provides clear, evidence-based, and timely notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies that are aligned to the intervention policy and is communicated to the school leaders and governing board.					4
iv.	Allows schools reasonable time and opportunity for remediation in non-emergency situations.					4
v.	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.					4
Standard Rating						4

Evaluative Comments:

i.	Board policy AP-I-450 establishes the authorizer’s intervention and problem-solving process that states the general conditions that may trigger intervention (i.e., signs of weak performance identified through routine monitoring, failure to meet multiple performance targets) and the types of actions and consequences that may ensue (i.e., notice of deficiency, probation, revocation review). The process is further explained in the authorizer’s charter school handbook and discussed with schools during monthly meetings. Charter school leaders affirmed awareness and a general understanding of the policy and process.
ii.	A pre-opening checklist with mutually agreed upon reporting deadlines, email communication, and intervention notices with supporting documentation, citations and next steps demonstrate the authorizer’s use of ongoing oversight and evaluation processes to determine when intervention in non-emergency situations is needed.
iii.	Intervention notices issued during the evaluation review term and related to special education services and required pre-opening documentation make evident that the authorizer provides clear, evidence-based, and timely notice of contract violations aligned to its policy. The notices are addressed to charter school leaders and the governing board, and the leaders expressed confidence in their understanding of the authorizer’s intervention process.
iv.	As made evident by intervention notices and email communication between the authorizer, internal staff, and charter school leaders, the authorizer allows schools reasonable time and opportunity for remediation in non-emergency situations.

- v. Intervention notices provided by the authorizer document the use of intervention strategies (i.e., school develops an improvement plan) that preserve school autonomy and responsibility while clearly stating possible consequences for noncompliance (i.e., increase the intervention level consistent with policy).

Standard 4e - Public Reporting Sub-standards	0	1	2	3	4
i. Produces and communicates to its decision-makers, charter school leaders, and the public an annual authorizer report that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provides clear, accurate performance data for the charter schools it oversees; b. Reports on individual school and overall portfolio performance according to the framework set forth in the charter agreement in accordance with state law; and c. Reports on the authorizer’s performance in meeting its goals. 					4
Standard Rating					4
Evaluative Comments:					
i. The authorizer’s 2022-23 and 2023-24 annual reports document the production of an annual authorizer report that provides performance data for its charter school and reports on the authorizer’s performance in meeting its goals. During the aforementioned school years, the authorizer only had one charter school in operation; therefore, the individual school report also served as the overall report on the portfolio’s performance. The annual reports were publicly posted on the authorizer’s website, shared with charter school leaders as documented by monthly meeting agendas, and performance outcomes were provided to its decision-makers during a board meeting each year.					

Standard 5a – Amendments to the Charter Agreement		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Establishes and clearly communicates to schools an amendment process that’s aligned to the charter agreement and state law, utilizes the state’s required application, and follows the state’s required timeline and approval criteria.					4
ii.	Promptly notifies a school of its amendment decision, including written explanation of the evidence-based reasons for the decision and explains in writing any available rights of legal or administrative appeal through which a school may challenge the authorizer’s decision.	N/A				
iii.	Grants amendments only to schools with a petition that demonstrates alignment to the school’s mission and goals and provides specific, evidence-based information that shows thorough preparation and viability of the plan.	N/A				
iv.	Does not make amendment decisions on the basis of political or community pressure.	N/A				
Standard Rating						4
Evaluative Comments:						
i.	The charter school handbook establishes and communicates an amendment process that is aligned with the charter agreement and state law, requires the use of the state’s application materials, and follows the state’s required amendment process timeline. Additionally, board policy I-450 generally references a charter school’s right to request to amend its agreement and draft versions of an updated board policy include additional details that align with the process outlined in the authorizer’s handbook. Furthermore, the authorizer ensures clear communication with its schools regarding the amendment process through monthly meetings and email newsletter reminders. Charter school leaders were generally able to articulate the process to amend the agreement.					
ii.	N/A – The authorizer did not receive an amendment petition during the review term.					
iii.	N/A – The authorizer did not receive an amendment petition during the review term.					
iv.	N/A – The authorizer did not receive an amendment petition during the review term.					

Standard 5b - Renewal Process		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Conducts a high-stakes interim review of each school in the fifth year of the current charter term and clearly communicates the results to the school in accordance with Department of Education guidelines.					4
ii.	Provides to each school, in advance of the renewal decision using the timeline specified in state law, 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. 					4
iii.	Allows the school 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.					4
iv.	Requires any school seeking renewal to complete the state’s renewal application and follows the renewal application timeline required in state law.					4
Standard Rating						4

Evaluative Comments:	
i.	As made evident by the interim review report for selected school C, which identified the school’s progress to date and prospects for renewal, the authorizer conducts a high-stakes interim review of its schools in the fifth year of the term in accordance with its charter agreement and state law. The report was provided to decision-makers at a board meeting and included evidence of communicating the results to the school through an opportunity for the school to respond to the results.
ii.	The cumulative report issued in December 2023 for the selected school documents the authorizer issuing the required report in accordance with the timeline established in state law. The cumulative report summarized the selected school’s performance record over its charter term by including all annual performance reports, stated the authorizer’s summative findings of the school’s performance as an average across the charter term, and stated that the school was on track for renewal. While having no impact on the score, it is necessary to note that the authorizer’s cumulative report did not include metrics related to the school’s organizational performance, as organizational indicators were not previously part of the performance framework against which the school was evaluated throughout most of its charter term. This has since been resolved through the approval and implementation of an updated performance framework, and specific feedback related to this issue was provided in a previous evaluation.
iii.	The authorizer’s renewal protocol includes a timeline for providing a response to the cumulative report and evidence of email communication documents the authorizer’s implementation of this process for the selected school. The authorizer noted in its narrative that the selected school did not submit a response.
iv.	The renewal application for the selected school, the authorizer’s renewal protocol, and email communication between the authorizer and the school make evident that the authorizer requires schools to complete the state’s renewal application and follows the renewal timeline required in state law.

Standard 5c - Renewal Decisions Based on Merit and Inclusive Evidence		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Establishes and clearly communicates a renewal policy which requires the thorough analysis of a school's comprehensive body of objective evidence defined by the performance framework and consistent with the charter agreement and state law, including any policy changes thereto.				3	
ii.	Defines and communicates with its schools the criteria for renewal and non-renewal decisions that are consistent with the charter agreement.					4
iii.	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.					4
iv.	Promptly notifies a school of its renewal decision, including written explanation of the evidence-based reasons for the decision and any available rights of legal or administrative appeal through which a school may challenge the authorizer's decision.				3	
v.	Promptly communicates renewal decisions to the school community and public within a time frame that allows parents and students to exercise choices for the upcoming school year.					4
vi.	Does not make renewal decisions on the basis of political or community pressure or solely on promises of future improvement.					4
Standard Rating						3.67
Evaluative Comments:						

- i. While the authorizer’s current board policy outlines a renewal process, the policy does not establish the body of objective evidence that will be analyzed. However, while still in draft form, documentation of proposed revisions to the policy state that the board “shall make its renewal decision based on the renewal application, annual progress reports, and renewal performance report” in accordance with state law and the requirements of this sub-standard. The renewal process is also detailed in the authorizer’s charter school handbook, which is annually communicated to its schools.
- ii. The authorizer’s renewal protocol defines criteria for renewal and non-renewal decisions and is consistent with the general terms in the charter agreement. The protocol specifically states that outcomes on its performance framework and an evaluation of the renewal application using the state’s model scoring rubric shall be used. Minutes from monthly check-ins further demonstrate regular discussions regarding renewal and review of the renewal site visit protocol, and the cumulative report provides additional evidence of the school’s prospects for renewal.
- iii. The authorizer considered one renewal application during the evaluation review term. As documented by board meeting recordings and minutes, the renewal report, the renewal review committee’s consensus rubric and recommendation for approval, and evidence of ongoing communication between the authorizing staff and charter school, the decision to grant renewal was based on substantial evidence that the school achieved the standards and targets stated in its charter agreement and is faithful to the terms of the contract and applicable law. While having no impact on the score, the lack of cumulative organizational evidence previously referenced in the evaluative comments for sub-standard 5bii, also means that decision-makers had limited evidence to evaluate the school’s organizational viability. The authorizer did include organizational data collected as part of its renewal site visit conducted in 2024, but the evidence did not include a comprehensive assessment across the school’s charter term.
- iv. While an email from the authorizing staff to the charter school dated January 24, 2025 documents the authorizer communicating its decision to approve the renewal application and included a copy of the decision-makers’ resolution, the notice was sent 15 calendar days after the decision on January 9, 2025. Though the authorizer acknowledged the delay and identified weather and staffing changes as the cause, decision notices must be sent within 10 calendar days (not business days) of the decision, as required by this sub-standard and in alignment with reporting timelines established in law.
- v. The authorizer promptly communicates decisions to the school community and public, as evidenced by documentation demonstrating its board meeting agendas and minutes are publicly posted on the authorizer’s website, board meetings are livestreamed, and meeting recordings are published on the authorizer’s YouTube channel.
- vi. Based on the renewal report, recommendation from the renewal committee, and the decision-makers’ vote to approve the renewal for the selected school, there is no evidence that the authorizer makes decisions on the basis of political or community pressure.

Standard 5d - Revocation		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Establishes and clearly communicates a revocation policy with criteria for charter revocation decisions that are consistent with the charter agreement and state law, including any policy changes thereto.				3	
ii.	Revokes a charter during the charter term only if there is clear violation in accordance with the reasons set forth in state law.	N/A				
iii.	Promptly notifies each school of its revocation decision, including written explanation of the reasons for the decision and any available rights of legal or administrative appeal through which a school may challenge the authorizer's decision.	N/A				
iv.	Promptly communicates revocation decisions to the school community and public within a timeframe that allows parents and students to exercise choices for the upcoming school year.	N/A				
v.	Does not make revocation decisions on the basis of political or community pressure.	N/A				
Standard Rating						3
Evaluative Comments:						
i. While the board's administrative procedure AP-I-450 includes the reasons for revocation as stated in law, this differs from the criteria stated in board policy I-450, which only cites "material deviations" as grounds for revocation. However, though still in draft form, proposed updates to the authorizer's revocation policy include the allowable grounds for revocation in accordance with state law as well as details regarding the timeline for a notice of revocation and a school's right to appeal.						

Standard 5e - Closure Sub-standards	0	1	2	3	4
i. Establishes and clearly communicates to schools a closure policy or procedure that is consistent with the charter agreement and requires the authorizer to oversee and work 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.				3	
Standard Rating					3
Evaluative Comments:					
i. While the authorizer generally describes and communicates details regarding closure via its charter school handbook, neither the handbook nor any other current document includes details regarding the timely notification to parents, orderly transition of students and student records, and disposition of school funds, property, and assets. However, a draft version of updates to its board policies references a protocol that will “outline a detailed process that will ensure timely notification to parents, orderly transition of students and student records, and disposition of school funds, property, and assets in accordance with state law”, and a draft protocol that addresses these key tasks was provided.					