



Charter School Authorizer Evaluations

Evaluator Additional Guidance

| Standard 1a - Planning and Commitment to Excellence | |
|--|---|
| Sub-standards | |
| i. Ensures that the authorizer’s decision-makers, leadership, and staff understand and are committed to the quality charter authorizing principles and standards. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Are the authorizer’s decision-makers, leadership and staff discussing and receiving training related to the quality charter authorizing standards at least annually?● Potential Evidence: tracker, agendas, certificates, sign-in sheets for onboarding training and/or professional development related to quality authorizing standards; board agendas with items related to quality authorizing standards (i.e., school performance reports, training on evaluation process, report on evaluation outcomes); current list of decision-makers, leadership and staff with term dates● Definitions: (for this and all related evaluation standards)<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Decision-makers” refers to the local board of education or Tennessee Public Charter School Commissioners responsible for making decisions regarding approval, renewal, and revocation of a charter school○ “Leadership” refers to the executive leadership that oversees charter work, including the director of schools○ “Staff” refers to those fully or partially funded by the authorizer fee and responsible for the day-to-day authorizing responsibilities● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Evaluated against the most current list of decision-makers, leadership and staff○ Can include references to quality authorizing standards in materials○ Must include evidence of training topic, dates and attendees○ This sub-standard is focused more on demonstrating a commitment to the quality charter authorizing standards through intentional exposure and engagement with the standards for decision-makers, leadership and staff● Addresses: Evidence shows an attempt to communicate or train decision-makers, leadership, and staff at least once within review term● Satisfies: Evidence shows communication and training to decision-makers, leadership and staff on quality authorizing standards at least annually during the review term |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: To what extent does the authorizer implement a clear policy/procedure to address conflicts of interest in all decision-making processes concerning its portfolio of charter schools? Does the authorizer require full disclosure for staff and decision-makers of any potential or perceived conflicts?● Potential Evidence: conflict of Interest policy, signed statements (may be signed outside of review term), current list of decision-makers, leadership and staff with term dates, school leader interview, evidence of authorizer following its COI policy● Evaluator Notes: |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Evaluated against the current list of decision-makers, leadership and staff○ COI forms or policy address external relationships, funding, lines of authority, and decision-making related to charter approval and accountability; COI forms are not necessarily required if the policy does not require it, or the policy addresses all requirements of this sub-standard○ If policy requires signed forms, evaluators will also request evidence of the forms for review○ Conflict of interest as defined by T.C.A. §§ 12-4-101 and 12-4-102, and T.C.A. § 8-17-101 through 106: It is unlawful for any officer, committee member, director, or other person whose duty it is to vote for, let out, overlook, or in any manner to superintend any work or any contract in which any municipal corporation, county, state, development district, utility district, human resource agency, or other political subdivision created by statute shall or may be interested, to be directly interested in any such contract.● Addresses: Evidence shows an attempt to define conflicts of interest for decision-makers and staff relevant to authorizing functions● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates understanding of and protection against conflicts of interest in authorizing decision-making for all current decision-makers and staff |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer have a mission for authorizing? Has the authorizer developed goals? Has the authorizer minimally developed plans for improvement following its formal evaluation and non-evaluation year’s self-assessment?● Potential Evidence: mission statement, strategic plan, authorizing goals, handbook, improvement plans, goal setting meeting agenda● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Mission is not required to include the term “authorizing” and may be for district and/or authorizing office. Statements using terms such as “school choice” and/or “all schools” are sufficient.○ Plans for improvement must be directly tied to most recent evaluation outcomes and can include non-evaluation year self-assessment completed during the review term● Addresses: Evidence includes a mission statement and goals relevant to authorizing/charter schools● Satisfies: Evidence includes authorizing mission statement, aligned goals, and plans for improvement developed within the review term |
| iv. Implements policies, processes, and practices that streamline and systematize its work toward stated goals and executes its duties efficiently. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: To what extent has the authorizing staff implemented clear policies, processes and practices that are aligned to its goals and help to efficiently execute its work?● Potential Evidence: policy guidebook; authorizing policies and procedures; authorizer handbook; presentation materials; annual reports |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard considers evidence that is also included in standards 2, 4 and 5 and may be best assessed after a full evaluation of those standards○ Evidence of implementation includes site visit documentation that aligns to the site visit procedure outlined in the handbook; intervention notice that’s issued in accordance with an intervention policy○ A lack of goals or policies, as assessed in other evaluation standards, will also impact the score for this sub-standard○ Processes and policies should work together cohesively and are followed to ensure efficiency○ Stated goals should have some connection, even if loose, to the policies and practices● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer has established policies, processes, and practices aligned to its goals● Satisfies: Evidence of implementation of established policies, processes, and practices aligned to its goals that help to efficiently execute its work |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Do decision-makers make charter application, amendment, renewal, and/or revocation decisions that are based on evidence (or lack thereof) and have a strong likelihood for student success?● Potential Evidence: decision materials related to authorizing decisions evaluated in standards 2 and 5● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Evidence” is relevant to the criteria of the state’s rubric, or authorizer’s if developed for renewal○ “Data” includes review team/staff evaluation and conducted due diligence○ “Expertise” considers involvement and/or recommendation from review team and staff○ If the authorizer did not implement a new start, revocation, renewal, or amendment decision during the review term, this sub-standard is marked N/A○ If the authorizer participated in an appeal for any authorizing decision during the review term and the appellate body overturned the authorizer’s decision, the maximum score for this sub-standard is a “3”● Addresses: Evidence includes authorizer decisions for selected schools identified for standards 2 and 5 in Appendix B that are based on evidence, data and/or expertise● Satisfies: Evidence includes authorizer decisions for selected schools identified for standards 2 and 5 in Appendix B that are based on evidence, data and expertise and demonstrate a strong likelihood for student success or continued student success without contingencies; decisions are not overturned by the appellate body |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 1b – Human Resources | |
|--|---|
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer hire and/or contract with staff members who bring experience in at least all areas of charter school oversight listed in this sub-standard?● Potential Evidence: annual authorizer fee report, staff/contracted employee resumes, job descriptions, staffing list with term dates, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Competent” and “Expertise” in any area refers to experience prior to hiring; professional development after hiring is not sufficient○ Teacher, school leader, and/or school administrator experience equates to “instruction and assessment” and “education leadership”○ Direct experience or a degree/credential can be considered for special education and EL○ Law experience can be documented through evidence of staff collaboration with board attorney○ Nonprofit governance and management can be achieved through prior nonprofit or authorizing experience○ This sub-standard evaluates the background/expertise of current staff, contractors or support staff (does not require funding by authorizing fee)○ For authorizers experiencing significant staffing changes, authorizers may choose to extend beyond current (at the time of evaluation, per submitted staffing documents) to include all or additional staff employed during the review term● Addresses: Evidence shows current staff has prior experience in some of the areas listed in the sub-standard● Satisfies: Evidence shows current staff has prior experience in all areas listed in sub-standard |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer invest in regular professional development for its leadership and staff?● Potential Evidence: professional development tracker, certifications, job descriptions, staffing list with term dates, authorizer fee report, attendance sheets, proof of registration● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard evaluates professional development for current staff and leadership relevant to their role○ Staffing and leadership considered against the most current staffing list○ Evidence should demonstrate ongoing opportunities for staff and leadership at least once during review term; does not require every staff member and leader to attend multiple trainings every year○ Documentation must include training topic, date(s) within review term, and names of participating staff/leaders |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Addresses: Evidence includes documentation of some staff participating in professional development relevant to their role during the review term● Satisfies: Evidence includes documentation of all staff and leadership participating in professional development relevant to their role during the review term |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Do charter school leaders know who to contact with questions about authorizing? Does the authorizing staff have opportunities to provide input with district leaders and decision-makers?● Potential Evidence: school leader interview, board meeting and/or leadership meeting minutes, agendas that demonstrate authorizing staff involvement, presentation materials for decision-makers developed by authorizing staff● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Authorizing functions” includes new start, renewal, intervention, revocation, amendments, site visits, performance framework responsibilities, etc.○ The evaluation of this sub-standard shall also consider responses from school leaders as evidence○ School leaders should generally agree that authorizing staff has input opportunities with leadership and decision-makers○ Staff providing authorizing recommendations to the board will be considered “input”; evaluators will look for evidence of decision-makers giving significant weight to staff recommendations● Addresses: Evidence suggests authorizing staff has some input with district leadership or decision-makers and school leaders are confident about who to contact with questions about authorizing functions● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates authorizing staff has input with district leadership and decision-makers at least annually during review term and school leaders are confident about who to contact with questions about authorizing functions |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 1c - Financial Resources | |
|--|---|
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizing staff annually develop an authorizing budget? Do the budgets detail how the authorizer devotes financial resources to fulfill all authorizing responsibilities?● Potential Evidence: authorizing office operating budgets for the same fiscal years as the authorizer fee reports submitted during the review term, meeting minutes and/or other evidence demonstrating consideration of data to make budget decisions● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Two budgets from the review term (and align with the authorizer fee reports submitted) are required and should include funding source(s) for any expenses not covered by the collected authorizer fee○ Authorizers shall collect an annual fee for authorizing from its authorized schools, which is the lesser of three percent (3%) of the annual per-student state and local allocations or \$35,000 per school; no cap for the Charter Commission○ Budget must affirm all revenue and expenses are related to authorizing, as allowable in State Board Rule 0520-14-01-.05, which includes: a) Charter school application approval process, b) Interim review process, c) Charter school renewal process, d) Monitoring and oversight activities, e) Personnel costs and trainings, f) Annual reporting, and g) Ongoing charter school support services<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Monitoring and oversight activities may include development of performance framework, monitoring visits, data meetings, data management tools, legal requirements (SPED, EL support) school closure■ Ongoing support services may be related to intervention, professional development, contracts in support of authorizing functions (not LEA, except for the Charter Commission)○ In accordance with T.C.A. 49-13-128, the Charter Commission may use the authorizer fee to fulfill obligations consistent with the authority of the Commission (including LEA responsibilities) and is not limited to the allowable expenses in State Board Rule○ “Commensurate” means the financial needs are proportionate to the size of the portfolio; analysis of this sub-standard requires professional discretion● Addresses: Evidence includes at least one corresponding authorizing office operating budget from the review term that addresses funding for authorizing responsibilities● Satisfies: Evidence includes two corresponding authorizing office operating budgets from the review term and details expenses related to authorizing responsibilities allowable in Rule |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|--|--|
| ii. Deploys funds effectively, transparently, and efficiently with the public and student interests in mind. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer utilize the authorizer fee and any related funds effectively, transparently, and efficiently?● Potential Evidence: annual authorizer fee report, authorizing office operating budget, budget meeting agendas, screenshot of or link to authorizer’s website, school communication, handbook, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ While recommended, authorizers are not required to post operating budgets (only authorizer fee reports); authorizing budgets are posted on the state’s website and authorizers are not responsible for the state’s posting○ “Effectively” means using all authorizer fee funds to cover authorizer obligation costs and other revenues to cover authorizing costs that extend beyond authorizer fee; unused funds are returned to schools, as applicable○ “Transparently” mean publishing annual authorizer fee report via authorizer website○ “Efficiently” means having an established process for spending as described in narrative or other documentation● Addresses: Evidence includes at least one annual authorizer fee report from the review term that demonstrates transparent use of funds● Satisfies: Evidence includes two annual authorizer fee report from the review term which demonstrate effective, transparent, and efficient use of funds |
| iii. Annually reports the authorizing obligations fulfilled using the authorizer fee in accordance with state law. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizing staff annually complete and submit its authorizer fee report as required in law?● Potential Evidence: annual authorizer fee reports submitted during the review term)● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Authorizer Fee Reports are due 6-months after the end of each school year (by December 1); a new authorizer may have less than two years depending on its school(s)’s first year in operation○ Authorizer Fee Report is deemed “complete” if developed using the state’s reporting template, includes clear descriptions for use of funds, amounts collected per school, and demonstrates adequate and appropriate resources allocated to supporting authorizing work○ State Board staff to confirm if authorizer annually submitted on-time fee reports during the review term● Addresses: Evidence includes at least one annual authorizer fee report from the review term that’s posted on the state’s website● Satisfies: Evidence includes two complete annual authorizer fee reports from the review term that are posted on the state’s website |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 2a - Application Proposal Information, Questions, and Guidance | |
|--|--|
| Sub-standards | |
| <div><div>i. Develops and issues a charter application information packet or request for proposals (RFP) that:<div><div>a) States the authorizer’s mission and any chartering priorities the authorizer may have established;</div><div>b) Provides the state’s required comprehensive application and rubric to elicit the information needed for rigorous evaluation of applicants’ plans and capacities; and</div><div>c) Communicates clear guidance, requirements and timelines with prospective applicants regarding the application content and format, while explaining evaluation criteria.</div></div></div></div> | <div><div><div><div>● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer develop and publicly issue an application packet that states its mission and any established priorities, provides access to the state’s required application and scoring rubric, and clearly communicates the process, requirements, timelines, and evaluation criteria to prospective applicants?</div><div>● Potential Evidence: authorizer-developed charter application guidance document or RFP, screenshot of or link to authorizer’s website with application materials and/or guidance, how-to videos, presentation materials, handbook</div><div>● Evaluator Notes:<div><div>○ Authorizers shall be evaluated for the development of an information packet or RFP for prospective applicants regardless of if an application is received. The packet/RFP must go beyond providing links or copies of the state’s application and rubric.</div><div>○ Mission and priorities should align to those evaluated in standard 1a</div><div>○ Authorizer may include links to or copies of the state’s required application and scoring rubric within the packet or RFP to meet the sub-standard requirements in b)</div><div>○ “Communicates” means publicly sharing information about the application process, such as through the authorizer’s website</div><div>○ “Guidance, requirements and timelines” includes details about the application process (use of application and rubric, application fee up to \$2,500 per, if any, review team, capacity interview), application’s evaluation criteria (state’s scoring rubric and any other considerations/conducted due diligence), and a general timeline, at a minimum, that’s aligned to state’s required timeline:<div><div>■ Letter of Intent due December 3</div><div>■ Application due February 1</div><div>■ 90 days to review and vote on initial application</div><div>■ Amended application due 30 days after initial denial</div><div>■ 60 days to review and vote on amended application</div><div>■ 10 days after amended application denial to appeal decision</div></div></div></div></div><div>● Addresses: Evidence includes charter application information packet or RFP for prospective applicants</div><div>● Satisfies: Evidence includes authorizer-developed charter application information packet or RFP for prospective applicants that meets all requirements of a), b) and c) in the sub-standard</div></div></div></div> |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 2b - Fair, Transparent, Quality-Focused Process | |
|---|--|
| Sub-standards | |
| i. Implements a charter application process that is defined in policy, is open, well-publicized, and transparent, and is organized around clear, realistic timelines. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Guiding Questions: Has the authorizer’s decision-makers defined the application process in policy? Does the policy detail a process that is open, well-publicized, transparent and aligned to the state’s required timelines? Does the authorizer implement a process that’s aligned to its policy?• Potential Evidence: charter application policy, process handbook, guidance, emails or other applicant communication, board meeting documents or other public communication, school leader interview• Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard shall be assessed for all authorizers. If an application process was not implemented during the review term, the authorizer shall be assessed on its policy only.○ For this sub-standard and all others requiring a “policy”, a document shall only be deemed a policy if it is board-approved and publicly available in the same way as is the requirement for all board policies approved by an LEA○ “Open” means open to all interested applicants without restriction○ “Well-publicized” means policy is publicly posted on authorizer’s website○ “Transparent” means the policy provides an overview of the application process that’s aligned to what’s evaluated in standard 2a○ “Timelines” refers to the state’s required timelines detailed in standard 2a• Addresses: Evidence the application process is defined in a board-approved policy and implementation for the selected schools identified in Appendix B is aligned to that policy, as applicable• Satisfies: Evidence the board-approved application process policy meets the requirements of this sub-standard and implementation for the selected schools identified in Appendix B is aligned to that policy, as applicable |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Guiding Question: Does the authorizer follow the application timeline outlined in law and communicate to applicants how each stage of the process is conducted and evaluated?• Potential Evidence: applicant information packet, timeline document, communication with applicant, FAQ document, application decision communication• Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard shall be assessed for all authorizers. If an application process was not implemented during the review term, the authorizer shall be assessed on its process only.○ Communication with applicants detailing each stage and evaluation criteria can be via one form of communication or communication during each stage○ Evidence of implementation shall be considered for a selected school in Appendix B, as applicable |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the authorizer received applications during both years within the review term, two years of evidence is required ● Addresses: Evidence of a process that allows sufficient time between stages by following the state’s required timeline in sub-standard 2ai ● Satisfies: Evidence of a process that allows sufficient time between stages by following the state’s required timeline in sub-standard 2ai and explaining how each stage is conducted and evaluated, and process was implemented for selected schools, as applicable |
| 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 a thorough understanding of the essential principles of charter school autonomy and accountability. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizing staff engage internal and external reviewers with relevant academic, organizational, financial, and legal expertise and an understanding of charter school autonomy and accountability? ● Potential Evidence: list of review team member names and qualifications (resumes, bios, etc.), evidence of internal and external reviewers, evidence of legal review/input ● Evaluator Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This sub-standard shall be assessed for all authorizers. If an application process was not implemented during the review term, the authorizer shall be assessed on its process only. ○ Evidence of implementation must be provided for the selected schools in Appendix B ○ Legal expertise may be demonstrated through application support from a general counsel or board attorney ○ Understanding the essential principles of charter school autonomy and accountability may be demonstrated by an evaluator with charter school or authorizing experience ● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the process requires internal and external evaluators with expertise in academics, organizational, financial and/or legal ● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the process requires internal and external evaluators with expertise in academic, organizational, financial, and legal and at least one reviewer has charter school or authorizing experience, and process was implemented for selected schools, as applicable |
| iv. Provides orientation or training to application evaluators (including interviewers) to ensure consistent evaluation of standards, practices, and the fair, unbiased treatment of all applicants. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizing staff provide reviewer training for each application review cycle? Does the training ensure consistent evaluation of standards and practices and the unbiased treatment of applicants? ● Potential Evidence: reviewer training materials utilized during the application cycles for the selected schools in Appendix B, signed conflict of interest forms, orientation attendance documentation, attendance sheets ● Evaluator Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This sub-standard shall be assessed for all authorizers. If an application process was not implemented during the review term, the authorizer shall be assessed on its process only. ○ Evidence must be provided for review team members responsible for reviewing the selected schools in Appendix B |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2023 through August 31, 2025.

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Materials must include evidence of ensuring consistent evaluation of standards and practices (such as through group rubric norming, discussion of all rubric criteria, application review practice or similar) and the fair, unbiased treatment of all applicants (such as through training topics or completed COI forms)● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates a process that includes reviewer orientation or training materials from the review term that ensure consistent evaluation of standards or the fair, unbiased treatment of all applicants● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates a process that includes reviewer orientation or training materials from the review term that ensure consistent evaluation of standards and the fair, unbiased treatment of all applicants, and process was implemented for selected schools with documentation of attendance for all review team members, as applicable |
|--|---|

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 2c - Rigorous Approval Criteria | |
|---|--|
| Sub-standards | |
| <div><div>i. Utilizes the state’s required application and rubric which:</div><div><div>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;</div><div>b) Establishes distinct requirements and criteria for applicants who are existing school operators or replicators including:<div><div>1. Clear evidence of their capacity to operate new schools successfully while maintaining quality in existing schools;</div><div>2. Documentation of their educational, organizational, and financial performance records based on all existing schools;</div><div>3. Explanation for any never-opened, closed, revoked, or non-renewed schools (including closed, revoked or non-renewed third-party contracts to operate schools);</div><div>4. Presentation of their growth plan, business plan, and most recent financial audits;</div><div>5. Evidence of meeting high standards of academic, organizational, and financial success to earn approval for replication; and</div><div>6. Document any current or past litigation and the resolution of such litigation.</div></div><div>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:<div><div>1. Evidence of the service provider’s educational and management success;</div><div>2. A description of the process for selecting the ESP;</div><div>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;</div></div></div></div></div><div><div><div>● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer require applicants to utilize the state’s application? Does the authorizer assess each application with the state’s scoring rubric?</div><div>● Potential Evidence: new start applications, scoring rubrics, applicant information packet, charter school application policy</div><div>● Evaluator Notes:<div><div>○ If an authorizer did not receive an application during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A</div><div>○ Authorizers may provide PDF versions of charter applications or links to the application for the selected schools, if posted on the authorizer’s website</div><div>○ Authorizers may provide completed evaluation rubrics from each evaluator or a final consensus rubric to demonstrate use of the rubric</div></div></div><div>● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates use of the state’s required application and scoring rubric</div><div>● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the applicant’s use of the state’s required application and the authorizer’s use of the scoring rubric for the selected schools in Appendix B</div></div></div></div> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>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</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> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer require applicants to participate in a capacity interview?● Potential Evidence: capacity interview notes with interview questions and attendees listed (for this sub-standard, capacity interview recordings may be submitted in place of notes/transcript, but is not preferred)● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not receive an application during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A○ Questions must be specific to the sponsor for the selected schools in Appendix B and cover topics related to implementation of the academic, financial and/or organizational plan, contingency plans for recruitment, enrollment plans and/or facilities, serving special populations, fundraising, budgeting, etc.○ Attendees list clearly demonstrates review team and those from the sponsor’s team responsible for overseeing the school/implementing the plan● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer completed a capacity interview with the review team and sponsor’s team for the selected schools in Appendix B● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer completed a capacity interview with the review team and sponsor’s team for the selected schools in Appendix B and asked questions that allowed the applicant to demonstrate evidence of capacity to execute its plan |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 2d - Rigorous Decision Making | |
|---|---|
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Do the decision-makers approve or deny applicants based on an assessment of competency and capacity consistent with its approval criteria?● Potential Evidence: charter school application policy, review committee recommendation, board meeting minutes, board meeting recordings, board presentation materials, decision letters or other official forms of communication● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not receive an application during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A○ If the authorizer participated in an appeal for any application decision during the review term and the appellate body overturned the authorizer’s decision, the maximum score for this sub-standard is a “3”● Addresses: Evidence includes documentation of a decision for the selected schools in Appendix B● Satisfies: Evidence includes documentation of a decision for the selected schools in Appendix B that’s clearly aligned to the applicant’s demonstrated competence and capacity to succeed (or lack thereof), consistent with the authorizer’s approval criteria evaluated previously in standard 2 |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizing staff/leadership present to the decision-makers a thorough evaluation of each application that includes a review of the application against the scoring rubric, completion of a capacity interview, and consideration of due diligence to determine experience and capacity?● Potential Evidence: board presentation materials, charter school application policy, reviewer rubrics, capacity interview documentation, board recommendation report, board meeting minutes, evidence of conducted due diligence● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not receive an application during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A○ Documentation includes evidence of providing decision-makers with a summary of the application review conducted by the review team and scored against the state’s scoring rubric, evidence of a capacity interview, and staff conducted due diligence○ An authorizer’s due diligence can be demonstrated through discussion in a presentation/board meeting or stated in a summary report and typically includes research conducted by authorizing or district staff that is separate from the work of the review team, such as analysis of school performance, review of potential conflicts of interest among sponsor’s team, financial impact on LEA, neighborhood analysis of quality seats and seat capacity, etc.● Addresses: Evidence includes board materials that document the work of the review team for the selected schools in Appendix B |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Satisfies: Evaluation includes board materials that document the work of the review team, including evidence of a capacity interview, and due diligence collected for the selected schools in Appendix B |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer ensure application review team members and decision-makers are free from conflicts of interest with the applicants and any potential or perceived conflicts are disclosed? ● Potential Evidence: signed conflict of interest forms, documentation of potential or perceived disclosures, communication, policy/process documents, meeting recording links or minutes, review team assignment lists ● Evaluator Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If an authorizer did not receive an application during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A ○ Ensuring can include signed conflict of interest forms, conflict of interest policies, or public statements made during decision-making for applications received during the review term ○ Evidence for decision-makers may be the same documentation used in sub-standard 1aii ● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates process is free from conflicts of interest for some reviewers and some decision-makers for the selected schools in Appendix B ● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates process is free from conflicts of interest for all reviewers and decision-makers for the selected schools in Appendix B |
| 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 reasons for denial so that applicants can decide if they wish to revise their plans based in part on that information and resubmit in the future. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer notify applicants in writing of the decision-maker’s determination within 10 calendar days of the decision? If denied, does the written notification include details about resubmission or appeals rights (if applicable) and the evidence-based reasons for the decision? ● Potential Evidence: decision letters, email communication ● Evaluator Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If an authorizer did not receive an application during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A ○ “Promptly” means within 10 calendar days of the decision ○ “Evidence-based factors” means the reasons for the decision as determined by the decision-makers and consistent with the state’s scoring rubric, conducted due diligence, and/or evidence of substantial negative fiscal impact on the district ○ If the decision notification clearly states addressee (including those cc’d) and the date sent, it can be reasonably assumed that the authorizer notified the applicant of its decision; evidence of email communication is not required ○ If approved, decision notification does not need to include available rights of appeal or the evidence-based factors that determined the reasons for the decision |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2023 through August 31, 2025.

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If denied, decision notification must explain the available rights to resubmit following the initial denial and of an appeal following an amended denial<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Sponsors do not have any further appeal rights following a decision by the Charter Commission● Addresses: Evidence includes decision communication for the selected schools in Appendix B● Satisfies: Evidence includes initial and amended (as applicable) decision notifications for the selected schools in Appendix B that fully meets the requirements of this sub-standard |
| v. Does not make application decisions on the basis of political or community pressure. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the decision-maker make application decisions based on evidence-based reasons without evidence of political or community pressure?● Potential Evidence: board meeting minutes, links to board meeting recordings (with time stamps), decision communication, documentation of public comment for selected schools in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not receive an application during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A○ While the decision can differ from the recommendation, the evidence-based reasons must be clearly stated during the board meeting (as a motion) and/or in writing via the decision notification○ Evidence of personal bias shall be weighed as political pressure○ To consider whether a decision was made based on political or community pressure, evaluators should flag and conduct a deeper review in the following instances:<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Review committee and/or staff recommendation does not align with decision■ Review committee and/or staff recommendation does not align with collected public comment and decision■ Decision does not cite evidence-based reasons■ Decision is based on contingencies discussed by decision-makers or staff● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates application decisions for the selected schools were based solely on political or community pressure● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates application decisions for the selected schools were grounded in an evidence-based review and there is no evidence of decisions based solely on political or community pressure |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Standard 3a - Charter Agreement, Negotiation, and Execution

Sub-standards

| | |
|--|---|
| i. Executes a charter agreement between the authorizer and a legally incorporated governing board independent of the authorizer. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer require signatures from the authorizer’s decision-makers and charter school governing board?● Potential Evidence: charter agreements for selected schools in Appendix B, evidence of delegation of signing authority, if applicable● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Executes” means a charter agreement signed and dated by the authorizer and the charter school○ “Authorizer” means the school board chair for LEAs and the chair of the Charter Commission○ “Legally incorporated governing board” means the charter school’s governing body chair○ Signing authority may be delegated to the director of schools for the authorizer or the executive director (or equivalent) for the charter school with evidence of delegation, such as through board meeting minutes or a formal letter○ Signatures must be dated within 6 months of the start of the charter term● Addresses: Evidence includes signed and dated charter agreements for selected schools● Satisfies: Evidence includes agreements for the selected schools signed and dated by the appropriate representatives for the authorizer and the governing board within the required timeline |
| ii. Ensures mutual understanding and acceptance of the terms of the charter agreement by the school’s governing board. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer allow opportunity for dialogue to ensure mutual understanding and acceptance of the terms of the agreement with the governing board/charter leadership?● Potential Evidence: email communication, meeting agendas, and/or feedback documentation for selected schools in Appendix B; school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Mutual understanding and acceptance” may be demonstrated through evidence of communication between the authorizer and the charter school in which the school has a reasonable amount of time to review and ask questions regarding the terms of the agreement○ Evidence must be dated prior to the execution of the agreement and can be between school leadership and authorizing staff as the respective representatives○ Evidence may be considered for the most recent charter agreement, including renewals or amendments● Addresses: Evidence of providing selected schools with a copy of the agreement● Satisfies: Evidence of communication between charter school and authorizer for selected schools prior to execution of agreement that demonstrates the charter school’s understanding and acceptance of the terms |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 3b – Terms, Rights and Responsibilities | |
|--|--|
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer execute 10-year term agreements with a high-stakes review in Year 5 and annual performance reports?● Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Charter agreements must document the 10-year charter term (agreement expires 10 academic years after the first day of instruction, per TCA 49-13-110, except in the case of the Charter Commission who may choose terms between 5 and 10 years when renewing an agreement)○ Charter agreements must state that the authorizer conducts an interim review during the fifth year of the charter term○ Charter agreements must state that the authorizer annually evaluates/produces an annual performance report for the school● Addresses: Charter agreements for selected schools are for 10-year terms● Satisfies: Charter agreements for selected schools meet all requirements of this sub-standard |
| ii. Explicitly defines material terms of the charter agreement. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the charter agreement clearly state the material terms in accordance with law?● Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ T.C.A. 49-13-110 requires the charter agreement “contain all material components of the approved application”, which shall be satisfied by attaching the approved application as an exhibit or including language that incorporates the application by reference○ If the approved application is not included in the agreement, evaluators will review the agreement for material components of the approved application, which at a minimum includes: mission and goals; academic focus and plan; plan for evaluating academic achievement; operating budget; method for conducting annual audits; plan for commencing operations; rules and policies for governance and operation; governing body members; anticipated enrollment; discipline plan; plan for compliance with health and safety laws; employment terms; sponsor information; funding procedures; management plan; governing bylaws; assurance of liability; assurance to comply with state law; insurance coverage; transportation; financing commitments; plan for facilities● Addresses: Charter agreements for selected schools include some material terms● Satisfies: Charter agreements for selected schools meets all requirements of this sub-standard |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the charter agreement allow for material changes to the agreement?● Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Material change” means a substantive change to the terms of the agreement regarding a school’s governance, financial, operational or academic structure○ A formal amendment process is required for at least the following material changes in accordance with Charter Commission Rule 1185-01-01-.04 (agreements may reference this rule or include the below list, at a minimum):<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ change in governance structure or addition of/changes to CMO■ addition or removal of grade level(s)■ change in student enrollment outside of thresholds set in agreement■ addition or removal of transportation■ change to location outside of the geographic area set in agreement■ change to academic focus or goals● Addresses: Charter agreements for selected schools allow amendments for material changes● Satisfies: Charter agreements for selected schools require the authorizer to approve amendments for material changes and do not require a formal process for non-material changes |
| 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the charter agreement clearly state the terms for each of the identified topics in this sub-standard?● Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Rights and responsibilities” in (a) means defining the role of the school and authorizer<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Authorizer responsibilities include those related to monitoring, oversight and evaluation (i.e., site visits, reporting requirements, performance framework)■ School responsibilities include those related to academic, organizational, and financial (i.e., curriculum, staffing, special education, audits)○ “Autonomies” in (b) means the school’s decision-making authority and must minimally include those listed in (b)○ “Performance standards, criteria and conditions” in (c) may be defined via a Performance Framework that’s legally incorporated into the agreement (commonly as an attachment), and must also include minimal requirements for renewal, intervention, and revocation○ “Terms and conditions for operation” in (d) can include effective date, location, enrollment counts, costs, reporting, funding, insurance |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>legal requirements prior to opening and are prepared to open smoothly;</p> <p>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 approved by the authorizer; and</p> <p>g. State the responsibilities of the school and the authorizer in the event of school closures.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Pre-opening requirements” in (e) may be demonstrated via a document that’s incorporated into the agreement (commonly as an attachment and in the form of a checklist) ○ “Obligations” in (f) must minimally include the enrollment requirements listed in (f) ○ For school closure requirements in (g), agreement must minimally name both parties as involved/responsible and can reference to a closure policy/procedure for specifics ● Addresses: Charter agreements for selected schools include terms for some identified topics in sub-standard ● Satisfies: Charter agreements for selected schools Include terms for all identified topics in sub-standard |
| <p>v. Ensures that purchasing any fee-based services that the authorizer provides is explicitly not a condition of charter approval, continuation, or renewal.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the charter agreement state that any fee-based services provided by the authorizer is not a condition of approval, continuation, or renewal? ● Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B ● Evaluator Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This sub-standard requires authorizers to include language about fee-based services regardless of whether the authorized school currently have a fee-based service agreement with the authorizer ● Addresses: Charter agreements for selected schools include a section on fee-based services ● Satisfies: Charter agreements for selected schools include a section on fee-based services that clearly states purchasing services from the authorizer is not a condition of charter approval, continuation, or renewal |
| <p>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</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer ensure that its fee-based service agreements are executed separate from the charter agreement, maintain charter school autonomy, and are equitable to traditional district schools? ● Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B, fee-based service agreements for selected schools, fee-based service agreements for traditional district schools ● Evaluator Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the selected schools in Appendix B have not entered into a fee-based service agreement with the authorizer, this sub-standard shall be N/A ○ To demonstrate “equitability”, the authorizer may describe a process for reviewing its fee-based service agreement for alignment with an agreement or established terms of a non-charter school in the district receiving the same service ● Addresses: Evidence includes a separate fee-based service agreement for selected schools ● Satisfies: Evidence includes a separate fee-based service agreement for selected schools that does not infringe upon school autonomy and is equitable to other district schools |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 3c – Performance Standards | |
|--|--|
| Sub-standards | |
| <div>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:<div>a. Objective and verifiable measures of student achievement as the primary measure of school quality, in accordance with state law;</div><div>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; and</div><div>c. Expectations for appropriate access, education, support services, and outcomes for students with disabilities.</div></div> | <div><div>● Guiding Question: Does the charter agreement include a performance framework that establishes student achievement as the primary measure of school quality, sets clear, measurable and attainable targets for academic, financial and organizational performance, and sets clear expectations for students with disabilities?</div><div>● Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B, incorporated and current performance framework, board meeting agenda/minutes documenting adoption of framework</div><div>● Evaluator Notes:<div><div>○ This sub-standard considers the charter agreement and performance framework collectively and must incorporate the framework into the agreement (either by reference or as an exhibit with attachment) to fully satisfy the sub-standard; if a framework is not incorporated, the maximum score for this sub-standard is a 2</div><div>○ Charter agreement and/or performance framework must meet the requirements of (a) through (c)</div><div>○ Incorporated framework must be current, as confirmed via the annual report, authorizer’s policies, handbook, monitoring and oversight processes, etc.</div><div>○ Authorizers may develop own framework or adopt the state’s model performance framework; if adopted, the framework must include evidence of formal adoption, such as authorizer branding, adoption dates, tailored language; submitting the state’s model framework document on its own will not be considered as evidence</div></div></div><div>● Addresses: Charter agreement for selected schools references a performance framework and/or meets some criteria of this sub-standard</div><div>● Satisfies: Charter agreement for selected schools incorporates a performance framework and meets all criteria of this sub-standard</div></div> |
| <div>ii. The performance framework includes clearly defined and measurable indicators, measures, metrics, and targets that:<div>a) Academic Performance<div>1. Define the sources of academic data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation;</div><div>2. Set expectations for student academic achievement status or proficiency, including comparative proficiency;</div></div></div> | <div><div>● Guiding Question: Does the performance framework meet the academic, financial and organizational criteria of this sub-standard?</div><div>● Potential Evidence: current, board-approved performance framework</div><div>● Evaluator Notes:<div><div>○ This sub-standard considers the performance framework only; authorizers shall not lose points on this sub-standard if framework is not incorporated into agreement, as required in 3ci</div></div></div></div> |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|---|---|
| <div> <div> <div>3.</div> <div>Set expectations for student academic growth, including adequacy of growth toward state standards;</div> </div> <div> <div>4.</div> <div>Incorporate state and federal accountability systems, including state grading and/or rating systems;</div> </div> <div> <div>5.</div> <div>Set expectations for postsecondary readiness, including graduation rates (for high schools); and</div> </div> <div> <div>6.</div> <div>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).</div> </div> </div> <div> <div>b)</div> <div>Financial Performance</div> <div> <div>1.</div> <div>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;</div> <div>2.</div> <div>Enable the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school’s financial stability and viability based on short-term performance; and</div> <div>3.</div> <div>Enable the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school’s long-term financial sustainability.</div> </div> </div> <div> <div>c)</div> <div>Organizational Performance</div> <div> <div>1.</div> <div>Define the sources of organizational data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation;</div> <div>2.</div> <div>Define the essential elements of the educational program for which the authorizer will hold the school accountable;</div> <div>3.</div> <div>Define financial management and oversight standards based on generally accepted accounting principles;</div> <div>4.</div> <div>Hold school governing boards accountable for meeting statutory and board-established operating and reporting requirements;</div> <div>5.</div> <div>Ensure school compliance with student and employee rights and obligations; and</div> <div>6.</div> <div>Establish expectations related to the school environment, including health and safety, transportation, facilities, and appropriate handling of records.</div> </div> </div> | <div> <div> <div>○</div> <div>Authorizers may choose to “define the sources” of academic, financial and organizational data within the framework or separately via an appendix, guidance, etc.</div> </div> <div> <div>○</div> <div>“Mission-specific performance measures” in (a)6. is a new requirement and currently an optional indicator for performance frameworks. Authorizers shall be evaluated for their mission-specific performance measures beginning in 2027.</div> </div> <div> <div>○</div> <div>Financial performance must, at a minimum, include an analysis of the school’s annual financial audit and evaluate short term performance (i.e., current ratio, unrestricted cash, enrollment variance, default) and long-term sustainability (i.e., total margin, debt to asset ratio, cash flow, debt service coverage ratio)</div> </div> <div> <div>○</div> <div>“Essential elements of the educational program” in (c)2. can include indicators that measure implementation of the material terms, compliance with education requirements, and rights of students with disabilities and English Learners</div> </div> <div> <div>○</div> <div>Authorizers shall not lose points if indicators are organized differently. All indicators must be present somewhere in the framework to fully satisfy the sub-standard.</div> </div> <div> <div>●</div> <div>Addresses: Performance framework meets some criteria for this sub-standard</div> </div> <div> <div>●</div> <div>Satisfies: Performance framework meets all criteria for this sub-standard</div> </div> </div> |
|---|---|

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 3d – Provisions for Educational Service Provider (ESP) (if applicable) | |
|---|---|
| Sub-standards | |
| <p>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:¹</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Clearly establish the primacy of the charter agreement over the ESP contract;b. 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;c. Prohibit the ESP from selecting, approving, employing, compensating, or serving as school governing board members;d. Provide for sufficient transparency around the spending of public monies; ande. 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the charter agreement meet the terms for contracting with an ESP?● Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected school(s) in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If the selected schools do not contract with an ESP, this standard is N/A○ This standard evaluates the terms of the school’s charter agreement and shall only apply to ESPs with substantial responsibility for the overall academic, operations and/or financial operations of the school; a charter management organization with multiple schools in its “network” (i.e., KIPP Nashville, Rocketship, Green Dot, Freedom Prep) is not considered an ESP for the purposes of this standard; the CMO may contract with an ESP but cannot be the ESP as well○ Authorizers must amend the charter agreement to include this language if a school chooses to contract with an ESP at any point after the initial execution of its charter agreement, if not already included● Addresses: Charter agreement includes some requirements in this sub-standard● Satisfies: Charter agreement includes all requirements in this sub-standard |
| <p>ii. Reviews the proposed ESP contracts 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. The roles and responsibilities of the school governing board and the ESP, 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 ESP accountable for performance, aligned with the performance measures in the charter agreement;c. All compensation to be paid to the ESP including all fees, bonuses, and what such compensation includes or requires;d. Terms of any facility agreement that may be part of the relationship; | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer review the proposed ESP contract with the charter school’s governing board/leadership? Does the authorizer ensure that the contract meets the criteria of this sub-standard?● Potential Evidence: executed ESP contract for the selected schools with all required language from this sub-standard, communication between authorizer and governing board/leadership, meeting agenda, contract versions● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If the selected schools do not contract with an ESP, this standard is N/A○ This standard evaluates the terms of the service contract between the school and the ESP and shall only apply to ESPs with substantial responsibility for the overall academic, operations and/or financial operations of the school; a charter management organization with multiple schools in its |

¹ 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.

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2023 through August 31, 2025.

| | |
|---|--|
| <div>e. Financial reporting requirements and provisions for the school governing board’s financial oversight;</div> <div>f. 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;</div> <div>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;</div> <div>h. Provisions for contract termination; and</div> <div>i. 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.</div> | <div>“network” (i.e., KIPP Nashville, Rocketship, Green Dot, Freedom Prep) is not considered an ESP for the purposes of this standard; the CMO may contract with an ESP but cannot be the ESP as well</div> <div>● Addresses: Executed ESP contract with selected school(s) meet some criteria of this sub-standard</div> <div>● Satisfies: Executed ESP contract with selected school(s) meet all criteria of this sub-standard</div> |
|---|--|

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 4a – Performance Evaluation and Compliance Monitoring | |
|--|--|
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer define (in its charter agreement and policy) and implement an accountability and monitoring system that informs renewal, revocation, and intervention decisions?● Potential Evidence: performance accountability, intervention, and oversight and monitoring systems tools (tracker, calendar, submission portal, etc.); oversight and monitoring policy; handbook or other documentation that defines how monitoring system informs decision-making; procedure documents; school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard focuses on the implementation of a system that’s outlined in policy and informs decisions○ Evidence must be considered across both years of the review term○ Policy must be an LEA/authorizing policy that’s approved by its decision-makers and publicly available in the same way as is the requirement for all board policies approve by an LEA○ Accountability and compliance monitoring system includes processes for authorizing responsibilities defined in charter agreement, such as charter school performance, discipline, licensure, students with disabilities, enrollment, English Learners, etc. (see charter agreement/performance framework)○ Evidence must clearly demonstrate cause and effect between the authorizer’s accountability and compliance monitoring with renewal, revocation and intervention decisions○ Evaluation of an accountability and monitoring system within the charter agreement is conducted in standard 3○ School leaders can articulate the oversight and monitoring system generally● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates an accountability and monitoring system is established generally in a board-approved policy and documentation affirms the implementation of the system● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates an accountability and monitoring system is established generally in a board-approved policy and documentation affirms implementation of a comprehensive system that is used to inform renewal, revocation, and intervention decisions |
| ii. Defines and communicates to schools the process, methods, and timing of gathering and reporting school performance and compliance data. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer define and communicate the how, what, and when for collecting and reporting data tied to its accountability and monitoring system?● Potential Evidence: handbook, guidance document, training session, reporting calendar, completed performance framework, annual charter meeting, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard builds upon the accountability and compliance monitoring system evaluated in 4ai and focuses on communicating the process, methods, and timing of gathering and reporting performance and compliance data |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Define” means the authorizer develops a process for collecting and reporting school performance and compliance data relative to the system evaluated in 4ai○ “Communicates” means the authorizer provides to all schools in advance the process, methods, and timing via a handbook, reporting calendar, annual meeting, newsletter, or similar○ The “process”, “method” and “timing” covers what is gathered/reported, how, and when● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer has defined a process for gathering and reporting school performance and compliance data● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer has defined the process, methods, and timing of gathering and reporting school performance and compliance data that’s communicated to schools in advance and aligned to its system evaluated in 4ai |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer’s accountability system streamline expectations and requirements? Does the authorizer’s accountability system protect autonomy and minimize administrative and reporting burdens for its schools?● Potential Evidence: handbook, guidance document, newsletters, trainings, team meeting agendas/notes, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard builds upon the accountability and compliance monitoring system evaluated in 4ai and the processes and communication evaluated in 4aai by focusing on streamlining expectations and requirements while protecting autonomy and minimizing administrative burdens○ To “effectively streamline”, an authorizer’s system be comprehensive by including all federal, state and local requirements together in one document, and include a method for tracking completion○ To “protect autonomy”, an authorizer’s system should not infringe upon the autonomies outlined in the charter agreement (as evaluated in standard 3)○ To “minimize burdens”, an authorizer’s system should follow an annual routine and should not include requirements that extend beyond local, state or federal expectations (i.e., directing decisions, required attendance at trainings offered by the LEA)○ One example of the annual routine is sufficient unless the authorizer notes that changes to the routine were made during the review term● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates that the authorizer’s accountability system has some elements of streamlining, protecting autonomies, or minimizing burdens |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates that the authorizer’s accountability system (as evaluated in 4ai) is streamlined, protects autonomies, and minimizes burdens; school leaders report general knowledge of reporting requirements from year to year and agree that the accountability system is streamlined |
| iv. Solicits feedback from its schools and utilizes the results to provide clear technical guidance to schools to ensure timely compliance with applicable rules and regulations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer solicit feedback from its schools and use the feedback to provide compliance-related technical guidance?● Potential Evidence: feedback surveys and results, meeting agenda, year-long planning documents, technical guidance memos/videos/trainings, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Authorizers may use the narrative form to explain connections between documentation, such as how submitted school feedback was used to develop a submitted professional development session, if not immediately evident in the documentation itself○ If school feedback suggests that technical guidance is not needed, only the action of soliciting feedback shall be evaluated○ Evidence should include feedback solicited at least once per year during the review term○ “Technical guidance” means targeted and customized support from professionals with subject matter expertise aimed to direct the school toward successfully fulfilling its obligations under applicable rules, laws, and the terms of agreement<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Example: feedback suggests schools do not understand impact of recent legislation, authorizer develops guidance document regarding compliance changes in charter school law■ Example: feedback includes request for support on new LEA reporting tool, authorizer offers training session■ Example: feedback states school staff is stretched thin, authorizer develops and provides access to recorded how-to videos on compliance topics○ Technical guidance may be provided through ongoing communication such as a newsletter, SPED/EL implementation, relevant support related to LEA requirements○ School leaders confirm authorizer solicits feedback and schools receive technical guidance from authorizer● Addresses: Evidence of authorizer soliciting feedback from schools● Satisfies: Evidence of authorizer soliciting feedback from schools at least annually and using feedback to inform technical guidance topics or for providing compliance-related guidance to schools |
| v. Conducts at least one formal on-site review to each school annually, uses the data collected to inform the school’s annual evaluation, and provides schools with a report summarizing the review. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer conduct one formal on-site visit to each school annually, use the data collected to inform the school’s performance, and provide schools with a summary report after the formal visit? |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Potential Evidence: site visit protocol, annual reports, site visit summary reports for any two schools issued during the review term, site visit schedule, site visit training documents, evidence of conducting on-site reviews, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard focuses on the authorizer’s implementation of the formal site visit○ Evidence demonstrates authorizer conducts formal site visits of its schools at least annually○ Evidence includes explanation for how data (qualitative and/or quantitative) collected during the formal visit informs a school’s outcomes on the performance framework○ Two years of site visit summary reports for two schools from within the review term is required; must be separate from the school’s annual evaluation on the performance framework (two years required if school(s) are open and operating during full review term)● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates authorizer conducts at least one formal site visit annually for one school● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates authorizer conducts at least one formal site visit annually for two schools, provides a summary report after the visit, and there’s a clear connection between data collected during the visit to indicators on the performance framework |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer communicate the purpose of site visits, ensure visits are for collecting data that cannot be obtained otherwise, and ensure visits respect school autonomy, minimize administrative burdens, and avoid operational interference?● Potential Evidence: authorizer handbook, intervention notice, communication with schools, protocols, charter agreement, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard evaluates all on-site school visits related to authorizing (not LEA-related monitoring) and is not limited to the formal site visit evaluated in the 4av○ Proposed on-site visits may be related to intervention, meetings, monitoring, technical guidance, etc.○ Evidence must demonstrate that the purpose of such visits is communicated in advance and is not related to collecting data that can be obtained otherwise (i.e., data available in the student information system, state assessment outcomes, state accountability reporting)○ Language regarding the authorizer’s right to visit its schools should be evaluated as part of the charter agreement criteria in sub-standard 3biv○ Communication may be evaluated through documentation provided to schools, such as the authorizer’s handbook or through a training, and/or direct communication with a school regarding an upcoming visit |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Evidence demonstrates on-site visit frequency, purpose, and methods are organized and scheduled in a way that respects autonomy, minimizes burdens, and avoids operational interference, such as through:<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Providing at least one month’s notice (non-emergency)■ Avoiding requests for documentation or data that can be obtained elsewhere, has already been collected by the authorizer, or takes a significant amount of time to compile■ Avoiding directing the school in areas that are within the school’s autonomy■ Alignment to the regular school schedule and is minimally interruptive for staff and student● Addresses: Evidence of communicating the purpose of its site visits in advance and is not related to data that can be obtained otherwise● Satisfies: Evidence of communicating the purpose of its site visits in advance, is not related to data that can be obtained otherwise, and meets the remaining criteria for this sub-standard; school leaders agree that the purpose of authorizer’s on-site visits is communicated in advance and the authorizer’s visits respect autonomy, minimize burdens, and avoid operational interference |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer evaluate each school annually on performance and progress toward standards required by the charter agreement? Does the authorizer communicate evaluation results with the governing body and school leadership?● Potential Evidence: annual authorizer report, performance framework documents, end-of-year/evaluation debrief meeting agenda, charter agreements for selected schools, communication with any two schools that occurred during the review term, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard assesses the authorizer’s annual evaluation of its schools, which is rolled into the authorizer’s annual report. Evaluation of the full annual authorizer report is addressed in standard 4e.○ Evaluation against the indicators of the performance framework is sufficient to affirm standards and targets in the charter agreement if the charter agreement incorporates the performance framework, as required in 3ci○ The authorizer may demonstrate clear communication with the governing board and leadership through email, written notification, evaluation debrief meeting, or similar in which the authorizer shares the results of its evaluation for the selected school(s)○ “Leadership” means the school leader or executive director, as appropriate○ This sub-standard requires two years of evidence for any two schools from within the review term● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer evaluates schools on performance and progress toward standards and targets stated in the charter agreement |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2023 through August 31, 2025.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer annually evaluates schools on performance and progress toward standards and targets in the charter agreement and communicates results with the governing board and leadership |
|--|--|

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 4b - Respecting School Autonomy | |
|---|--|
| Sub-standards | |
| i. Respects the school’s authority over its day-to-day operations by refraining from directing or participating in educational decisions or choices that are within a school’s purview under the charter law or contract and do not conflict with the authorizer’s additional responsibilities as the local education agency. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer refrain from directing or participating in educational decisions or choices that do not conflict with the authorizer’s LEA responsibilities?● Potential Evidence: charter school communication/newsletters, intervention protocol, site visit documentation, meeting presentations decks, survey feedback, narrative form, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard will consider the collective evidence for any school in the portfolio and will start from the perspective that authority has been respected by the authorizer○ School leaders should generally agree that the authorizer meets the criteria of this sub-standard○ Some evidence/documentation may cross into the district’s responsibility as the LEA for its charter schools (i.e., special education and EL monitoring, federal programs, results-based monitoring); evaluators should try to separate the roles when considering feedback● Addresses: Documentation neither demonstrates refraining from or directing/participating in educational decisions or choices that are within the school’s purview● Satisfies: Documentation includes specific evidence of refraining from directing or participating in educational decisions or choices that are within the school’s purview |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer collect information in a way that minimizes administrative burden on schools while ensuring reporting requirements are met?● Potential Evidence: school leader interview, newsletter and/or email communication, meeting agendas● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard will consider the collective evidence for any schools in the portfolio and focuses on information collecting of any type; not limited to data or information related to accountability as evaluated in sub-standard 4aiii○ School leaders should generally agree that the authorizer meets the criteria of this sub-standard○ Evidence demonstrates that the authorizer avoids last minute request for information from its schools (with limited exceptions that may arise outside of the authorizer’s control) or excessive requests that exist outside of its established performance and compliance related reporting processes○ “Minimizes administrative burdens” – information requests are detailed, specific, necessary, and with sufficient time for the school to comply● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates information is collected to protect student and public interests |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates information is collected in a way that minimizes administrative burden while also ensuring information is collected with sufficient detail and timeliness to protect student and public interests |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer annually review compliance requirements and evaluate the potential to increase school autonomy?● Potential Evidence: legislative summary documents, annual requirements training sessions, meeting agendas, redline versions of compliance reporting documents, email communication● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard builds off 4bi and 4bii and considers collective evidence to evaluate an authorizer’s effort to review compliance requirements and find opportunities to increase school autonomy○ Actual changes may or may not be needed – only evidence a review is necessary to satisfy this sub-standard○ Examples of satisfying this sub-standard include:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ In response to a recent legislative change, the authorizer adjusted its processes to ensure or increase school autonomy▪ Authorizing staff meets annually to review its compliance requirements and find opportunities to increase school autonomy by streamlining requirements▪ Authorizer’s reporting process includes a tiered system that is differentiated based on school performance and the authorizer annually evaluates which schools meet the criteria● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates authorizer review of compliance requirements● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates authorizer review of compliance requirements at least annually for the purpose of evaluating potential to increase autonomy based on flexibility in law, streamlining requirements, demonstrated school performance, or otherwise |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 4c – Protecting Student Rights | |
|--|--|
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer hold schools accountable for enrolling students via an open and equitable process?● Potential Evidence: school enrollment application review, enrollment indicator on performance framework, school policy review, site visit protocol, intervention letters, lottery verification● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Ensures” – the authorizer takes specific steps to confirm the school is meeting enrollment obligations stated in the charter agreement and required in law, such as through a policy audit, review of enrollment application materials during the site visit, an enrollment indicator on the performance framework that evaluates the requirements of this sub-standard, intervention notices documenting an enrollment issue related to the requirements of this sub-standard○ This sub-standard evaluates the actions the authorizer takes to affirm the school is upholding its responsibility defined in the charter agreement, as evaluated in standard 3○ Documentation contains evidence of the authorizer’s review (such as providing feedback following a policy audit) of the enrollment processes for two schools at least once during the review term○ While charter schools are required to submit a lottery verification, an authorizer’s collection of the lottery verification alone is insufficient to satisfy the requirements of this sub-standard● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates that the authorizer ensures schools’ enrollment processes are aligned to some of the criteria of this sub-standard● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates that the authorizer ensures schools’ enrollment processes are aligned to the criteria of this sub-standard |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer hold schools accountable for providing equitable access and inclusive services to all students?● Potential Evidence: desktop monitoring, special populations indicator on performance framework related to requirements of this sub-standard, school policy review for two schools, site visit protocol, document audits, intervention letters● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Ensures” – the authorizer takes specific steps to confirm equitable access and services are provided by the school, such as through a special populations file review, desktop monitoring, etc., such as through a policy audit, desktop monitoring, audits, document review during a site visit, an equitable access and inclusive services indicator on the performance framework aligned to the requirements of this sub-standard, intervention notices related to the requirements of this sub-standard |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard evaluates the actions the authorizer takes to affirm the school is upholding its responsibility defined in the charter agreement, as evaluated in standard 3○ Documentation contains evidence of the authorizer’s act of review (beyond collecting documentation) of two schools’ access and services at least once during the review term● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates that the authorizer ensures its schools’ access and services for some of the special populations listed in this sub-standard● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates that the authorizer ensures its schools provide access and services for all special populations listed in this sub-standard |
| iii. Ensures clarity in the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in serving students with disabilities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer ensure its schools understand the authorizer/LEA’s role and the school’s role in serving students with disabilities?● Potential Evidence: handbook, guidance, trainings, email communication, roles and responsibilities document● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Ensures” – the authorizer takes specific actions to clearly define roles and responsibilities of the authorizer/LEA and the school for serving SWD○ This sub-standard evaluates the actions the authorizer takes to affirm the school is upholding its responsibility defined in the charter agreement, as evaluated in standard 3○ Documentation contains evidence of the authorizer clearly defining roles and responsibilities for serving SWD in a way that is available/communicated to its schools, such as in a handbook or through a recorded training● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer ensures clarity in the roles and responsibilities of its charter schools in serving students with disabilities● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer ensures clarity in the roles and responsibilities of its charter schools and of the authorizer/LEA in serving students with disabilities |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer ensure its schools’ student discipline policies and actions are legal, fair, and equitable? Does the authorizer ensure schools have a grievance process?● Potential Evidence: discipline indicator on performance framework, school policy review for two schools, site visit protocol, intervention letters● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Ensures” – the authorizer takes specific steps to review the discipline policies and grievance processes, such as through a policy audit, document review during a site visit, a discipline-related indicator that meets the requirements of this sub-standard, intervention notices related to the requirements of this sub-standard○ Documentation contains evidence of the authorizer’s actions related to the discipline requirements of this sub-standard for two schools at least once during the review term |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2023 through August 31, 2025.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Addresses: Evidence demonstrates that the authorizer ensures schools’ discipline policies and actions are legal, fair and equitable• Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates that the authorizer ensures schools’ discipline policies and actions are legal, fair and equitable, that students are not suspended, expelled or counseled out of a school outside of that process, and there’s a clear grievance process |
|--|--|

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 4d – School Intervention | |
|--|--|
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer establish and communicate an intervention policy that sets forth the conditions and responses that may ensue?● Potential Evidence: intervention policy, handbook, newsletter/email communication or intervention notice with policy linked, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ As required in T.C.A. 49-13-122, authorizers must adopt a progressive intervention policy that outlines the process for intervention if the authorizer determines the school meets the criteria for revocation or is not complying with state law or the terms of the charter agreement○ Policy must be an LEA/authorizing policy that’s approved by its decision-makers and publicly available in the same way as is the requirement for all board policies approve by an LEA○ “Clearly communicates” means to be publicly available or provided to schools in some form○ School leaders express awareness of and/or can generally articulate intervention process● Addresses: Authorizer has an established, board-approved intervention policy● Satisfies: Authorizer has an established, clearly communicated, board-approved progressive intervention policy with general conditions, actions and consequences |
| ii. Utilizes ongoing oversight and evaluation processes to determine when intervention in a non-emergency situation is needed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer rely on its oversight and monitoring processes to determine when non-emergency intervention is needed?● Potential Evidence: monitoring process documents, intervention policy, intervention notices, email communication, performance framework outcomes● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ This sub-standard evaluates the implementation of monitoring processes to inform intervention or the lack thereof, and is the only sub-standard where an authorizer is evaluated on when intervention is needed○ Evidence may be provided for any school within the authorizer’s portfolio○ Evidence demonstrates authorizer consistently employs an intervention process when evidence from monitoring and oversight processes trigger an intervention, as described in the policy<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Example: Authorizer’s educator licensure check reveals several educators who are under-licensed and, after several points of communication, the school does not come into compliance and the authorizer issues notice of concern, as outlined in its policy |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Example: A school’s academic performance across both years in the review term documents that it is not meeting expectations and authorizer issues notice of concern, as outlined in its policy■ Example: After implementing a corrective action plan, as outlined in policy, the school misses several agreed upon deadlines and authorizer escalates intervention to next step outlined in policy○ Documentation demonstrates implemented intervention is aligned to policy● Addresses: Authorizer conducts ongoing oversight and evaluation of its schools to determine performance● Satisfies: Authorizer utilizes ongoing oversight and evaluation of its schools to determine performance which informs need for intervention in non-emergency situations |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer provide clear, evidence-based, and timely notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies? Does the authorizer’s notice align to its intervention process outlined in policy? Are intervention notices communicated to school leaders and the governing board?● Potential Evidence: intervention policy, intervention communication, intervention notices, templates, school leader interview; evidence may be provided for any school within the authorizer’s portfolio, as noted in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not implement its invention process during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A○ Evidence may be provided for any school within the authorizer’s portfolio○ “Clear, evidence-based, and timely” means the authorizer defines the violation or concern, cites evidence to support intervention trigger, and does so within a reasonable timeframe after determining the violation or concern (circumstance-dependent)○ Notice must be aligned to the intervention policy and communicated directly to the school leaders and governing board directly or cc’d; school leaders can include principal and/or executive director, as appropriate● Addresses: Authorizer provides notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies aligned to its intervention policy and communicated with school leaders or governing board● Satisfies: Authorizer provides notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies that’s clear, evidence-based and timely, aligned to its intervention policy, and communicated to school leaders and governing board |
| iv. Allows schools reasonable time and opportunity for remediation in non-emergency situations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer allow schools reasonable time and opportunity for remediation in non-emergency situations?● Potential Evidence: intervention policy, intervention communication, intervention notices● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not implement its invention process during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A○ Evidence may be provided for any school within the authorizer’s portfolio |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2023 through August 31, 2025.

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Evidence includes documentation detailing next steps, timeline, and opportunity for issue resolution○ “Reasonable” may be apparent in an authorizer’s policy/procedure or within specific interventions; how “reasonable” is based on the context and reviewer’s professional judgement● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer allows schools an opportunity for issue resolution when implementing intervention● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer allows schools reasonable time and opportunity for remediation in non-emergency situations |
| v. Engages in intervention strategies that clearly preserve school autonomy and responsibility while clearly stating possible consequences for noncompliance. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer engage in intervention strategies that preserve autonomy while clearly stating possible consequences for noncompliance?● Potential Evidence: intervention documentation, intervention notices, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not implement its invention process during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A○ Evidence may be provided for any school within the authorizer’s portfolio○ “Preserve school autonomy and responsibility” means the authorizer identifies what the school must remedy without prescribing solutions○ Documentation must clearly state possible consequences for noncompliance, such as escalation in accordance with the intervention policy● Addresses: Evidence documents intervention strategies preserve school autonomy and names the schools’ responsibility● Satisfies: Evidence documents intervention strategies that clearly preserve school autonomy, names the schools’ responsibility, and states consequences for noncompliance |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Standard 4e – Public Reporting
Sub-standards

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>i. Produces and communicates to its decision-makers, charter school leaders, and the public an annual authorizer report that:</p> <p>a. Provides clear, accurate performance data for the charter schools it oversees;</p> <p>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</p> <p>c. Reports on the authorizer’s performance in meeting its goals.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer produce and communicate an annual report that meets the criteria of this sub-standard?● Potential Evidence: annual authorizer reports, evidence of publicly communicating report, board presentations, screenshot of or link to authorizer’s website, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Annual reports due by January 1 each year for the most recently completed school year; authorizers must submit the two annual reports that were due during the review term○ A new authorizer will begin producing annual reports during the second year of operation for its school(s) and may not have two years of annual reports to submit for the evaluation○ “Communicates” shall be measured through evidence of publicly posting annual reports on the authorizer’s website, as required in T.C.A. § 49-13-120 effective July 1, 2025○ Annual reports must include school academic, financial and organizational performance data, provide individual school and overall portfolio performance outcomes against the performance report, and report on the authorizer’s performance in meeting its goals<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Performance framework included in annual report must align with in-force performance framework evaluated in standard 3c, unless authorizer has documented evidence of adjustments to the framework■ Goals should align with those evaluated in standard 1■ Portfolio performance can be included as a school-level summary or performance across all schools by indicator (authorizer’s discretion)● Addresses: Evidence includes the authorizer’s two annual reports that are publicly available on the authorizer’s website and meets some requirements of a, b, and c for this sub-standard● Satisfies: Evidence includes the authorizer’s two annual reports that are publicly available on the authorizer’s website and meets all the requirements of a, b, and c for this sub-standard |
|--|---|

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 5a – Amendments to the Charter Agreement | |
|---|--|
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer establish and communicate an amendment process that follows the charter agreement, state law, and the state’s required petition process?● Potential Evidence: amendment process or policy, handbook, guidance, newsletter/email communication, screenshot of or link to authorizer’s website, school leader interview, charter agreements for selected schools in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Process or policy must align with state law, which sets forth the process for charters to petition the authorizer to amend their agreement, and includes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Charters may submit a petition using the state’s form for material modification addressed in sub-standard 3bii■ Two application deadlines with a letter of intent due by September 1 or January 15, and application due by October 1 or February 14 respectively; charters may also submit emergency petitions at any point as needed■ Decision due within 60 days of application receipt■ Authorizer must use the state’s required rubric as the approval criteria○ School leaders are aware of and/or can articulate the amendment process○ Charter agreement alignment is evaluated against the charter agreement(s) for the selected schools, if applicable, or the agreements evaluated in standard 3b○ “Clearly communicates” means the authorizer’s process or policy is publicly posted or directly shared with schools in some form● Addresses: Evidence documents a board-approved amendment policy or process that’s communicated and meets some of the state’s requirements● Satisfies: Evidence documents a board-approved amendment policy or process that’s communicated and meets all the state’s required processes and timelines |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Did the authorizer notify the selected school(s) of its amendment decision in writing and, if denied, provide the evidence-based reasons for denial within 10 days of the decision?● Potential Evidence: decision letter, email communication for selected schools in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not receive an amendment petition during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A○ “Promptly notifies” means the school is notified of the decision within 10 calendar days of decision○ If denied, written notice includes evidence-based reasons aligned to approval criteria evaluated in 5ai |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If denied, written notice explains the available rights to an appeal (schools authorized by the Charter Commission do not have the right to an appeal)● Addresses: Evidence includes decision notice for the selected school(s)● Satisfies: Evidence includes decision notice for the selected school(s) that’s prompt, includes the evidence-based reasons, and explains available rights |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer grant amendments only to schools that meet the state’s approval criteria?● Potential Evidence: decision letters, board presentation materials, recommendation report, completed rubrics, board meeting minutes, board meeting video, charter agreements for selected schools in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not receive an amendment petition during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A○ If the authorizer received an amendment appeal within the review term and the authorizer’s decision was overturned by the appellate body, the authorizer shall receive a maximum score of “3” for this sub-standard○ Evidence must include decision documentation and considers granting or denying based on the criteria○ Documentation aligns with process evaluated in 5ai● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates authorizer’s decision regarding the amendment petition for the selected school(s)● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates authorizer’s decision regarding the amendment petition for the selected school(s) was based on alignment to the school’s mission and goals and provides specific, evidence-based information that shows thorough preparation and viability of the plan |
| iv. Does not make amendment decisions on the basis of political or community pressure. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the decision-maker make amendment decisions based solely on political or community pressure?● Potential Evidence: board meeting minutes, link to board meeting recordings (with time stamps), decision communication, documentation of public comment for selected schools in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not receive an amendment petition during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A○ Evaluators shall consider if a decision was made “on the basis of political or community pressure” through the consideration of related factors such as:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Staff recommendation versus decision-makers vote▪ Staff recommendation versus collected public comment and decision-makers vote▪ Decision-makers reasoning for their individual decisions (or lack thereof), as stated publicly during the decision-makers’ meeting▪ Staff recommendation and decision are evidence-based and aligned to approval criteria |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2023 through August 31, 2025.

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Publicly stated or written rationale of decision demonstrates alignment with expectations, an evidence-based review, and does not include evidence solely based on outside factors● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates decisions for the selected schools were based solely on political or community pressure● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates decisions for the selected schools were grounded in an evidence-based review and there is no evidence of decisions based solely on political or community pressure |
|--|---|

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Standard 5b – Renewal Process

Sub-standards

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>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 the charter agreement and Department of Education guidelines.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer conduct a high-stakes interim review for its schools during their fifth year of the charter term? Does the authorizer communicate the outcome of the review and school’s prospects for renewal?● Potential Evidence: interim review report for any school during its fifth year, renewal process documents, interim review template, interim review report for the selected schools of standard 5c in Appendix B, email communication, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ An authorizer shall not be penalized if it was not the authorizer during the fifth year of the charter term○ Documentation must include evidence of high-stakes interim review for selected school(s) as required by charter agreement, which was evaluated in sub-standard 3bi○ “Clearly communicates” means the authorizer shares interim report/result with school that includes overall renewal status during the fifth year of the term<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ The overall renewal status includes: (a) on-track for renewal; (b) off-track, at risk of non-renewal; or (c) severely off-track, at risk of revocation, in accordance with state guidance● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer’s process includes conducting high-stakes interim reviews during the fifth year of the charter term● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer process includes conducting high-stakes interim reviews, produced interim reports for the selected school evaluated in standard 5c, if applicable) during the fifth year of the charter term and clearly communicates results |
| <p>ii. Provides to each school, in advance of the renewal decision using the timeline specified in state law, a cumulative performance report that:</p> <p>a. Summarizes the school’s performance record over the charter term; and</p> <p>b. States the authorizer’s summative findings concerning the school’s performance and its prospects for renewal.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer provide schools with a cumulative report that meets the criteria of this sub-standard?● Potential Evidence: cumulative performance report for the selected schools of standard 5c in Appendix B, renewal process documents, cumulative report template, email communication, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not implement a renewal during the review term, only evidence of including the actions required by this sub-standard as part of the process shall be evaluated Cumulative performance reports are due to the school by January 1 in the ninth year of the charter term<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ School performance records and the timing of a cumulative report may vary for schools that have transitioned from another authorizer and shall have no impact on scoring for this sub-standard |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Report must summarize the school’s performance record over the charter term, include summative findings, and state the prospects for renewal<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ The prospect for renewal includes the same status options as 5bi: (a) on-track for renewal; (b) off-track, at risk of non-renewal; or (c) severely off-track, at risk of revocation● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer’s process includes providing a cumulative report in advance of the renewal decision● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer’s process includes providing a cumulative report using the timeline outlined in law, summarizes the school’s performance record over the charter term, states summative findings, and states the school’s prospects for renewal and this process was implemented for the selected schools, if applicable |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer allow the school time to review and respond to the cumulative report, correcting the record if needed and presenting additional performance evidence?● Potential Evidence: renewal process documents, email templates, cumulative performance report, email communication, school leader interview● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not implement a renewal during the review term, only evidence of including the actions required by this sub-standard as part of the process shall be evaluated○ “Meaningful” shall be determined based on the professional judgement of the evaluation team○ Authorizers may choose to allow schools an opportunity and time to respond to the cumulative report in advance of the renewal application’s April 1 deadline (i.e., formal letter, meeting, interview) or as part of the renewal application; authorizers must communicate the method for response to fully satisfy this sub-standard● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer’s process allows schools an opportunity to respond to the cumulative report● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer’s process allows schools meaningful opportunity and reasonable time to respond to the cumulative report, correct the record, provide additional evidence regarding its performance, and evidence of implementation for the selected schools follows this process |
| iv. Requires any school seeking renewal to complete the state’s renewal application and follow the renewal application timeline required in state law. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer require schools seeking renewal to complete the state’s renewal application by April 1 of the year prior to the year in which the charter expires? Does the authorizer follow the state’s timeline for renewal?● Potential Evidence: renewal policy, renewal process documents, handbook, completed renewal applications for selected schools of standard 5c, if applicable, in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes: |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2023 through August 31, 2025.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If an authorizer did not implement a renewal during the review term, only evidence of including the actions required by this sub-standard as part of the process shall be evaluated○ Schools seeking renewal must use the state’s renewal application and this expectation should be stated in the authorizer’s policy, procedure, process document or similar○ The renewal application timeline required in law must be stated in the authorizer’s policy, procedure, process document or similar and includes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Authorizer provides school with cumulative report by January 1 in the ninth year of the charter term■ Application due by April 1 in the ninth year of the charter term■ Authorizer’s renewal decision made by February 1 of tenth year of the charter term (the year in which the charter expires)● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer requires schools to use the state’s renewal application● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer requires schools to use the state’s renewal application, the authorizer’s renewal process follows the state’s renewal application timeline, and implementation evidence for the selected schools follows this process |
|--|--|

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| Standard 5c - Renewal Decisions Based on Merit and Inclusive Evidence | |
|---|--|
| 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 is consistent with the charter agreement and state law, including any policy changes thereto. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Has the authorizer established and communicated to schools a renewal policy? Does the renewal policy require a review of the cumulative body of evidence (academic, financial, and organizational) over the charter term and consistent with the charter agreement?● Potential Evidence: renewal policy, communication with schools (can be communicated to all schools generally or specifically to selected schools in Appendix B), school leader interview, charter agreements for selected schools in Appendix B, if applicable● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ A note for standard 5c: the Charter Commission is the only authorizer with the authority to approve a renewal term between 5 and 10 years; all other authorizers must renew for another 10-year term○ “Clearly communicates” means to be publicly available or provided to schools in some form○ Policy must be an LEA/authorizing policy that’s approved by its decision-makers and publicly available in the same way as is the requirement for all board polices approve by an LEA○ School leaders express awareness of and/or can generally articulate evidence considered in a renewal○ Policy requires a review of the “body of objective evidence”, meaning, at a minimum, the renewal application, annual progress reports, and cumulative performance report in accordance with T.C.A. 49-13-121○ Progress and cumulative performance reports must include academic, financial and organizational indicators aligned to the performance framework○ Consistency with charter agreement is evaluated through review of the agreements for the selected schools(s), if applicable, or agreements submitted for standard 3● Addresses: Evidence includes an established, board-approved renewal policy● Satisfies: Evidence includes an established, board-approved renewal policy that’s communicated and requires analysis of the comprehensive body of objective evidence |
| ii. Defines and communicates with its schools the criteria for renewal and non-renewal decisions that are consistent with the charter agreement. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Has the authorizer defined and communicated the criteria for renewal with its schools?● Potential Evidence: renewal process document, renewal policy, handbook, communication with schools, school leader interview, charter agreements for selected schools in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ School leaders are aware of and/or can articulate the criteria for renewal○ Authorizer has defined its renewal criteria in a policy or process document that is communicated to schools (either publicly available or provided in some form) |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Criteria should directly address what information is considered and how that information is evaluated (i.e., How does the authorizer make renewal decisions? What are the criteria to be renewed?) ○ Criteria must align with the renewal policy and charter agreement(s) evaluated in sub-standard 5ci ○ Authorizers may use the state’s model scoring rubric or develop its own to evaluate the renewal application ● Addresses: Evidence includes defined criteria for renewal ● Satisfies: Evidence includes defined criteria for renewal that’s communicated to schools and consistent with the authorizer’s policy and any renewal information outlined in the charter agreement |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Do the decision-makers grant renewal only to schools that meet the authorizer’s academic, financial and organizational performance expectations? ● Potential Evidence: decision letter for selected schools in Appendix B, board presentation materials, recommendation report, scoring rubrics/evaluation notes, board meeting minutes, board meeting video, charter agreements for selected schools in Appendix B ● Evaluator Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the authorizer did not implement a renewal during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A ○ If the authorizer participated in an appeal for a renewal decision during the review term and the appellate body overturned the authorizer’s decision, the maximum score for this sub-standard is a “3” ○ Authorizer’s decision should be in alignment with the renewal policy and charter agreement(s) assessed in 5ci and the renewal criteria assessed in 5cii ● Addresses: Evidence includes documentation of decision and rationale for the selected schools ● Satisfies: Evidence includes documentation of decision and rationale for the selected schools and that rationale demonstrates the authorizer grants (or denies for a lack thereof) renewal only to schools that have met the academic, financial and organizational performance expectations, consistent with the authorizer’s policy, agreements and criteria evaluated in sub-standards 5ci and 5cii |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer notify schools in writing of the decision-maker’s determination within 10 calendar days of the decision? If denied, does the written notification include details about appeal rights (if applicable) and the evidence-based reasons for the decision? ● Potential Evidence: decision letter for selected schools in Appendix B, email communication ● Evaluator Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the authorizer did not implement a renewal during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A ○ “Promptly” means within 10 calendar days of the decision ○ “Evidence-based reasons” means consistent with the authorizer’s policy and renewal criteria |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If the decision notification clearly states addressee (including those cc'd) and the date sent, it can be reasonably assumed that the authorizer notified the applicant of its decision, therefore evidence of email communication is not required○ If approved, decision notification does not need to include available rights of appeal or the evidence-based reasons that determined the reasons for the decision○ If denied, decision notification must explain the available rights to an appeal (schools authorized by the Charter Commission do not have the right to an appeal) and the evidence-based reasons for denial● Addresses: Evidence includes decision notification for the selected schools● Satisfies: Evidence includes decision communication for the selected schools that's prompt and, if denied, includes written explanation of evidence-based reasons and available rights to an appeal |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer notify the public of its renewal decisions within an appropriate time frame that allows parents and students to select another school?● Potential Evidence: public notice posting, press release, newsletter, board meeting minutes, board meeting video for selected schools in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If the authorizer did not implement a renewal during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A○ For renewals that are approved, the posting of the board's decision via the authorizer's website is sufficient to satisfy this sub-standard○ For renewals that are denied, evaluators will assess the authorizer's direct communication with the school community that goes beyond posting the decision to the authorizer's website○ Schools that are denied have 10 days to appeal the decision; any appeal action must be considered when reviewing communication from the authorizer○ Evaluators shall use professional discretion to determine if timing of communication with school community and public allows for choice ahead of the upcoming school year (prior to July 1)● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates that authorizer communicated renewal decisions for the selected schools● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates that authorizer promptly communicated renewal decisions for the selected schools and, if denied, communicated directly with the school community within an appropriate time frame |
| vi. Does not make renewal decisions on the basis of political or community pressure or solely on promises of future improvement. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the decision-maker make renewal decisions based on evidence-based reasons rather than political or community pressure?● Potential Evidence: board meeting minutes, links to board meeting recordings (with time stamps), decision communication, documentation of public comment for the selected schools in Appendix B |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2023 through August 31, 2025.

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If the authorizer did not implement a renewal during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A○ While the decision can differ from a staff recommendation, the evidence-based reasons must be clearly stated during the board meeting (as a motion) and/or in writing via the decision notification○ Evidence of personal bias shall be weighed as political pressure○ To consider whether a decision was made based on political or community pressure, evaluators should flag and conduct a deeper review in the following instances:<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Review committee and/or staff recommendation does not align with decision■ Review committee and/or staff recommendation does not align with collected public comment and decision■ Decision does not cite evidence-based reasons or is not aligned with authorizer’s renewal criteria■ Decision is based on future promises or improvement contingencies discussed by decision-makers or staff● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates decisions for the selected schools were based solely on political or community pressure● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates decisions for the selected schools were grounded in an evidence-based review and there is no evidence of decisions based solely on political or community pressure |
|--|---|

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Standard 5d – Revocation

Sub-standards

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>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.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Questions: Has the authorizer established and communicated to schools a revocation policy? Does the policy align with state law?● Potential Evidence: revocation policy, communication with schools (can be communicated to all schools generally or specifically to selected school in Appendix B), school leader interview, charter agreement for selected school in Appendix B, if applicable● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “Clearly communicates” means to be publicly available or provided to schools in some form○ Policy must be an LEA/authorizing policy that’s approved by its decision-makers and publicly available in the same way as is the requirement for all board polices approve by an LEA○ School leaders express awareness of and/or can generally articulate criteria for revocation○ Policy includes revocation criteria that aligns with requirements in T.C.A. 49-13-122, which allows authorizers to revoke in the following situations:<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ May revoke if the school receives identification as a priority school■ Shall revoke if the school receives identification as a priority school for two consecutive cycles■ May revoke if the school: (1) commits a material violation of any conditions, standards or procedures set forth in the charter agreement; (2) failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward the performance expectations set forth in the charter agreement; or (3) failed to meet generally accepted standards of fiscal management○ Policy may also define emergency situations in which the authorizer can revoke without first implementing intervention, such as in instances of fraud; misappropriation of funds; flagrant violation of health and safety laws, rules, and regulations; flagrant disregard of the charter agreement; or similar misconduct○ Policy may include timeline that requires written notice of the possibility of revocation and reasons for possible revocation 30 days prior to a decision○ Consistency with charter agreement is evaluated against charter agreement for selected school, if applicable, or agreements evaluated in standard 3● Addresses: Evidence includes an established, board-approved revocation policy● Satisfies: Evidence includes an established, board-approved revocation policy that’s communicated and is consistent with state law |
|---|---|

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>ii. Revokes a charter during the charter term only if there is clear violation in accordance with the reasons set forth in state law.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Do the decision-makers revoke a charter only for a clear violation in accordance with the reasons in state law? ● Potential Evidence: decision letter for selected school in Appendix B, board presentation materials, 30-day notice, board meeting minutes, board meeting video, charter agreements for the selected school in Appendix B ● Evaluator Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If an authorizer did not implement a revocation during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A ○ If the authorizer participated in a revocation appeal during the review term and the appellate body overturned the authorizer’s decision, the maximum score for this sub-standard is “3” ○ Authorizer’s decision should be in alignment with the revocation policy (assessed in 5di), given that the policy defines the criteria for revocation as allowable in law ○ “Clear violation” means documented evidence demonstrates that the authorizer determined the school met the criteria for revocation allowable in law (see Evaluator Notes in 5di) ● Addresses: Evidence includes documentation of decision and rationale for the selected schools ● Satisfies: Evidence includes documentation of decision and rationale for the selected schools and that rationale demonstrates the authorizer revokes only if clear violation, consistent with state law |
| <p>iii. Promptly notifies a 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.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer notify schools in writing of the decision-maker’s determination within 10 calendar days and, if denied, include details about appeal rights and the reasons for the decision? ● Potential Evidence: decision letter for selected schools in Appendix B, email communication ● Evaluator Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the authorizer did not implement a revocation during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A ○ “Promptly” means within 10 calendar days of the decision ○ “Explanation of the reasons” means providing evidence for the revocation criteria allowable in law ○ If the decision notification clearly states addressee (including those cc’d) and the date sent, it can be reasonably assumed that the authorizer notified the applicant of its decision; evidence of email communication is not required ○ If revoked, notification must state the reasons that determined the decision and any available rights to an appeal (appeal rights apply to all schools except those authorized by the Charter Commission) ● Addresses: Evidence includes decision notification for the selected schools ● Satisfies: Evidence includes decision notification for the selected school that’s prompt and includes written explanation of the reasons for revocation and any available rights to an appeal |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Did the authorizer notify the public of its revocation decision within an appropriate timeframe that allows parents and students to select another school?● Potential Evidence: public notice posting, press release, newsletter, board meeting minutes, board meeting video for selected school in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If the authorizer did not implement a revocation during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A○ If the authorizer decides not to revoke, the posting of the board’s decision via the authorizer’s website is sufficient to satisfy this sub-standard○ For revocations, evaluators will assess the authorizer’s direct communication with the school community that goes beyond posting the decision to the authorizer’s website○ Schools that are revoked have 10 days to appeal the decision; any appeal action must be considered when reviewing communication from the authorizer○ Evaluators shall use professional discretion to determine if timing of communication with school community and public allows for choice ahead of the upcoming school year (prior to July 1)● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer communicated its decision for the selected schools● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer promptly communicated its decisions for the selected schools and, if revoked, communicated directly with the school community within an appropriate time frame |
| v. Does not make revocation decisions on the basis of political or community pressure. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Guiding Question: Does the decision-maker make revocation decisions based on reasons allowable in law rather than political or community pressure?● Potential Evidence: board meeting minutes, links to board meeting recordings (with time stamps), decision communication, documentation of public comment for the selected schools in Appendix B● Evaluator Notes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If the authorizer did not implement a revocation during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A○ While the decision can differ from a staff recommendation, the reasons must be clearly stated during the board meeting (as a motion) and/or in writing via the decision notification○ Evidence of personal bias shall be weighed as political pressure○ To consider whether a decision was made based on political or community pressure, evaluators should flag and conduct a deeper review in the following instances:<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Review committee and/or staff recommendation does not align with decision■ Review committee and/or staff recommendation does not align with collected public comment and decision■ Decision does not cite evidence or is not aligned with reasons allowable in law |

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2023 through August 31, 2025.

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates decisions for the selected schools were based solely on political or community pressure● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates decisions for the selected schools were grounded in evidence and reasons allowable in law and there is no evidence of decisions based solely on political or community pressure |
|--|---|

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Standard 5e – Closure

Sub-standards

- i. Establishes and clearly communicates to schools a closure policy or procedure that is consistent with the charter agreement and state law 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.
- **Guiding Question:** Does the authorizer establish and communicate a closure policy or procedure that aligns to state law, state guidance, its charter agreement, and the criteria of this sub-standard?
 - **Potential Evidence:** closure policy/procedure, closure documentation, closure timeline or action plan, communication with families, meeting agendas, charter agreements for selected school in Appendix B, if applicable
 - **Evaluator Notes:**
 - This sub-standard is evaluated for all authorizers. If an authorizer did not implement a closure during the review term, consider the established closure policy/procedure. Closures may occur because of a revocation, non-renewal, or voluntarily by the operator.
 - Consistency of closure requirements within the charter agreement is evaluated in standard 3
 - “Clearly communicates” means to be publicly available or provided to schools in some form
 - Authorizer’s established, board-approved policy or a closure procedure addresses the criteria of this sub-standard, at a minimum:
 - Requires the authorizer to oversee and work with the school governing board and leadership to carry out the closure protocol
 - Ensures timely notification to parents
 - Ensures orderly transition of students and student records to new schools
 - Ensures disposition of school funds, property, and assets
 - Authorizers may adopt state guidance as their protocol (i.e., authorizer branding, policy, in handbook, etc.); submission of the state’s closure guidance alone shall not be sufficient to satisfy this sub-standard
 - If implemented, closure must follow, at a minimum, timeline required in T.C.A. § 49-13-130:
 - Within one week of authorizer’s decision, school must notify parents of decision in writing
 - Within two weeks of authorizer’s decision, authorizer meets with school’s governing body and leadership to establish transition team (school staff, authorizing staff, and others) responsible for:
 - Transfer of students
 - Release and transfer of student records to authorizer or TDOE
 - Release and transfer of personnel records to authorizer or TDOE
 - Submission of financial statements to appropriate authorizer or TDOE
 - Submission of financial statements to the appropriate authorizer or TDOE
 - Disposition of school funds and school assets

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2023 through August 31, 2025.

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● A school audit pursuant to T.C.A. § 49-2-112■ Once established, the authorizer and the transition team shall:<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Within 30 days of authorizer’s decision, communicate other school options to families● Communicate regularly with families, staff and stakeholders● Ensure current instruction continues for the remainder of the school year unless immediate closure● Ensure all agencies, employees, insurers, contractors, creditors, debtors, and management orgs are notified● Ensure governing body continues to meet as necessary to wind down operations, manage school finances, allocate resources, and facilitate closure● Addresses: Closure policy/procedure and implementation meets some of the criteria of this sub-standard● Satisfies: Closure policy/procedure and implementation meets all criteria of this sub-standard and documentation demonstrates that the authorizer followed its process for the selected school |
|--|---|

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| No explanation or documentation | Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses most but satisfies 50% or less of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard | Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard |