



**Charter School Authorizer Evaluations
Evaluator Additional Guidance
2023**

Standard 1a - Planning and Commitment to Excellence

Sub-standards

<p>i. Ensures that the authorizer’s decision-makers, leadership, and staff understand and are committed to the quality charter authorizing principles and standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Are the authorizer’s decision-makers, leadership and staff discussing and receiving training on the quality charter authorizing standards at least annually? ● Potential Evidence: onboarding training and/or professional development for authorizing team and local board; board training on quality charter authorizing standards; board updates on school performance reports, evaluation process and/or outcomes; evidence of local board review of evaluation self-assessment and/or annual report submissions; certificate of completion, professional development attendance log, sign-in sheet ● Addresses: Evidence shows an attempt to inform and/or train decision-makers, leadership, and staff at least once within review term ● Satisfies: Evidence shows communication and training to entire board (decision-makers), leadership and staff on quality charter authorizing standards at least annually within the review term <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Decision-makers” for this sub-standard and throughout refers to the local board of education, Tennessee Public Charter School Commission, or Achievement School District that makes decisions regarding approval, renewal, and revocation of a public charter school application or agreement. ○ “Staff” refers to those who are fully or partially funded by the authorizer fee. ○ Examples: onboarding for new staff members, board members, leadership; referencing quality authorizing standards in all presentations and reports; professional development on standards/evaluation process and outcomes; reporting evaluation outcomes to leadership, board ○ Note: a screenshot of a professional development calendar invitation is insufficient as evidence; evidence must demonstrate who attended a professional development session
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard addresses conflicts of interest for the authorizer. Conflicts of interest for an application review team are addressed in standard 2.</i> ● 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 regarding issues before them? ● Potential Evidence: conflict of Interest policy/procedure, signed statements (may be signed outside of review term), organizational chart, school leader interview, evidence of authorizer following its COI policy ● Addresses: Evidence shows an attempt to define conflicts of interest for decision-makers and staff relevant to 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

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conflict of interest policy/procedure and signed conflict of interest statements that’s inclusive of authorizing responsibilities ○ Conflict of interest statements must include all current members of authorizing office (those with primary responsibility and any personnel fully or partially funded by the authorizer fee) and entire board membership ○ Conflict of interest forms/statements address external relationships, funding, and lines of authority ○ “Conflict of Interest” (COI) as defined by T.C.A. §§ 12-4-101 and 12-4-102 as well as T.C.A. § 8-17-101 through 106: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ 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.
<p>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.</p>	<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, self-assessment ● Addresses: Evidence includes a mission statement relevant to authorizing/charter schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mission is not required to include the term “authorizing” but must clearly be focused on authorizing. Mission may be for district and/or entire charter office. Documents using terminology such as “school choice” and/or “all schools” are sufficient. ● Satisfies: Evidence includes authorizing mission statement, aligned goals, and “improvement plans” in response to outcomes from prior authorizer evaluation and non-evaluation year self-assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To meet the threshold for 4 points, “improvement plans” must be for the authorizer evaluation and the self-assessment that occurred within the review term
<p>iv. Implements policies, processes, and practices that streamline and systematize its work toward stated goals and executes its duties efficiently.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard may be best assessed after a full evaluation of standards 2, 4 and 5.</i> ● 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; evidence demonstrating implementation of policies and procedures such as a handbook, communication materials, meetings, board presentations; authorizing goals; 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

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Addresses: Evidence shows the authorizer has policies, processes, and practices aligned to its goals ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of implementation of policies, processes, and practices such as a site visit process that aligns to the process outlined in the handbook or an intervention notice that’s issued in accordance with an intervention policy. ○ Stated goals should have some connection, even if loose, to the policies and practices ○ “Streamlined” – implementation is comprehensive. Processes and policies work together cohesively and are followed to ensure efficiency.
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: 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.</i> ● <i>Note: If the authorizer participated in an appeal for any decision during the review term, the appellate body’s decision is considered for this sub-standard. If the authorizer’s decision was overturned upon appeal, the authorizer can only receive a maximum score of “3” for this sub-standard.</i> ● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer’s decision-makers make application, amendment, renewal, and/or revocation decisions that are based on evidence (or lack thereof) and have a strong likelihood for student success? Are the decisions aligned to the state’s required rubric criteria and to state law? ● Potential Evidence: new start application materials, board meeting minutes, link to board meeting recording (with time stamps), decision letters, amendment petition materials, renewal materials, revocation materials ● Addresses: Evidence includes authorizer decisions for selected schools identified for standards 2 and 5 in Appendix B ● Satisfies: Evidence includes evidence-based reasons from decision-makers 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; also considers any appeal decisions that occurred during the review term <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Evidence” is relevant to the criteria of the state’s rubric ○ “Data” includes review team/staff recommendations and conducted due diligence ○ “Expertise” – decisions consider review team and/or staff expertise

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

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard evaluates the background/expertise of the authorizing staff (all personnel fully or partially funded by the authorizer fee).</i> ● 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 for all personnel fully or partially funded by the authorizer fee, organizational chart, school leader interview ● Addresses: Evidence shows staff has prior experience in some of the following areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Education leadership ○ Instruction and assessment ○ Local community needs ○ Special education ○ English leaders and other diverse learning needs ○ Performance management and accountability ○ Law ○ Finance ○ Facilities ○ Nonprofit governance and management (can be achieved through prior authorizing experience) ● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrate that staff members have expertise in all areas listed in sub-standard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teacher, school leader, and school administrator experience equates to “instruction and assessment” and “education leadership”. ○ Direct experience, a degree or credential must be documented for special education and EL. Ex: a special education teacher or licensed paraprofessional ○ “Competent” and “Expertise” refer to prior experience. Professional development in the area is not sufficient.
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard evaluates professional development for current staff, leadership, and decision-makers.</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer engage in onboarding of new authorizing staff and regular professional development for its leadership, and staff?

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Potential Evidence: professional development tracker, onboarding training, certificates of completion, job descriptions for all personnel fully or partially funded by the authorizer fee, organizational chart, authorizer fee report, attendance sheets, training presentations, proof of registration for professional development event within review term ● Addresses: Evidence includes documentation of some staff and/or leadership participating in professional development relevant to their role during the review term ● Satisfies: Evidence includes documentation of all staff fully or partially funded by the authorizer fee and leadership participating in professional development relevant to their role during the review term <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Standards” refers to the State Board’s Quality Authorizing Standards ○ “Regular” is discretionary but must occur during the review term—this could be once, annually, or more frequent ○ “Developing” should include staff onboarding. If onboarding has not yet occurred or is incomplete prior to the evaluation submission window, authorizers may submit an ongoing plan for new staff development. ○ Staffing and leadership is considered against the most current org chart and must align with staffing included in fee report and/or budget (or include an explanation for any discrepancies) ○ Note: a screenshot of a professional development calendar invitation is insufficient as evidence; evidence must demonstrate who attended a professional development session
<p>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.</p>	<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 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 ● Addresses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence demonstrates authorizing staff has some input with decision-makers ○ School leaders are confident about who they contact with questions about authorizing functions (new start, renewal, intervention, revocation, amendments, site visits, performance framework, etc.) ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence demonstrates authorizing staff has regular input with decision-makers (evidence of opportunity at least annually during review term) ○ School leaders are confident about who to contact and believe the authorizing staff has clear opportunities to provide input with decision-makers

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.

- *Note: Authorizer Fee Reports are submitted on a 6-month lag. A new authorizer may not have submitted any fee reports prior to the evaluation.*
- **Guiding Question:** Does the authorizing staff annually develop an authorizer fee report and authorizing budget? Do the fee reports and budgets detail how the authorizer devotes financial resources to fulfill all authorizing responsibilities? Does the authorizer collect an authorizing fee from its schools and are all expenses paid by the fee related to authorizing?
- **Potential Evidence:** annual authorizer fee reports completed during the review term, authorizing office operating budgets in place during the review term, meeting minutes and/or other evidence demonstrating consideration of data to make budget and staffing decisions
- **Addresses:** Evidence includes at least one annual authorizer fee report and one authorizing office operating budget from the review term that address funding for authorizing responsibilities (as applicable during review term)
 - Authorizing responsibilities and relevant use of the authorizer fee:
 - Application review
 - Interim review
 - Renewal
 - Monitoring and oversight (development of performance framework, monitoring visits, data meetings, data management tools, legal requirements such as special education and EL support, school closure)
 - Authorizing staff/Personnel costs and training
 - Annual reporting
 - Support services for charter school (intervention, professional development, contract services)
- **Satisfies:** Evidence includes two years of annual authorizer fee reports and authorizing office operating budgets submitted during the review term that address funding for all authorizing responsibilities (as applicable during review term)
 - “Commensurate”: The financial needs are proportionate to the size of the portfolio. Analysis of this sub-standard requires professional discretion.
 - Authorizer fee requirements: The annual authorizer fee for local districts serving as the authorizer shall be the lesser of three percent (3%) of the annual per-student state and local allocations or \$35,000 per school. There is no cap for the ASD or Charter Commission.

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annual Authorizer Fee Report includes clear descriptions for use of funds demonstrating adequate resources allocated to supporting authorizing work ○ Budget includes funding source(s) for any expenses not covered by the collected authorizer fee and affirms all revenue and expenses are related to authorizing (see authorizing responsibilities listed above)
<p>ii. Deploys funds effectively, transparently, and efficiently with the public and student interests in mind.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: Annual authorizer fee reports are submitted on a 6-month lag. A new authorizer may not have two years of reports to submit.</i> ● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer utilize the authorizer fee and other funds stated within its authorizing budget effectively, transparently, and efficiently? ● Potential Evidence: annual authorizer fee report, authorizing office operating budget, budget meeting agendas, screenshot of authorizer’s website, screenshot of TDOE website, school communication, narrative form, handbook, school leader interview ● Addresses: Evidence includes at least one annual authorizer fee report and one authorizing office operating budget from the review term ● Satisfies: Evidence includes two years of annual authorizer fee report and operating budget during the review term which demonstrate effective, transparent, and efficient use of funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Effectively” – uses 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” – publishes annual authorizer fee report via authorizer website and shares report directly with authorized charter schools; submits authorizing office budget to Department of Education ○ “Efficiently” – has a clear process for spending described in narrative or other documentation
<p>iii. Annually reports the authorizing obligations fulfilled using the authorizer fee in accordance with state law.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: Annual reports are submitted on a 6-month lag. A new authorizer may not have two years of annual reports to submit.</i> ● <i>Note: The Charter Commission may use its collected fees to fund expenses beyond the obligations included below such as operating costs and LEA services.</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizing staff annually complete and submit an annual authorizer fee report? ● Potential Evidence: annual authorizer fee reports submitted during the review term, email submission to TDOE, screenshot of TDOE website where reports are posted, evidence of excess fees distributed to schools ● Addresses: Evidence includes at least one complete annual authorizer fee report from the review term that is prepared on the state’s template and submitted to the TDOE

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Satisfies: Evidence includes two complete annual authorizer fee reports from the review term that are prepared on the state’s template, submitted to the TDOE and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annual Authorizer Fee Reports include clear descriptions for use of funds, amounts collected per school, and demonstrates adequate and appropriate resources allocated to supporting authorizing work ○ Submitted to the TDOE by December 1 each year ○ “Obligations” as defined by State Board rule 0520-14-01-.05 and T.C.A. § 49-13-128(f) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The annual authorizer fee for district authorizers shall be the lesser of three percent (3%) of the annual per-student state and local allocations or \$35,000 per school. There is no cap for the ASD or Charter Commission. ■ Allowed Uses: a) Charter school application approval process, b) Interim review process, c) Charter school renewal process, d) Monitoring and oversight activities, e) Personnel costs, f) Annual reporting, and g) Ongoing charter school support services ■ “If, for any school year, the total amount of authorizer fees collected by the LEA exceeds the amount used by the LEA to perform its authorizing obligations and responsibilities, the LEA shall distribute the amount remaining to its authorized public charter schools.” ... “in the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which the excess fees were collected.”
--	---

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

- i. Develops and issues a charter application information packet or request for proposals (RFP) that:
 - a) States the authorizer’s mission and any chartering priorities the authorizer may have established;
 - b) Provides the state’s required comprehensive application and rubric to elicit the information needed for rigorous evaluation of applicants’ plans and capacities; and
 - c) Communicates clear guidance, requirements and timelines with prospective applicants regarding the application content and format, while explaining evaluation criteria.

- *Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for the TN Public Charter School Commission. All other authorizers shall be evaluated for the development of an information packet or RFP for prospective applicants regardless of if an application is received.*
- *Note: For 2023 Only – Authorizers shall not lose points if the mission is not stated within the information packet/RFP.*
- **Guiding Question:** Does the authorizer develop and 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?
- **Potential Evidence:** authorizer-developed charter application guidance document or RFP, screenshot of authorizer’s website with application materials and/or guidance, how-to videos, presentation materials, email communication, handbook, meeting agenda
- **Addresses:** Evidence includes charter application information packet or RFP for prospective applicants
- **Satisfies:** charter application information packet or RFP for prospective applicants includes:
 - Mission and chartering priorities (if established) aligned to authorizer’s mission and goals stated in Standard 1a
 - A link or copies of the state’s required application and scoring rubric
 - Details about the application process steps, application and evaluation criteria, and a general timeline, at a minimum, that’s aligned to state’s required timeline:
 - Letter of Intent due December 3
 - Application due February 1
 - 90 days to review and vote on initial application
 - Amended application due 30 days after initial denial
 - 60 days to review and vote on amended application
 - Applicants have 10 days after amended application denial to appeal decision
 - Any additional local requirements are shared with applicants in advance of February 1 application deadline

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

<p>i. Implements a charter application process that is defined in policy, is open, well-publicized, and transparent, and is organized around clear, realistic timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Note: 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.</i> • <i>Note: For 2023 Only – Authorizers may submit a draft version of an application process policy if not yet approved.</i> • Guiding Questions: Has the authorizer’s decision-makers defined the application process in policy? Does the authorizer implement a process that’s aligned to its policy? Is the implemented process open, well-publicized, transparent and aligned to the state’s required timelines? • Potential Evidence: charter application policy, process handbook, guidance, authorizer’s website screenshots, emails or other applicant communication, board meeting documents or other public communication, school leader interview • Addresses: Evidence the application process is defined in policy and the implementation for the selected schools identified in Appendix B is aligned to that policy • Satisfies: Application evidence for selected schools demonstrates that the process is aligned to policy and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ open to all interested applicants (no restrictions); ○ “transparent” – publicly defined and shared; ○ clear about the scoring criteria (state’s rubric); and ○ organized around the state’s required timelines in sub-standard 2ai.
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for any authorizer who did not receive an application during the review term.</i> • Guiding Question: Does the authorizer follow the application timeline outlined in law and explain to applicants how each stage of the process is conducted and evaluated? • Potential Evidence: applicant information packet, timeline document, website screenshot, communication with applicant, FAQ document, application decision communication • Addresses: Evidence includes application timeline that’s aligned to the state’s required timeline in sub-standard 2ai • Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implementation evidence for selected schools in Appendix B demonstrate authorizer follows state’s required timeline in sub-standard 2ai ○ Communication with applicants detailing each stage and evaluation criteria for selected schools in Appendix B (can be via one form of communication or communication during each stage)

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for any authorizer that did not receive applications during the review term.</i> ● 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, capacity interview documentation, internal evaluation process documents, reviewer training materials, evidence of legal review/input ● Addresses: evidence includes documentation of internal and external evaluators with some relevant expertise in academics, organizational, financial and/or legal ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence includes documentation of internal and external evaluators with relevant academic, organizational, financial, and legal expertise for the selected schools in Appendix B (legal expertise may be demonstrated by a general counsel or board attorney participating in the application process at some point such as reviewing the application or recommendation, etc.) ○ At least one reviewer for the selected schools in Appendix B has experience with charter schools or clearly demonstrates an understanding of charter autonomy and accountability
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for any authorizer that did not receive applications during the review term.</i> ● 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 ● Addresses: evidence includes application evaluator orientation or training materials ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence includes training materials utilized during the application cycles and documentation of evaluators in attendance for selected schools in Appendix B ○ Training addresses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ consistent evaluation of standards and practices (can be addressed through training activities such as group rubric norming, application review practice or similar) ■ fair, unbiased treatment of all applicants (can be addressed through training or completed COI forms)

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

- i. Utilizes the state’s required application and rubric which:
 - a) Requires all applicants to present a clear and compelling mission, a quality educational program, a demonstration of community support, a solvent and sustainable budget and contingency financial plans, a clear demonstration of the effectiveness of the model for the target student population and students with diverse needs, effective governance and management structures and systems, founding team members demonstrating diverse and necessary capabilities in all phases of the school’s development;
 - b) Establishes distinct requirements and criteria for applicants who are existing school operators or replicators including:
 - 1. Clear evidence of their capacity to operate new schools successfully while maintaining quality in existing schools;
 - 2. Documentation of their educational, organizational, and financial performance records based on all existing schools;
 - 3. Explanation for any never-opened, closed, revoked, or non-renewed schools (including closed, revoked or non-renewed third-party contracts to operate schools);
 - 4. Presentation of their growth plan, business plan, and most recent financial audits;
 - 5. Evidence of meeting high standards of academic, organizational, and financial success to earn approval for replication; and
 - 6. Document any current or past litigation and the resolution of such litigation.
 - c) Establishes distinct requirements and criteria for applicants proposing to contract with educational service providers (ESPs), including charter management organizations by requiring applicants to provide:
 - 1. Evidence of the service provider’s educational and management success;
 - 2. A description of the process for selecting the ESP;
 - 3. A draft (or existing) service/management contract that sets forth proposed key terms, including roles and responsibilities of the school governing board, the

- *Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for any authorizer that did not receive applications during the review term.*
- **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?
- **Potential Evidence:** new start applications, scoring rubrics, applicant information packet, charter school application policy
- **Addresses:** Evidence demonstrates use of the state’s required application and scoring rubric
- **Satisfies:** Evidence demonstrates applicant use of the state’s required application and the authorizer’s use of the scoring rubric for the selected schools identified 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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

<p>school staff, and the service provider; the services and resources to be provided; performance-evaluation measures and mechanisms; detailed explanation of compensation to be paid to the provider; financial controls and oversight; investment disclosure; methods of contract oversight and enforcement; and conditions for contract renewal and termination; and</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"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for any authorizer that did not receive applications during the review term.</i> ● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer require applicants to participate in a capacity interview? ● Potential Evidence: applicant information packet, charter school application policy, capacity interview notes, capacity interview recordings, capacity interview questions, capacity interview scheduling documents, capacity interview attendees list ● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer includes a capacity interview in its application review process ● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates the authorizer completed a capacity interview for the selected schools identified in Appendix B and asked questions that allow the applicant to demonstrate evidence of capacity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Questions can cover topics such as implementation of the academic, financial and/or organizational plan, contingency plans, recruitment and enrollment plans, serving special populations, fundraising, etc. ○ Applicant’s participants in the capacity interview include those who will manage the school/implement the 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

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for any authorizer that did not receive applications during the review term.</i> ● <i>Note: If the authorizer participated in a new start 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.</i> ● Guiding Question: Do the decision-makers approve or deny applicants based on an assessment of competency and capacity and consistent with the state’s scoring rubric? ● 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 ● Addresses: Evidence includes authorizer’s completed application review and evidence of a decision for the selected schools in Appendix B ● Satisfies: Evidence includes decision documentation which demonstrate the decision-maker’s approval or denial for selected schools in Appendix B was based on competence and capacity of applicant team and aligned to the state’s scoring rubric and the authorizer’s policy
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for any authorizer that did not receive applications during the review term.</i> ● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer evaluate each applicant through 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 ● Addresses: Evidence includes completed application reviews for the selected schools in Appendix B ● Satisfies: Evaluation of selected schools in Appendix B cite evidence from the application, capacity interview, rubric outcomes, and due diligence collected <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Due diligence can be demonstrated through discussion in a presentation/board meeting or stated in a summary report
<p>iii. Ensures that the application-review process and decision making are free of conflicts of interest and requires full disclosure of any potential</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for any authorizer that did not receive applications during the review term.</i>

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

<p>or perceived conflicts of interest between applicants, the reviewers, and the decision makers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer ensure the 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, review team assignment lists ● Addresses: Evidence includes signed COI forms for reviewers and decision-makers ● Satisfies: Evidence includes signed COI forms for all reviewers assigned to selected schools in Appendix B and all decision-makers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence for decision-makers may be the same documentation used in sub-standard 1aii ○ COI forms must require reviewers to disclose any real or perceived conflicts with any applications they are responsible for reviewing
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for any authorizer that did not receive applications during the review term.</i> ● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer notify applicants in writing of the decision-maker’s determination within 10 calendar days of the decision and include details about resubmission or appeals rights (if applicable) and the evidence-based reasons for the decision? ● Potential Evidence: decision letters, email communication ● Addresses: Evidence includes decision communication for the selected schools in Appendix B ● Satisfies: Evidence includes initial and amended (if applicable) decision communication for the selected schools in Appendix B that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is delivered promptly in writing (within 10 calendar days of a decision to approve or deny) ○ Explains the available rights to resubmit (for initial review) and of an appeal (for amended review) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The right to resubmit or appeal is not applicable for applications reviewed by the Charter Commission. ○ Explains the evidence-based factors that determined the decision (may be brief for approval decisions, must be detailed for denial) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ “Evidence-based” means consistent with the state’s scoring rubric, conducted due diligence, and/or evidence of substantial negative fiscal impact on the district
<p>v. Does not make application decisions on the basis of political or community pressure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for any authorizer that did not receive applications during the review term.</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the decision-maker make application decisions based on evidence-based reasons rather than 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

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential Evidence: board meeting minutes, links to board meeting recordings (with time stamps), decision communication, documentation of public comment • Addresses: Evidence demonstrates application decisions are not solely determined by political or community influence (Note: evidence of personal bias shall be weighed as political influence) • Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates application decisions for the selected schools rely on an evidence-based review, are consistent, and are not solely determined by political or community influence through the consideration of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review committee and/or Executive recommendation versus decision-makers vote ○ Review committee and/or Executive recommendation versus collected public comment and decision-makers vote ○ Review committee and/or Executive recommendation and decision are evidence-based ○ Rationale of decision demonstrates alignment with expectations, an evidence-based review, and does not include evidence solely based on outside factors ○ Decision is not based on contingencies.
--	---

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

<p>i. Executes a charter agreement between the authorizer and a legally incorporated governing board independent of the authorizer.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer require signatures from the authorizer’s decision-makers/leadership and charter school governing board? ● Potential Evidence: charter agreements for selected schools in Appendix B, evidence of delegation of signing authority, if applicable ● Addresses: Evidence includes signed charter agreements for selected schools ● Satisfies: Evidence includes agreements for the selected schools that are each signed by the authorizer and respective governing board chair within the first 6 months of the charter term <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The charter school’s executive director may sign in lieu of the governing board chair with evidence of clear delegation of authority to sign on behalf of the board chair; evidence must show authorization, such as through board meeting minutes or a formally documented letter
<p>ii. Ensures mutual understanding and acceptance of the terms of the charter agreement by the school’s governing board.</p>	<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, feedback documentation for selected schools in Appendix B; evidence can include charter school leadership rather than governing board, if needed, school leader interview ● Addresses: Evidence of attempt to discuss agreement with selected schools prior to execution of 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 (school has opportunity to ask questions, request edits, and agree to 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

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer execute agreements that are for 10-year terms with a high-stakes review in year 5 and annual performance reports? ● Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B ● Addresses: Charter agreements for selected schools are for 10-year terms ● Satisfies: Charter agreements for selected schools state: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Charter Term is 10-years ○ Authorizer conducts an Interim Review during the fifth year of the charter term ○ Authorizer produces annual performance reports for school
<p>ii. Explicitly defines material terms of the charter agreement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the charter agreement clearly state the material and non-material terms of the agreement? ● Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B with approved charter application included as an exhibit or incorporated by reference in the agreement ● Addresses: Charter agreements for selected schools include some material terms and defines some material changes ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agreements for the selected schools defines all material terms of the approved charter application required under T.C.A. 49-13-110, which shall be satisfied by attaching the approved charter application as an exhibit or incorporating the application by reference in the charter agreement ○ Material changes must include, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ changes 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 ■ change to academic focus
<p>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.</p>	<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 ● Addresses: Charter agreements for selected schools allow amendments for material changes ● Satisfies: Charter agreements for selected schools require amendments for changes to material terms that are aligned to standard 3bii and does not require amendments for non-material changes

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

<p>iv. Executes charter agreements that clearly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. State the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer; b. State and respect the autonomies to which schools are entitled—based on statute, waiver, or authorizer policy—including those relating to the school’s authority over educational programming, staffing, budgeting, and scheduling; c. Define performance standards, criteria, and conditions for renewal, intervention, revocation, and non-renewal, while establishing the consequences for meeting or not meeting standards or conditions; d. State the statutory, regulatory, and procedural terms and conditions for the school’s operation; e. State reasonable pre-opening requirements or conditions for new schools to ensure that they meet all health, safety, and other legal requirements prior to opening and are prepared to open smoothly; f. State the responsibility and commitment of the school to adhere to essential public-education obligations, including admitting and serving all eligible students so long as space is available, and not expelling or counseling out students except pursuant to a legal discipline policy approved by the authorizer; and g. State the responsibilities of the school and the authorizer in the event of school closures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: Charter agreements for the Achievement School District must address renewal in some form such as “shall be aligned to transition requirements set forth in law”.</i> ● 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 ● Addresses: Charter agreements for selected schools include terms for some of the identified topics in this sub-standard ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Charter agreements for selected schools Include terms for all identified topics in sub-standard ○ “Performance standards, criteria and conditions” may be defined via a Performance Framework that’s legally incorporated into the agreement and provided (commonly as an attachment) ○ “Pre-opening requirements” may be demonstrated via a document that’s incorporated into the agreement (commonly as an attachment and in the form of a checklist) ○ Charter agreement must define the responsibilities of both the school and the authorizer in the event of a closure
<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"> ● <i>Note: The Achievement School District does not offer fee-based services to its schools; therefore, this sub-standard shall be N/A.</i> ● 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 ● Addresses: Charter agreements for selected schools include a section on fee-based services

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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"> ● <i>Note: 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.</i> ● 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 ● Addresses: Evidence includes fee-based service agreement for selected school(s) ● Satisfies: Evidence includes fee-based service agreement for selected school(s) that’s separate from the charter agreement, demonstrate a respect for the school’s autonomy, and are 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

<p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Objective and verifiable measures of student achievement as the primary measure of school quality, in accordance with state law; b. Clear, measurable, and attainable academic, financial, and organizational performance standards and targets that the school must meet as a condition of renewal, including but not limited to state and federal measures; and c. Expectations for appropriate access, education, support services, and outcomes for students with disabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard considers the charter agreement and performance framework collectively. The performance framework must be incorporated into the agreement to fully satisfy the sub-standard.</i> ● 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? ● Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B, incorporated performance framework ● Addresses: Charter agreement for selected schools references a performance framework and states purpose(s) of framework that align to the criteria of this sub-standard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If a framework is not legally incorporated/attached to the charter agreement, the maximum score an authorizer shall receive is a 2 for this sub-standard. ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Charter agreement for selected schools cites performance framework and performance framework is incorporated into agreement document, commonly as an attachment (one PDF document with agreement and all attachments combined) ○ Evidence demonstrates the incorporated performance framework is currently in use with the authorizer’s schools (see annual report, policies, oversight and monitoring) ○ Incorporated performance framework includes all criteria of this sub-standard ○ Incorporated performance framework aligns with requirements in T.C.A. § 49-13-143 to use a performance framework for all schools or to adopt the Tennessee Department of Education’s model framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Framework must be clearly adopted by the authorizer. Submitting the TDOE’s model framework document directly will not be considered as evidence.
<p>ii. The performance framework includes clearly defined and measurable indicators, measures, metrics, and targets that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Academic Performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard considers the performance framework only. The authorizer shall not lose points on this sub-standard if the framework is not incorporated into the charter agreement. \</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the performance framework meet the academic, financial and organizational criteria 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

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the sources of academic data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation; 2. Set expectations for student academic achievement status or proficiency, including comparative proficiency; 3. Set expectations for student academic growth, including adequacy of growth toward state standards; 4. Incorporate state and federal accountability systems, including state grading and/or rating systems; 5. Set expectations for postsecondary readiness, including graduation rates (for high schools); and 6. Provide schools an option to incorporate mission-specific performance measures for which the school has presented valid, reliable, and rigorous means of assessment approved by the authorizer. <p>b) Financial Performance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the sources of financial data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation, including the school’s annual financial audit conducted by a qualified independent auditor; 2. Enable the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school’s financial stability and viability based on short-term performance; and 3. Enable the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school’s long-term financial sustainability. <p>c) Organizational Performance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the sources of organizational data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation; 2. Define the essential elements of the educational program for which the authorizer will hold the school accountable; 3. Define financial management and oversight standards based on generally accepted accounting principles; 4. Hold school governing boards accountable for meeting statutory and board-established operating and reporting requirements; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Potential Evidence: current performance framework ● Addresses: Performance framework meets some criteria for this sub-standard ● Satisfies: Performance framework meets all criteria for this sub-standard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Authorizers may choose to “define the sources” of data within the framework or via an appendix or guidance document that accompanies the framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Financial sources must include a school’s collected financial audit conducted by a qualified independent auditor, at a minimum ○ Performance framework aligns with requirements in T.C.A. § 49-13-143 to use a performance framework for all schools or to adopt the Tennessee Department of Education’s model framework ○ Authorizers can demonstrate the option to incorporate mission-specific performance measures as an indicator within the performance framework or through a policy/procedure document ○ “Essential elements of the educational program” can include indicators that measure implementation of the material terms, compliance with education requirements, and rights of students with disabilities and English Learners ○ 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.
---	---

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Ensure school compliance with student and employee rights and obligations; and 6. Establish expectations related to the school environment, including health and safety, transportation, facilities, and appropriate handling of records. 	
---	--

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly establish the primacy of the charter agreement over the ESP contract; 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; Prohibit the ESP from selecting, approving, employing, compensating, or serving as school governing board members; Provide for sufficient transparency around the spending of public monies; and 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"> <i>Note: If the authorizer’s selected schools identified in Appendix B do not contract with an ESP provider, this standard is N/A.</i> <i>Note: Standard 3di focuses on the charter agreement and standard 3dii focuses on the contract between the charter school and the ESP.</i> Guiding Question: Does the charter agreement for a school that contracts with an ESP provider meet the criteria of the sub-standard? Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected school(s) in Appendix B Addresses: Charter agreement includes at least 2 of the 5 criteria of this sub-standard Satisfies: Charter agreement includes meets all 5 criteria of 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The roles and responsibilities of the school governing board and the ESP, including all services to be provided under the contract; 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; All compensation to be paid to the ESP including all fees, bonuses, and what such compensation includes or requires; Terms of any facility agreement that may be part of the relationship; Financial reporting requirements and provisions for the school governing board’s financial oversight; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Note: If the authorizer’s selected schools identified in Appendix B do not contract with an ESP provider, this standard is N/A.</i> <i>Note: Standard 3di focuses on the charter agreement and standard 3dii focuses on the contract between the charter school and the ESP.</i> 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 signed by governing board and ESP for selected school(s) in Appendix B, communication between authorizer and governing board/leadership, meeting agenda, contract versions Addresses: Executed ESP contract for selected school(s) meet at least 4 of the 9 criteria of this sub-standard Satisfies: Executed ESP contract for selected school(s) meet all criteria of this sub-standard

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; g. Assurances that the school governing board, at all times, maintains independent fiduciary oversight and authority over the school budget and ultimate responsibility for the school’s performance; h. Provisions for contract termination; and i. Respective responsibilities of the governing board and ESP in the event of school closure, including transparency in the school’s revenues and expenditures, as well as those managed by the ESP. 	
--	--

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

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: For 2023 Only – Authorizers may submit a draft version of an oversight and monitoring policy if not yet approved.</i> ● <i>Note: Evidence must include annual documentation within the two-year review term to fully satisfy the sub-standard.</i> ● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer define its accountability and monitoring system in its charter agreement? Has the authorizer further defined its system in policy? Does the authorizer implement a system that’s used to inform decision-making? ● Potential Evidence: charter agreements for selected schools in Appendix B, 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 ● Addresses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ System is defined in charter agreement for selected schools ○ System is further defined in a policy that’s approved by its decision-makers ○ Evidence of authorizer collecting compliance information ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ System is defined in charter agreement for selected schools and further defined in policy ○ Documented evidence details how monitoring systems inform renewal, revocation, and intervention decisions ○ System includes process for monitoring and collecting compliance information that aligns with all requirements of the charter agreement/performance framework such as charter school performance, discipline, licensure, students with disabilities, enrollment, English Learners, etc. (see charter agreement/performance framework) ○ Evidence of annual implementation during the review term ○ School leaders can articulate the oversight and monitoring system generally
<p>ii. Defines and communicates to schools the process, methods, and timing of gathering and reporting school performance and compliance data.</p>	<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, evidence of communication with selected schools in Appendix B, annual authorizer report, completed performance framework, annual charter meeting ● Addresses: Evidence includes a process for collecting school performance and compliance data ● Satisfies:

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of defining and actively communicating the process, method, and timing of gather school performance and compliance data for the selected schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Generally the “process”, “method” and “timing” covers what needs to be submitted, how and when ○ Evidence of defining and actively communicating to schools (at least annually) how and when the authorizer will report school performance and compliance data
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Is the authorizer’s accountability and monitoring system streamlined? Does the authorizer’s system maintain charter school autonomy while minimizing administrative and reporting burdens? ● Potential Evidence: handbook, guidance document or otherwise, email communication, trainings, newsletters, process for adding or removing requirements, school leader interview ● Addresses: Evidence of implementing an accountability system that attempts to follow an annual routine for collecting performance and compliance data ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Accountability system follows a clear annual routine ○ “Streamlines” – system is comprehensive (e.g., one document with all reporting requirements for the year) and includes a method for tracking completion to “minimize burdens” ○ School leaders report general knowledge of reporting requirements from year to year and agree that the accountability system is streamlined ○ Documentation does not infringe upon school autonomy (i.e., directing decisions, required trainings) ○ One example of the annual routine is sufficient unless the authorizer notes that changes to the routine were made during the review term
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer solicit feedback from its schools? Does the authorizer provide compliance-related technical guidance based on feedback from schools? ● Potential Evidence: feedback surveys and results, meeting agenda, year-long planning documents, evidence of technical guidance through communication, professional development sessions, meetings, guidance documents, videos, etc., school leader interview ● Addresses: Evidence of authorizer soliciting feedback from schools and providing some technical guidance ● Satisfies: Evidence of authorizer soliciting feedback from schools annually, using feedback to inform technical guidance topics, and providing compliance-related guidance to schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Technical guidance” – targeted and customized guidance from professionals with subject matter expertise aimed to direct the school toward successfully fulfilling its obligations under applicable rules, laws, and the terms of

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<p>agreement. E.g., Guidance document regarding compliance changes in charter school law, training session on utilizing new LEA reporting tool, access to recorded how-to videos on compliance topics, guidance provided through ongoing communication such as a newsletter, SPED/EL implementation, relevant support related to LEA requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guidance can be developed by another agency/organization and shared via the authorizer as well ○ School leaders confirm receiving technical guidance from authorizer
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer conduct one formal on-site visit to each school annually? Does the authorizer use the data collected to inform its annual evaluation on the performance framework? Does the authorizer provide schools with a summary report after the formal visit? ● Potential Evidence: site visit protocol, annual reports, site visit summary reports for selected schools in Appendix B, site visit schedule, site visit training documents, evidence of conducting on-site reviews ● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates authorizer conducts formal site visits annually for the selected schools ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site visit protocol or similar explains how collected data informs annual evaluation on the performance framework ○ Two years of site visit summary reports per selected school that is 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)
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Questions: Does the authorizer communicate the purpose of collecting data that cannot be obtained otherwise for any on-site visit conducted? Are on-site visits conducted in accordance with the charter agreement? Does the authorizer ensure visits respect school autonomy, minimize administrative burdens, and avoid operational interference? ● Potential Evidence: communication with schools, site visit training documents, site visit protocol, charter agreements for selected schools, visit schedule ● Addresses: Evidence of communication with selected schools regarding site visits that’s aligned to the charter agreement, respects autonomy, minimizes burdens, and avoids operational interference ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Two years of evidence per selected school ○ Site visit protocol or similar communicated in advance of visit explains frequency, purposes (collecting data that cannot be obtained otherwise), and methods (type of visit such as observations, interviews, document audit, etc.) ○ Site visits are aligned to what’s in the charter agreement ○ Site visits are organized and scheduled in a way that respects autonomy, minimizes burdens, and avoids operational interference

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Scheduled with at least one month’s notice (non-emergency) ■ Does not request documentation or data that can be obtained elsewhere (i.e., state assessment data) or has already been collected by the authorizer ■ Summary report is not prescriptive ■ Aligned to regular school schedule as much as possible
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Note: This sub-standard assesses the authorizer’s annual evaluation of its schools, which should exist outside of the authorizer producing its annual authorizer report. The annual authorizer report is assessed in standard 4e.</i> • 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, meeting agenda, documentation of communication with selected schools in Appendix B during the review term • Addresses: Evidence includes some form of school annual reporting on each school’s performance and progress that’s communicated with governing body and school leadership for selected schools • Satisfies: Evidence of annual evaluation of performance and progress via the performance framework and communication with school’s governing board and leadership for each selected school during the review term (two years of evidence per selected school, if open and operating during full 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

Standard 4b - Respecting School Autonomy

Sub-standards

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard will consider the collective documentation for evidence of alignment and will start from the perspective that authority has been respected by the authorizer.</i> ● 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; evidence must include documentation for the selected schools in Appendix B at a minimum ● Addresses: Documentation neither demonstrates refraining or demonstrates directing/participating in educational decisions or choices that are within the school’s purview ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation includes specific evidence of refraining from directing or participating in educational decisions or choices that are within the school’s purview (outside of the authorizer’s LEA and/or authorizing responsibilities) ○ School leaders generally agree that the authorizer meets the criteria of this sub-standard ○ Note: some feedback may cross into the authorizer’s role as the LEA, evaluators should try to separate the roles when considering feedback)
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard will consider the collective documentation for evidence of alignment.</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer collect information in a way that minimizes administrative burden on schools while ensuring reporting requirements are met? ● Potential Evidence: data collection process documents, reporting calendar, school leader interview, site visit document requests, email communication; evidence must include documentation for the selected schools in Appendix B at a minimum ● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates information is collected in a way that minimizes administrative burden while also ensuring reporting requirements are met ● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates information is collected in a way that minimizes administrative burden while also ensuring reporting requirements are met for the selected schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Minimizes administrative burdens” – submission requests are detailed, specific, follow a regular cadence, necessary (aligned to performance framework, LEA responsibilities, charter agreement, etc.), and communicated in advance with sufficient time for the school to comply

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer regularly review (at least annually) 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, reporting calendar, reporting protocol, handbook, school leader interview ● Addresses: Evidence includes authorizer review of compliance requirements at least once during the review term ● Satisfies: Evidence of reviewing compliance requirements and evaluating potential to increase autonomy by review of flexibility in law, streamlining requirements, considering school performance, or otherwise at least annually (actual changes may or may not be needed – only the act of review is necessary to satisfy 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 4c – Protecting student rights

Sub-standards

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard considers the authorizer’s review of its schools’ enrollment processes.</i> ● <i>Note: State law requires the Achievement School District to prioritize zoned students. A lottery will only be required when there is an excess of seats after all zoned students have been placed.</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer hold schools accountable for enrolling students via an open and equitable process? ● Potential Evidence: school admission application review, enrollment indicator on performance framework, annual reports, school policy review, school handbook review, site visit protocol, intervention letters, lottery verification, reporting calendar, charter agreements for selected schools in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence includes charter agreements for selected schools, handbook or similar that addresses student enrollment processes aligned to criteria of this sub-standard ● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates how the authorizer ensures the selected schools’ enrollment processes are aligned to the criteria of this sub-standard <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 ○ Authorizer requires schools to submit lottery verification, as applicable ○ Site visits protocols, site visit reports, reporting requirements, performance framework indicators and outcomes, and/or intervention letters may contain evidence of the authorizer’s review of school enrollment documentation
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard considers the authorizer’s review of its schools’ special populations services.</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer hold schools accountable for providing equitable access and inclusive services to all students? ● Potential Evidence: desktop monitoring, special populations trainings and/or guidance, special populations indicator on performance framework, annual reports, school policy review, school handbook review, site visit protocol, document audits, intervention letters, reporting calendar, charter agreements for selected schools in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence includes charter agreement for selected schools, handbook or similar that addresses access and services for all students, including the special populations listed in this sub-standard ● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates how the authorizer ensures the selected schools are providing equitable access and inclusive services to all students, including the special populations listed in this sub-standard <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

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site visits protocols, site visit reports, reporting requirements, performance framework indicators and outcomes, and/or intervention letters may contain evidence of the authorizer’s review of access and services
<p>iii. Ensures clarity in the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in serving students with disabilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer ensure its schools understand the authorizer’s role and the school’s role in serving students with disabilities? ● Potential Evidence: charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B, handbook, guidance, trainings, meeting agendas, email communication, roles and responsibilities document ● Addresses: Evidence includes charter agreement for selected schools, handbook or similar that addresses roles and responsibilities of authorizer and school in serving students with disabilities ● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates how the authorizer ensures the selected schools are clear in the roles and responsibilities of the authorizer and school in serving students with disabilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Ensures” – the authorizer takes specific steps to define roles and responsibilities of each party that goes beyond the general descriptions included in a charter agreement
<p>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.</p>	<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: charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B, documentation of authorizer’s review of selected schools’ handbook and/or policies, guidance, trainings, meeting agendas, email communication ● Addresses: Evidence includes charter agreement for selected schools, handbook or similar requires schools to set forth and implement student discipline criteria aligned to this sub-standard ● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates how the authorizer ensures the selected schools have a discipline policy in place that’s legal, fair, and equitable and does not suspend, expel or counsel out of a school outside of that process and the selected schools have a clear grievance process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Ensures” – the authorizer takes specific steps to review the discipline policies and grievance processes of the schools selected in Appendix B ○ Site visits protocols, site visit reports, reporting requirements, performance framework indicators and outcomes, and/or intervention letters may contain evidence of the authorizer’s review of access and service

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

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: Draft versions of an intervention policy will result in a lower score. All authorizers are required to adopt a “progressive intervention policy”, per PC206 of 2023.</i> ● 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, communication methods; evidence may be provided for any school within the authorizer’s portfolio, as noted in Appendix B, school leader interview ● Addresses: Authorizer has an established intervention policy with general conditions, actions, and consequences ● Satisfies: Authorizer has an established intervention policy with general conditions, actions and consequences that has been clearly communicated to schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ School leaders can articulate intervention generally
<p>ii. Utilizes ongoing oversight and evaluation processes to determine when intervention in a non-emergency situation is needed.</p>	<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: reporting calendar, annual report, performance framework outcomes, monitoring and oversight policy, intervention policy, evidence of intervention such as notices/documentation, email communication; evidence may be provided for any school within the authorizer’s portfolio, as noted in Appendix B ● Addresses: Authorizer reviews the outcomes of its monitoring and oversight processes for each school ● Satisfies: Authorizer reviews at least annually the outcomes of its monitoring and oversight processes for each school and uses outcomes to determine when intervention is needed (see policy/process documents for evidence of intent if not implemented during review term) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence demonstrates authorizer consistently employs an intervention process outlined in policy when evidence from monitoring and oversight processes trigger an intervention as described in the policy
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not implement its invention process during the review term (and there is no evidence that demonstrates it should have been implemented), this sub-standard is N/A.</i> ● <i>Note: For 2023 Only – Authorizers may submit a draft version of an intervention policy if not yet approved.</i> ● 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?

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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 ● Addresses: Notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies are clear, evidence-based, and timely ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Clear, evidence-based, and timely (as determined by content and evaluation team’s professional judgement) ■ Aligned to the intervention policy ■ Communicated to the school leaders and governing board
<p>iv. Allows schools reasonable time and opportunity for remediation in non-emergency situations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not implement its invention process during the review term (and there is no evidence that demonstrates it should have been implemented), this sub-standard is N/A.</i> ● 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, templates; evidence may be provided for any school within the authorizer’s portfolio, as noted in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence includes documentation detailing timeline for issue resolution. ● Satisfies: Evidence includes documentation detailing next steps, time, and opportunity for issue resolution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “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
<p>v. Engages in intervention strategies that clearly preserve school autonomy and responsibility (identifying what the school must remedy without prescribing solutions) while clearly stating possible consequences for noncompliance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not implement its invention process during the review term (and there is no evidence that demonstrates it should have been implemented), this sub-standard is N/A.</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer engage in intervention strategies that preserve autonomy while clearly stating possible consequences for noncompliance? ● Potential Evidence: intervention policy, intervention documentation, intervention notices, templates, school leader interview; evidence may be provided for any school within the authorizer’s portfolio, as noted in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence of intervention demonstrates the authorizer states next steps in response to contract or performance violations ● Satisfies: Evidence of intervention demonstrates the authorizer identifies contract or performance violations without prescribing solutions, outlines school’s next steps/call to action, 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"> ● <i>Note: Annual reports are submitted on a lag with school year reports due by December 1 each year. Authorizers shall submit the two annual reports that were due during the review term to fully satisfy the sub-standard. A new authorizer may not have two years of annual reports to submit.</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer produce and communicate an annual report that meets the criteria of this sub-standard? ● Potential Evidence: annual authorizer reports due during the review term, evidence of sharing report with schools such as email communication or meeting, board presentations, screenshot of authorizer’s website ● Addresses: The two annual reports due during the review term include performance data for each of its charter schools and overall portfolio performance and are posted to the authorizer’s website ● Satisfies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The two annual reports include clear, accurate performance data that’s aligned to indicators of the in-force agreement’s performance framework ○ The two annual reports due during the review term include individual performance data (academic, financial, and organizational) for each of its charter schools and overall portfolio performance ○ Includes a report on the authorizer’s performance in meeting its goals ○ Annual reports are provided to the authorizer’s decision-makers, communicated directly to charter schools, and publicly available on the authorizer’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 5a – Amendments to the Charter Agreement

Sub-standards

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer establish and communicate to its schools 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, charter agreement for selected schools in Appendix B, email communication, screenshot of authorizer’s website, school leader interview ● Addresses: Evidence includes an amendment process that’s aligned to the charter agreement(s) for the selected school(s) in Appendix B, state law, and state requirements ● Satisfies: Evidence includes an amendment process that’s aligned to the charter agreement(s) for the selected school(s), state law, and state requirements and documentation of clear communicated regarding the process to selected school(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ State law allows for petitions to amend and the right to appeal ○ State requirements include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Petitions for material modification including those in sub-standard 3bii and any other changes identified in the charter agreement as material ■ Submission of a letter of intent by September 1 or January 15 ■ Use of the state’s amendment application and submission by October 1 or February 14 ■ Authorizer’s review and scoring on the state’s required rubric ■ Decision within 60 days of application due date ■ Allows for emergency amendment petitions at any time ○ School leaders are aware of and/or can articulate the amendment process
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not receive an amendment petition during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A.</i> ● 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 ● Addresses: Evidence includes decision communication for the selected school(s) ● Satisfies: Evidence includes decision communication for the selected school(s) that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is delivered promptly in writing (within 10 calendar days of a decision to approve or deny) ○ Explains the available rights to an appeal (Note: Charter schools authorized by the Charter Commission and ASD do not have the right 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

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Explains the evidence-based factors that determined the decision (may be brief for approval decisions, must be detailed for denial) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ “Evidence-based” means consistent with the state’s criteria
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not receive an amendment petition during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A.</i> ● <i>Note: 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.</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer grant amendments only to schools that meet the state’s approval criteria? ● Potential Evidence: decision letter for selected school(s), board presentation materials, recommendation report, completed rubrics, board meeting minutes, board meeting video, screenshot of board’s website ● Addresses: Evidence includes authorizer’s completed amendment petition review and evidence of a decision for the selected school(s) in Appendix B ● Satisfies: Evidence includes decision documentation which demonstrate the decision-maker’s reasons for approval or denial for selected school(s) in Appendix B was aligned to the authorizer’s policy or process, the state’s approval criteria and the criteria of this sub-standard
<p>iv. Does not make amendment decisions on the basis of political or community pressure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not receive an amendment petition during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A.</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the decision-maker make amendment decisions based on evidence-based reasons rather than 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 ● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates amendment decisions are not solely determined by political or community influence ● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates decisions for the selected schools rely on an evidence-based review, are consistent, and are not solely determined by political or community influence through the consideration of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staff recommendation versus decision-makers vote ○ Staff recommendation versus collected public comment and decision-makers vote ○ Staff recommendation and decision are evidence-based and aligned to approval criteria ○ Rationale of decision demonstrates alignment with expectations, an evidence-based review, and does not include evidence solely based on outside factors

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"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard assumes that the authorizer being evaluated was the authorizer of the selected school throughout the full charter term. An authorizer shall not be penalized if it was not the authorizer during the fifth year of the charter term.</i> ● 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 process document, handbook, guidance, interim review report for selected schools in Appendix B, email communication, school leader interview ● Addresses: Evidence includes an interim report conducted during the selected schools’ fifth year of the current term ● Satisfies: Evidence includes an interim report that’s communicated to the selected schools’ leadership and governing board, conducted during the fifth year of the current term, and includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The overall renewal status of (a) on-track for renewal; (b) off-track, at risk of non-renewal; or (c) severely off-track, at risk of revocation ○ A review of the school’s performance via the performance framework
<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"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for any authorizer that did not have a school in its ninth year of the contract term during the review term.</i> ● <i>Note: School performance records and the timing of a cumulative report may vary for schools that have transitioned from the ASD to another authorizer and shall have no impact on scoring for this sub-standard.</i> ● 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 in Appendix B, documented communication with selected schools ● Addresses: Evidence includes a cumulative report for each selected school that summarizes the school’s performance over the charter term, states the outcomes of the report, and is provided in advance of the renewal decision ● Satisfies: Evidence includes a cumulative report for each selected school that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is provided to the selected schools’ leadership and/or governing board by January 1 of the year prior to the year in which the charter expires ○ Summarizes the school’s performance over the charter term ○ States the outcomes of the review, including the school’s prospects for renewal

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The prospects for renewal state the school is (a) on-track for renewal; (b) off-track, at risk of non-renewal; or (c) severely off-track, at risk of revocation
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for any authorizer that did not have a school in its ninth year of the contract term during the review term.</i> ● 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, handbook, communication with selected schools in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence includes documentation selected schools’ opportunity to review and respond to the cumulative report ● Satisfies: Evidence includes documentation selected schools’ opportunity to review and respond to the cumulative report, to correct the record, and to present additional evidence regarding its performance prior to the April 1 renewal application deadline
<p>iv. Requires any school seeking renewal to complete the state’s renewal application and follow the renewal application timeline required in state law.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: This sub-standard shall be marked as N/A for the Achievement School District and any authorizer that did not receive applications during the review term.</i> ● 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 in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence includes completed renewal applications for selected schools ● Satisfies: Evidence includes completed renewal applications for selected schools and evidence that the authorizer’s renewal process follows the state’s timeline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Application submitted to authorizer by April 1 of the year prior to the year in which the charter expires ○ Cumulative report submitted by authorizer to school three months prior to the application deadline ○ Renewal decision made on or before February 1 of the year in which the charter expires

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

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: For 2023 Only – Authorizers may submit a draft version of a renewal policy if not yet approved.</i> ● 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 ● Addresses: Evidence includes renewal policy that’s communicated to schools ● Satisfies: Evidence includes renewal policy that’s communicated to schools and requires analysis of the comprehensive body of objective evidence defined by the performance framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Body of evidence generally includes annual reports, high-stakes interim review, and cumulative report (may not be applicable if a school was previously authorized under the ASD) ○ If an authorizer implemented a renewal process during the review term, consider if the renewal policy aligns to the charter agreements for the selected schools ○ School leaders are aware of and/or can articulate the process for renewal
<p>ii. Defines and communicates with its schools the criteria for renewal and non-renewal decisions that are consistent with the charter agreement.</p>	<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 agreement for selected schools in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence includes defined criteria for renewal ● Satisfies: Evidence includes defined criteria for renewal that’s communicated to schools and consistent with the charter agreement for the selected schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ School leaders are aware of and/or can articulate the criteria for renewal ○ Criteria may be generally stated in the charter agreement with specific criteria included in a policy or process document
<p>iii. Grants renewal only to schools that have achieved the standards and targets stated in the charter agreement, are organizationally and fiscally</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: If the authorizer did not implement a renewal (or have schools in transition for the ASD) during the review term, this sub-standard is N/A.</i> ● <i>Note: If the authorizer received a renewal 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.</i>

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

<p>viable, and have been faithful to the terms of the contract and applicable law.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer grant renewal only to schools that meet the standards and targets stated in the charter agreement? ● 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, screenshot of board’s website, charter agreements for the selected schools in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence includes authorizer’s completed renewal application review and evidence of a decision for the selected schools that considered the school’s academic, financial, and organizational performance over the term ● Satisfies: Evidence includes all requirements listed in “addresses” and decision documentation for selected schools which demonstrate the decision-maker’s reasons for approval or denial were aligned to the terms of the agreement and the authorizer’s policy, and considered the school’s academic, financial, and organizational performance over the term
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not receive a renewal application (or have schools in transition for the ASD) during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A.</i> ● Guiding Question: Did the authorizer notify the selected school(s) of its renewal decision in writing and, if denied, provide the evidence-based reasons for denial and any available appeals rights within 10 days of the decision? ● Potential Evidence: decision letter, email communication ● Addresses: Evidence includes decision communication for the selected school(s) in Appendix B ● Satisfies: Evidence includes decision communication for the selected school(s) in Appendix B that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is delivered promptly in writing (within 10 calendar days of a decision to approve or deny) ○ Explains the available rights to an appeal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Schools authorized by the Charter Commission and the ASD do not have the right to appeal ○ Explains the evidence-based factors that determined the decision consistent with the criteria for renewal as defined by the authorizer (may be brief for approval decisions, must be detailed for denial; use discretion)
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not receive a renewal application (or have schools in transition for the ASD) during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A.</i> ● Guiding Question: Did the authorizer notify the public of its renewal decisions for the selected schools within a reasonable amount of time? ● Potential Evidence: public notice posting, press release, newsletter, direct communication, board meeting minutes, board meeting video, screenshot of board’s website with decision information for selected schools in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence includes public decision communication for selected 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

Unless otherwise stated, all documentation should fall within the review term of September 1, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Satisfies: Evidence includes public decision communication for selected schools that’s timely <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Timely” – 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) ○ In the case of a non-renewal, evidence should include additional communication beyond the decision to assist with parent and student choices for the upcoming school year (prior to July 1)
<p>vi. Does not make renewal decisions on the basis of political or community pressure or solely on promises of future improvement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not receive a renewal application (or have schools in transition for the ASD) during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A.</i> ● 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, link to board meeting recordings (with time stamps), decision communication, documentation of public comment for the selected schools in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates renewal decisions are not solely determined by political or community influence ● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates decisions for the selected schools rely on an evidence-based review, are consistent, and are not solely determined by political or community influence through the consideration of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommendation versus decision-makers vote ○ Recommendation versus collected public comment and decision-makers vote ○ Recommendation and decision are evidence-based and aligned to authorizer’s renewal criteria ○ Rationale of decision demonstrates alignment with expectations, an evidence-based review, and does not include evidence solely based on outside factors ○ Decision is not based on future promises of improvement or contingencies.

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"> ● <i>Note: For 2023 Only – Authorizers may submit a draft version of a revocation policy if not yet approved.</i> ● Guiding Questions: Has the authorizer established and communicated to schools a revocation policy? If a revocation was implemented during the review term, is the policy consistent with the charter agreement? ● Potential Evidence: revocation policy, communication with schools (can be communicated to all schools generally or specifically to selected school in Appendix B), charter agreements for selected school in Appendix B, if applicable ● Addresses: Evidence includes revocation policy that’s communicated to schools ● Satisfies: Evidence includes revocation policy that’s communicated to schools and is consistent with state law and the charter agreement (if implemented) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policy follows state timeline which requires authorizers to notify the school of the intent to revoke 30 days prior to any decision ○ Policy includes reasons for revocation in accordance with state law 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 as defined by the state’s accountability system ■ Shall revoke if the school receives identification as a priority school for two consecutive cycles ■ May revoke if the school commits a material violation of any conditions, standards or procedures set forth in the charter agreement, failed to meet or make sufficient progress toward the performance expectations set forth in the charter agreement, or failed to meet generally accepted standards of fiscal management ○ If an authorizer implemented its revocation process during the review term, consider if the revocation policy aligns to the charter agreements for the selected schools
<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"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not implement a revocation during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A.</i> ● <i>Note: If the authorizer received a revocation 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.</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the authorizer revoke a charter only for 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, screenshot of board’s website, charter agreements for the selected school in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence of a decision for the selected schools based on evidence

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Satisfies: Evidence of a decision for the selected schools based on evidence and is aligned to the reasons set forth in state law and the authorizer’s policy
<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"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not implement a revocation during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A.</i> ● Guiding Question: Did the authorizer notify the selected school(s) of its revocation decision in writing and, if denied, provide the evidence-based reasons for denial and any available appeals rights within 10 days of the decision? ● Potential Evidence: decision letter, email communication ● Addresses: Evidence includes decision communication for the selected school in Appendix B ● Satisfies: Evidence includes decision communication for the selected school in Appendix B that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is delivered promptly in writing (within 10 calendar days of a decision to approve or deny) ○ Explains the reasons for the decision (may be brief for approval decisions, must be detailed for denial; use discretion) ○ Explains the available rights to an appeal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Schools authorized by the Charter Commission and the ASD do not have the right to appeal
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not implement a revocation during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A.</i> ● Guiding Question: Did the authorizer notify the public of its revocation decision for the selected schools within a reasonable amount of time? ● Potential Evidence: public notice posting, press release, newsletter, direct communication, board meeting minutes, board meeting video, screenshot of board’s website with decision information for selected school in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence includes public communication of decision for selected schools ● Satisfies: Evidence includes public communication of decision for selected schools that’s timely and goes beyond the decision itself to assist parents and students with choices for upcoming school year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Timely” – 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, with consideration of when the revocation occurred)
<p>v. Does not make revocation decisions on the basis of political or community pressure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: If an authorizer did not implement a revocation during the review term, this sub-standard shall be N/A.</i> ● Guiding Question: Does the decision-maker make revocation decisions based on evidence-based reasons rather than political or community pressure? ● Potential Evidence: board meeting minutes, link to board meeting recordings (with time stamps), decision communication, documentation of public comment for the selected school in Appendix B ● Addresses: Evidence demonstrates revocation decisions are not solely determined by political or community influence

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, 2021 through August 31, 2023.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Satisfies: Evidence demonstrates decisions for the selected schools rely on an evidence-based review, are consistent, and are not solely determined by political or community influence through the consideration of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommendation versus decision-makers vote ○ Recommendation versus collected public comment and decision-makers vote ○ Recommendation and decision are evidence-based and aligned to state law ○ Rationale of decision demonstrates alignment with expectations, an evidence-based review, and does not include evidence solely based on outside factors ○ Decision is not based on future promises of improvement or contingencies.
--	--

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

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Note: 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.</i> ● <i>Note: Assessment of closure requirements within the charter agreement is conducted in standard 3. This sub-standard focuses on policy/procedure and implementation.</i> ● Potential Evidence: authorizer’s closure policy/procedure (a copy of the TDOE guidance document shall not be accepted), closure documentation, evidence of communication with families, and charter agreements for selected school in Appendix B, if applicable ● Addresses: Closure policy/procedure meets at least 2 of the criteria in this sub-standard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 ● Satisfies: Closure policy/procedure meets all criteria of this sub-standard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If implemented during the review term, documentation demonstrates that the procedure was followed for the selected 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