



TENNESSEE
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

AUTHORIZER EVALUATIONS

AUTHORIZER ORIENTATION

AUGUST 26, 2021

INTRODUCTIONS

- Name, Authorizing Office, Role
- What do you want to learn today?

AGENDA

- Evaluation History
- 2021 Evaluation Timeline
- Overview of Process
 - Evidence Base
 - Review Process
- Process Q&A
- Next Steps

EVALUATION HISTORY

EVALUATIONS IN TENNESSEE

- In 2019, the General Assembly amended T.C.A. § 49-13-145, charging the State Board with the responsibility of ensuring the effective operation of authorizers in the state and evaluating authorizer quality.
- In Fall 2020, the State Board implemented a pilot of its evaluation process with Metro Nashville Public Schools and the Achievement School District.
- In February 2021, the State Board finalized its [rule](#) on charter school authorizer evaluations and the rule became effective on July 12, 2021.
- In March 2021, the State Board updated all [evaluation documents](#) for the 2021 cycle.
- The Fall 2021 evaluations will be the first formal evaluation cycle.

EVALUATION COHORTS

Tennessee authorizers will be evaluated in the following sequence:

Cohort 1 beginning in Fall 2021:

- Knox County Schools
- Hamilton County Board of Education
- Shelby County Schools

Cohort 2 beginning in Fall 2022:

- Achievement School District
- Metro Nashville Public Schools
- Tennessee Public Charter School Commission

NOTE: Cohorts will not change regardless of evaluation outcomes.

EVALUATION TIMELINE

2021 CYCLE

2021 FULL TIMELINE

- **August 26:** Orientation for authorizers (today)
- **Sept. 1 – Oct. 15:** Document submission window
- **October 25-26:** Evaluator Training
- **November 1:** Evaluation #1 begins
- **November 15:** Evaluation #2 begins
- **November 29:** Evaluation #3 begins
- **Mid-December:** Draft reports shared with authorizers
- **January 1:** Non-Evaluation Year Self-Assessment due
- **Mid-January:** Evaluation reports finalized
- **February 4:** Ratings approved at State Board meeting

EVALUATION WEEK TIMELINE

Days 1-2

- Evaluation Team conducts document review and completes preliminary ratings

Day 3

- Evaluation Team holds pre-consensus meeting
- Evaluation Team interviews charter school leaders

Day 4

- Evaluation Team meets with Authorizer for Documentation Debrief*
- Evaluation Team holds consensus meeting

Day 5

- Evaluation Team Lead meets with Authorizer for report out of preliminary ratings*
- Evaluation Team Lead begins drafting evaluation report

OVERVIEW OF PROCESS

EVIDENCE BASE

During the evaluation, the Evaluation Team shall consider:

- **Documents** submitted by the authorizer during the submission window;
- **Narrative** explanations submitted by the authorizer during the submission window;
- Clarifications and explanations provided by the authorizer during the **Document Debrief**;
- Supporting narrative shared during the **School Leader Interview**; and
- **Appeals history**, as applicable.

EVIDENCE BASE: DOCUMENTS

ESTABLISHED PRACTICES

Office Capacity:

- Authorizer's or organization's strategic plan (that mentions chartering), Authorizer's charter school policies, Organizational chart, Authorizing staff job descriptions (list any/all additional job responsibilities), Bios and resumes of staff members (and contractors), Relevant staff or board meeting minutes and/or emails, Professional development materials, Conflict of interest policy, Signed conflict of interest statements, Authorizing-related budget (includes expenditures and revenues), Financial audits

Authorization / Application:

- Application rubric, Reviewer protocols, Interview information Link to application guide and process. List of application reviewers (noting school system staff and external consultants), Bios and resumes of reviewers, Completed application review reports, Meeting minutes and/or emails

EVIDENCE BASE: DOCUMENTS

ESTABLISHED PRACTICES (CONT'D)

Contracting:

- Individual school contracts

Oversight:

- Compliance requirements/compliance reporting calendar, Site visit protocol, Site visit reports, School financial audits, Intervention policy Annual reports, Evidence of authorizer sharing annual reports with the public, Evidence of the authorizer reviewing academic, financial, and operational performance of its schools

Renewal:

- Renewal policy, Revocation application & expectations, Evidence of any renewal or termination decisions

EVIDENCE BASE: DOCUMENTS

IMPLEMENTATION

Authorizers submit implementation documents based on a random selection process.

Selection Process

- State Board compiles list of charter applications, charter schools in operation, renewals, revocations, and closures by authorizer.
- State Board shares list with authorizer and asked for verification of data.
- State Board uses a [random list generator](#) to select the top one or two schools on the randomized list in each category.
- State Board shares [Appendix B: Selected Schools List](#) with authorizer and review team to identify selected schools and aligned standards.

EVIDENCE BASE: DOCUMENTS

IMPLEMENTATION (CONT'D)

Selection Categories

- New School Applications: Set of application materials from two applicants who have gone through the application process (within last 2 years)
- Agreements: In-force agreements from two operational (regardless of # of years)
- Operational:
 - Set of all oversight documentation from one or two pre five-year review schools
 - Set of all oversight documentation from one post five-year review school (if any)
- Renewals: Set of renewal materials from two schools who have gone through the renewal process (within last 2 years)
- Revocations: Set of revocation materials from one school (if within last 2 years)
- Closure: Set of closure materials from one school (if within last 2 years)

EVIDENCE BASE: DOCUMENTS

SELECTED SCHOOLS

Category	Hamilton	Knox	Shelby
Applications (2)	Ivy Academy's Skillern Elementary School and Chattanooga Charter School of Excellence HS	N/A	Memphis School of Excellence Cordova and Bluff City Collegiate Charter School
Agreements (2)	Ivy Academy, Inc. and Chattanooga Girls Leadership Academy	Emerald Academy	Perea Elementary School and KIPP Memphis Collegiate Middle
Operational Docs (1) *pre five-year	Chattanooga Charter School of Excellence	N/A	Freedom Prep Academy Westwood Elem at Parkrose
Operational Docs (1) *post five-year	Ivy Academy, Inc.	Emerald Academy	Memphis Academy of Health Sciences
Renewal (2)	Chattanooga Charter School of Excellence	N/A	Power Center Academy High School – Hickory Hill and Circles of Success Learning Academy
Revocation (1)	N/A	N/A	Southwest Early College High
Closure (1)	N/A	N/A	Aster College Prep

EVIDENCE BASE: NARRATIVE

The narrative form is an opportunity for an authorizer to rate their uploaded evidence/ documentation. In it the authorizer can describe how the documentation supports their rating.

Characteristics:

- Rates every substandard
- Add a corresponding explanation identifying the evidence that supports the rating
 - Documents should be referred by their number and name in BOX Ex: **1. SBE Application Evaluator Review Guide**
 - Documents referenced within the narrative should be bolded
- Saved as a PDF
- Uploaded into Narratives folder in BOX

Standard 1a - Planning and Commitment to Excellence		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Supports and advances the purposes of charter school law.					
ii.	Ensures that the authorizer's local board of education or authorizing board, leadership, and staff understand and are committed to the quality charter authorizing principles and standards and developing as authorizing professionals.					
iii.	Defines external relationships and lines of authority to protect its authorizing functions from conflicts of interest and political influence.					
iv.	Implements policies, processes, and practices that streamline and systematize its work toward stated goals, and executes its duties efficiently while minimizing administrative burdens on schools.					
v.	Evaluates its work regularly against national and state standards for quality authorizing and recognized effective practices, and develops and implements timely plans for improvement when necessary.					
vi.	States a clear mission for quality authorizing.					
vii.	Makes authorizing decisions that will result in positive student outcomes, in accordance with state law.					
						Standard Rating
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						
i.						
ii.						
iii.						
iv.						
v.						
vi.						
vii.						

EVIDENCE BASE: NARRATIVE

TIPS AND TRICKS

Narratives SHOULD:

- Rate every sub-standard
- Use the explanation to describe the evidence that justifies the ratings

Narratives SHOULD NOT:

- Restate the sub-standard language
- Describe practices/expectations not included in the documentation

When organizing documents and narratives, make it as logical as you can by:

- Labeling each document with a number and name and ordering them in alignment with the order of the standards.
- Include page numbers in the narrative that direct reviewers to the exact document pages that align with the rating.

EVIDENCE BASE: DOCUMENT DEBRIEF

Overview:

- An opportunity for the authorizer to identify how the submitted documentation aligns with the criteria within the [Evaluation Rubric](#).
- Authorizers set the agenda by identifying the standards they would like to discuss and use their time to clarify and/or further explain their documentation and its alignment to the Evaluation Rubric.

Participants:

- The authorizer may choose up to five individuals to participate.
- Typical participants include staff members or consultants who have actively implemented the organization's authorizing responsibilities.
- Charter school staff should not participate in the documentation debrief.

EVIDENCE BASE: SCHOOL LEADER INTERVIEW

Overview:

- An opportunity for charter school leaders from the authorizer's portfolio to respond to questions regarding their authorizer's expectations and practices.
- Limited to one hour.
- Optional to participate.

Participants:

- School Leaders and Evaluation Team

EVIDENCE BASE: APPEALS HISTORY

Overview:

- A review of any relevant appeals during the review cycle that further demonstrate implementation of an established process.
- Authorizers will not be required to upload any documentation regarding an appeal. The Evaluation Team will receive the Executive Director's Findings and Recommendation and final vote on an appeal, as applicable.

REVIEW PROCESS: EVALUATION TEAM

- The Evaluation Team consists of 3 reviewers per evaluation, a Lead and 2 team members, which will include:
 - State Board Staff
 - Non-Evaluation Year Authorizer
 - SchoolWorks Consultant
- Non-Evaluation Year Authorizers shall receive additional information about serving on an evaluation team in the coming weeks. The opportunity will initially be available to one (1) staff member per authorizer for Fall 2021.

REVIEW PROCESS: CODE OF CONDUCT

Carry out work with integrity.

- Treat all those you encounter with courtesy and sensitivity. Try to minimize stress.
- Allay anxiety through mutual respect and valuing opinions. Show an interest in what is said/presented.
- Focus attention and questions on topics that will reveal the quality of an authorizer's practices.

Act in the best interests of authorizers.

- Do not put participants in a position where they may have conflicting loyalties.
- Evaluations are confidential until their public release.
- Try to understand what authorizers are doing and why. Be supportive.

Be objective; base findings on evidence, not opinion.

- Evaluations must be robust, fully supported by evidence, defensible, and must inform the ratings.
- Evaluations must be reliable in that others would make the same conclusion from the same evidence.

REVIEW PROCESS: TIMELINE

Days 1-2

- Evaluation Team conducts document review and completes preliminary ratings

Day 3

- Evaluation Team holds pre-consensus meeting
- Evaluation Team interviews charter school leaders

Day 4

- Evaluation Team meets with Authorizer for Documentation Debrief
- Evaluation Team holds consensus meeting

Day 5

- Evaluation Team Lead meets with Authorizer for report out of preliminary ratings
- Evaluation Team Lead begins drafting evaluation report

Rubric

Planning and Commitment to Excellence		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Supports and advances the purposes of charter school law.					
ii.	Ensures that the authorizer's local board of education or authorizing board, leadership, and staff understand and are committed to the quality charter authorizing principles and standards and developing as authorizing professionals.					
iii.	Defines external relationships and lines of authority to protect its authorizing functions from conflicts of interest and political influence.					
iv.	Implements policies, processes, and practices that streamline and systematize its work toward stated goals, and executes its duties efficiently while minimizing administrative burdens on schools.					
v.	Evaluates its work regularly against national and state standards for quality authorizing and recognized effective practices, and develops and implements timely plans for improvement when necessary.					
vi.	States a clear mission for quality authorizing.					
vii.	Makes authorizing decisions that will result in positive student outcomes, in accordance with state law.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						

Evaluative Comments:

i.

ii.

iii.

iv.

v.

vi.

vii.

REVIEW PROCESS: RATINGS & EVALUATIVE COMMENTS

Ratings: When determining the rating for a sub-standard, the evaluation team considers:

- Whether the authorizer has explained practices in the documentation debrief or narrative;
- Whether documentation addresses the sub-standard; and
- Whether the documentation satisfies 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 less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Evaluative Comments:

- Every sub-standard will have an evaluative comment which explains the key evidence or lack thereof used to determine the rating.

Standard 1a - Planning		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Supports and advances the purposes of charter school law.		1			
ii.	Ensures that the authorizer's local board of education or authorizing board, leadership, and staff understand and are committed to the quality charter authorizing principles and standards and developing as authorizing professionals.	0				
iii.	Defines external relationships and lines of authority to protect its authorizing functions from conflicts of interest and political influence.			2		
iv.	Implements policies, processes, and practices that streamline and systematize its work toward stated goals, and executes its duties efficiently while minimizing administrative burdens on schools.				3	
v.	Evaluates its work regularly against national and state standards for quality authorizing and recognized effective practices, and develops and implements timely plans for improvement when necessary.					4
vi.	States a clear mission for quality authorizing.		1			
vii.	Makes authorizing decisions that will result in positive student outcomes, in accordance with state law.		1			
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Qualitative Comments:						
i.						
ii.						
iii.						
iv.						
v.						
vi.						
vii.						

Standard 1a - Planning and Commitment to Excellence		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Supports and advances the purposes of charter school law.		1			
ii.	Ensures that the authorizer’s local board of education or authorizing board, leadership, and staff understand and are committed to the quality charter authorizing principles and standards and developing as authorizing professionals.	0				
iii.	Defines external relationships and lines of authority to protect its authorizing functions from conflicts of interest and political influence.			2		
iv.	Implements policies, processes, and practices that streamline and systematize its work toward stated goals, and executes its duties efficiently while minimizing administrative burdens on schools.				3	
v.	Evaluates its work regularly against national and state standards for quality authorizing and recognized effective practices, and develops and implements timely plans for improvement when necessary.					4
vi.	States a clear mission for quality authorizing.		1			
vii.	Makes authorizing decisions that will result in positive student outcomes, in accordance with state law.		1			
<i>Standard Rating</i>						1.71

Evaluative Comments:

i.
ii.
iii.
iv.
v.
vi.
vii.

Standard rating is the average of the substandard ratings
 Ex: Standard 1a has 7 sub-standards. Add up all ratings and divide by the number of sub-standards.
 $0+1+1+1+2+3+4 = 12$ $12 \div 7 = 1.71$

Standard		Rating (0-4)	Average
1a	Planning and Commitment to Excellence	1.2	2.37
1b		2.4	
1c		3.5	
2a	Rigorous Decision Making	1.1	2.17
2b		4.0	
2c		3.3	
2d		2.1	
2e		2.0	
2f		Elements for Applicants Proposing to Contract with Educational Service Providers, including Charter Management Organizations (if applicable)	
3a	Charter Agreement Term, Negotiation, and Execution	1.2	1.74
3b	Rights and Responsibilities	2.4	
3c	Performance Standards	3.5	
3d	Provisions for Educational Service Provider (ESP) Contracts (if applicable)	0.5	
3e	ESP Contracts Additional Provisions.	1.1	
4a	Performance Evaluation and Compliance Monitoring	4.0	2.52
4b	Respecting School Autonomy	3.3	
4c	Protecting Student Rights	2.1	
4d	School Intervention	2.0	
4e	Public Reporting	1.2	
5a	Closure	2.4	2.3
5b		3.5	
5c		0.5	
5d		1.1	
5e		4.0	
6a	Advanced Standard (Bonus)	3	3
		Overall Rating	2.33

Category rating is the average of the standard ratings
 Ex: Standard 1 has 3 sub-standards. Add up ratings and divide by number of sub-standards.
 $1.2+2.4+3.5 = 7.1$ $7.1 \div 3 = 2.37$

Overall rating is the average of the standard ratings
 Ex: Add up all ratings and divide by 24 standards (6a is bonus)
 $55.9/24 = 2.33$

OVERALL RATINGS

Score	Rating
3.5 – 4.0	Exemplary
3.0 – 3.49	Commendable
2.0 – 2.99	Satisfactory
1.0 – 1.99	Approaching Satisfactory
0 – 0.99	Unsatisfactory/Incomplete

REVIEW PROCESS: ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE

- The [Additional Guidance](#) is primarily designed to aid evaluators in reviewing documentation submitted by an authorizer against each sub-standard.
- The document is helpful for authorizers to see how the sub-standards have been further defined.
- The intention of this document is for it to evolve based on learnings from each evaluation cycle and has been updated since the pilot evaluations.

REVIEW PROCESS: ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE *EXAMPLE*

NOTE: Unless stated otherwise, documentation should fall between September 1, 2019 and August 31, 2021

Standard 1a - Planning and Commitment to Excellence

Sub-standards

i. Supports and advances the purposes of charter school law.

- **Potential Evidence:** new school application, intervention policy/procedure, renewal policy/procedure, revocation policy/procedure
- **Addresses:** "Supports": The authorizer's evidence addresses the charter school law directly or via their authorized charter schools. T.C.A. [49-13-102](#):
 - 1) Improve learning for all students and close the achievement gap between high and low students;
 - 2) Provide options for parents to meet educational needs of students;
 - 3) Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods, and provide greater decision-making authority to schools and teachers in exchange for greater responsibility for student performance;
 - 4) Measure performance of pupils and faculty, and ensure that children have the opportunity to reach proficiency on state academic assessments;
 - 5) Create new professional opportunities for teachers; and
 - 6) Afford parents substantial meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children.
- **Satisfies:**
 - "Advancing" purposes: ex: communicating a new school application process.
 - Not "advancing" purposes: ex: not approving new application, not offering expansion to high performing 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 less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

iii. Defines external relationships and lines of authority to protect its authorizing functions from conflicts of interest and political influence.

- **Potential Evidence:** Conflict of Interest policy/procedure, signed statements, and organizational chart.
- **Addresses:** evidence shows an attempt to address conflicts of interest.
- **Satisfies:**
 - Conflict of interest policy/procedure must specifically address authorizing. Signed conflict of interest statements, rather than a policy/procedure, are acceptable.

PROCESS Q&A

Q: HOW SHOULD WE ASSEMBLE OUR EVIDENCE?

There are a possibilities here:

- Start with the Additional Guidance
- Start with the Rubric
- Others?

Q: WHERE DO WE SUBMIT OUR DOCUMENTATION?

Upload process documents, required school implementation documents, and the narrative form to your folder on Box

Name	Updated	Size	Sharing	Details
1. Charter School Intervention Policy.docx	Today by Ali Gaffey	11.1 KB	Collaborators Invite People	
2. Charter School Renewal Application.docx	Today by Ali Gaffey	11.1 KB	Shared Link Create Link	
3. Charter Office Org Chart.docx	Today by Ali Gaffey	11.2 KB	File Request Create Link	

Q: DO WE NEED TO BUNDLE DOCUMENTS BY STANDARD?

- No, please create one singular list of documents in the submission folder on Box.
- The documents should be labeled with a number and name of your choice.
- For example:
 - 1. STEM Prep Charter Agreement
 - 2. FY20 Authorizing Budget
 - 3. SY19-20 Annual Authorizer Report

Q: WHAT IF WE DIDN'T GO THROUGH A PROCESS DURING THE REVIEW TERM?

- We know that some authorizers have not implemented or did not have any schools up for renewal, revocation, closure, etc. during their two-year review term.
- Upload the process documents and make note of why there aren't any implementation documents in the narrative form. You will not be scored for the implementation of that process.

Q: WHAT HAPPENS IF WE RECEIVE A RATING BELOW “SATISFACTORY”?

- State Board [Rule](#) and [Policy](#) outline the next steps for each overall rating, including the additional requirements for those who earn “Approaching Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory/Incomplete”.
- Additional requirements can include:
 - Completion of a [Corrective Action Plan](#) (CAP)
 - Submission of documentation demonstrating completion of a CAP
 - Requirement to participate in another authorizer evaluation the year immediately following a rating of “Unsatisfactory/Incomplete”
- Failure to complete the requirements and timelines outlined in the CAP or earning an overall rating of “Unsatisfactory/Incomplete” during two (2) consecutive evaluation years may result in a reduction in authorizer fees.

Q. WHAT'S EXPECTED OF NON-EVALUATION YEAR AUTHORIZERS?

- Authorizers who are in a Non-Evaluation Year must submit their completed [self-assessment](#) by January 1, 2022.
- The completed self-assessment and your Annual Authorizer Report shall be submitted to the State Board via email.
- Non-Evaluation Year authorizers may also opt in to serving as a member of an Evaluation Team for one of the three authorizers this Fall.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS?

NEXT STEPS

NEXT STEPS

Evaluation Year Authorizers:

- Check your inbox on September 1 for an email with your Box folder link and to schedule your evaluation week
- Upload documentation to your Box folder between September 1 and 4:30pm Central on October 15

Non-Evaluation Year Authorizers:

- Check your inbox on September 1 for an invite to participate as an evaluator
- Begin preparing for your self-assessment (Due January 1)