



Georgia Charter School Authorizer Evaluation

District Authorizer Evaluation Rubric | 2025

District Name: Atlanta Public Schools

Reviewer Name: Morgan Powell & LaMarius Moultrie Agbaje

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Evaluation Rubric

Authorizer Name: Atlanta Public Schools

Date: August 2025

SUMMARY	RATING
Category I. Authorizer Commitment & Capacity	
1. Human Resources	EX
2. Financial Resources	EX
Category II. The Petition Process	
3. Petition Application	EX
4. Petition Review	EX
5. Petition Decisions	AD
Category III. Performance Contracting	
6. Pre-Opening Period	AD
7. Performance Standards	EX
8. Contract Terms and Agreements	EX
9. Authorizer Obligations	EX
Category IV. Oversight and Evaluation	
10. Compliance Monitoring	EX
11. Intervention	EX
12. Upholds Charter School Autonomy	EX
Category V. Renewal and Termination	
13. Renewal Process	EX
14. Renewal Decisions	EX
15. Closure/Termination	EX
OVERALL RATING	EX

OVERALL RATING CRITERIA	
Rating	Criteria
Needs Improvement (NI)	Earned a majority NI (8 or more) across all standards
Adequate (AD)	Earned any combination of ratings across standards except as designated for NI or E
Exemplary (EX)	Earned a majority E (8 or more) and no NI across all standards
First Time Authorizer (FTA)	Charter authorizer in its first year of authorizing

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Category I. Authorizer Commitment & Capacity

Standard 1. Human Resources. The authorizer identifies appropriate personnel to carry out its authorizing obligations, including the point(s) of contact who will coordinate charter school support.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer has dedicated staff to supporting the charter schools in its portfolio. Whether staff are dedicated solely to charter school authorizing or have other duties, sufficient staff time and resources are allocated for the authorizer to fulfill its obligations, in light of the number of schools in the portfolio.	Authorizer currently has 8 FTE with a staff to school ratio of 1:2.5. There is a note in that FTE will drop to 4 in SY25-26 changing the staff to school ratio to 1:4.75 *		N/A	Y
Taken together, staff have adequate experience in charter authorizing or other relevant experience (e.g., education accountability, school funding and finance, education law and legal compliance).	M. Underwood – ED since 2019, charter school principal for 12 years, teacher, M.Ed W. Angelety – charter and district finance, state policy, org management T. Garcia – teacher, M.Ed S. Goldsmith – policy, paralegal, M.S in criminal justice N. Khan – special education teacher, M.Ed, Ed.S C. Melvin – B.S. Computer Information Systems, M.S. Curriculum Instruction and Technology C. Velde-Cabrera – teacher, principal, central office leader, ed. Administration, M.Ed J. Walker – business, project management		N/A	Y
The roles and responsibilities of the authorizing office cover key responsibilities in a coherent structure, specifically: - Petition receipt and review, - Oversight of academic, financial, and operational performance, and - Designated point of contact for charter stakeholder inquiries.	Petition receipt and review: Shonda Oversight: Wendy (finance), Taylor (accountability reporting), Nick (SpEd), Chad (Operations) Point of Contact: all staff, escalated issues go to Matt APS Org: Matt, Corliss (tech)		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

<i>Districts:</i> Board members attend trainings on principals and standards. (GA Code § 20-2-2063.3)	N/A for 2025	N/A for 2025	N/A for 2025	Y (N/A for 2025)
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	EX
Evaluator Comments: *The drop in FTE dedicated to authorizing could impact on APS's capacity to implement quality authorizing practices.				

Standard 2. Financial Resources. Pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 20-2-2068.1 and O.C.G.A. § 20-2-2089, the authorizer allocates the required financial resources to support charter schools, treats charter schools no less favorably than other local schools within the system unless otherwise provided by law, and provides transparency on the availability and allocation of charter school funding.				
Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer clearly publishes and shares the calculation of current and anticipated public funding for each charter school in accordance with law, specifically: - GaDOE/SBOE/SCSC- district allotment sheets - Local Districts- allotment sheet itemizing the calculation of state, local and federal allocations to be provided.	This information is published on the website here .		N/A	Y
Budget allocations for the school reflect an administrative fee that aligns with the charter contract and applicable law.	APS withhold is 2% - lower than the 3% withhold as dictated by law.		N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes a budget reflecting the total amount received from any authorizing fees and other sources, and how those funds are allocated internally. The authorizer publishes the administrative services provided based on the administrative fees withheld.	This information is published on the website here .		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Category II. The Petition Process

Standard 3. Petition Application. The authorizer publishes a written petition application in accordance with state requirements and timelines. The authorizer provides reasonable and timely technical assistance and is responsive to petitioner questions.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer publishes petition materials (application, timelines, process and guidance) online in an easy-to- find location.	All petition materials can be found on this webpage .		N/A	Y
The authorizer clearly articulates petition requirements. Requirements are focused on written content rather than form (i.e. application length, font size, etc.).	The local petition and addendum include page limitations and format requirements but is focused on written content.		N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes times and locations for petition submission that are reasonable and easy to be met by the petitioner.	Due date is published on the website here . Instructions on how to submit the petition via Dropbox or Google Drive with a deadline is provided to the applicant. For the recent cycle the due date was March 10, 2025. The letter of intent was due December 6, 2024.		N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes staff contact information for technical assistance.	Contact information can be found within the APS Addendum (pg 6).		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Standard 4. Petition Review. The authorizer conducts petition review in accordance with state requirements. The petition review includes an evaluation team of no fewer than three individuals with diverse expertise, with at least one of the individuals having charter school experience.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The petition evaluation team includes at least three individuals that have varied and relevant skills and backgrounds (i.e. education, finance, school governance, charter experience) trained in petition review or have completed a relevant training).	The recent application cycle included one capacity interview. There were 7 individuals on the evaluation team with varied expertise. APS hosts an orientation for reviewers.	Laura Lashley from the law firm of Parker Poe reviews all charter petitions and contracts.	N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes the petition evaluation criteria and the requirements for petition approval on the authorizer's website.	The common rubric is found on the website here .		N/A	Y
The review process includes an interview.	Documentation provided demonstrates that an interview occurs.		N/A	Y
Petition review and interview process are free of conflict of interest.	Authorizer provided signed copies of COI form for recent application cycle here.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	EX

Evaluator Comments:

Standard 5. Petition Decisions. The authorizer grants charters only to petitioners that have demonstrated competence and capacity to succeed in all aspects of the school, including a strong plan for improving student opportunities and outcomes. The authorizer makes petition decisions that are free from conflicts of interest.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
Board decision to approve or deny an application is made by the board within 90 days of receiving the complete application (GA Code § 20-2-2064)	In 2023 the board decision was made September 5, 2023. Petitions were due March 2023, not meeting the 90 day requirement however the school and board granted an extension		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

	In 2024, the board decision was made June 3, 2024. Petitions were due March 13, 2024 meeting the 90 day window.			
Authorization decisions are based on evidence tied to the petition evaluation criteria, applicable accountability metrics, and legal requirements.	The petition decision for Tapestry Public Charter School in 2023 cites several reasons why it was not awarded a charter: (1) Impacts on School Enrollment on District-Run Schools; (2) Staffing Shortages; and (3) Demographic Concerns. Reason 3 can be tied to the petition evaluation criteria (see Legal Attendance Zone section) however reasons 1 and 2 are not included in the criteria. A similar finding was made for the 2024 application from Tapestry Public Charter School.	Per APS “We do not keep individual completed petition evaluation rubrics following the end of the appeal period.” Therefore, petition evaluation criteria and final decision letters were used to determine ratings.	N/A	N
If denied, petitioner is provided a written detailed description of deficiencies and information about how to reapply in the future.	Authorizer provides written detailed description of deficiencies. While communication does not include specific language about how to reapply – materials submitted demonstrated that one school reapplied following a denial in 2023 therefore indicating an understanding of a denied petitioner's ability to reapply.	Per APS: This invitation to re-apply would be in the email to a denied petitioner. Authorizer provided an example email.	N/A	Y
In the case of denied applications, the authorizer provides the applicant with detailed feedback to provide a public record of why the applicant was denied and assist the applicant if it wants to reapply in the future.	See above.		N/A	Y
Recommendations are shared with petitioners at least one week prior to the authorizing board meeting.		Per APS: “Petition recommendations are shared when the board meeting agenda is publicly posted. For example, meeting notice posted Sept 1 for Sept 5 board meeting at which petition recommendation was presented.”	N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4-5	AD
Evaluator Comments:				

Category III. Performance Contracting

Standard 6. Pre-Opening Period. The authorizer establishes clear and necessary, but not overly burdensome expectations for the pre-opening period including, but not limited to, expectations regarding facilities, student enrollment and board development.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer has a pre-opening checklist or other process that clearly communicates to schools what key readiness requirements must be met to open. The checklist or process includes adequate timelines, deliverables, responsible parties, and notes which criteria may defer opening.	Pre-opening checklist submitted. Checklist includes tasks and timelines are included. The document is written in a way that indicates the school is the responsible party. A notes section includes additional guidance. There isn't language in the documents provided about what criteria may defer opening. The charter contract does include language for Pre-Opening Suspension (Section 24) should the Charter School fail to comply with any material provisions set forth that requires compliance prior to opening.	Per APS: "Concern about securing a facility and/or about hitting at least 50% enrollment targets could defer opening and would be communicated to schools if concerns arise during the pre-opening period." "Exact due dates would be communicated to a school and tailored to the specifics of the school's schedule for opening. The checklist provided gives general guidelines."	N/A	Y
Pre-opening expectations specify facility requirements that include, GaDOE Facilities Division sign off, obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy and submitting an Emergency Plan to required agencies.	Facilities category included in the pre-opening checklist. This section addresses GaDOE sign off, obtaining		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

	a Certificate of Occupancy and Emergency Plan.			
Pre-opening expectations specify student enrollment requirements including a minimum and maximum threshold to operate.	Enrollment is addressed under the Operations and Fiscal Management section of the pre-opening checklist. Charter schools must finalize a budget based on expected enrollment. There is no inclusion of student enrollment requirements that include a minimum and maximum threshold to operate.	See comment above.	N/A	N
Pre-opening expectations specify board development requirements including required trainings, policy development and operational oversight procedures.	There is a governance section within the pre-opening checklist. This section addresses required trainings, policy development and operational oversight procedures.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments:				

Standard 7. Performance Standards. The authorizer, through the performance contract, establishes high academic, financial, and operational performance standards under which schools will be evaluated, using objective and verifiable measures of student achievement and growth as the primary measure of school quality.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
Performance standards are included or referenced in the performance contract. These include clearly defined targets, thresholds or goals for each evaluation measure.	Current contracts can be found here on the website. Appendix A on all contracts include performance standards.		N/A	Y
Evaluation measures allow for annual review.	Contract frames performance expectations with the following language “during each year of its charter contract term”		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Data sources used to evaluate performance are objective and verifiable.	Section I: Academic – CCRPI & State Accountability Section II: School Climate – Climate Star Rating Section III: Financial Performance – financial reports, audits Section IV: Operational Performance – compliance reporting Section V: Governance Performance – compliance reporting		N/A	Y
The authorizer measures academic performance using a framework that includes clearly defined expectations for: • Student achievement • Student progress measures Expectations consider ALL students, including students with special needs, students with disabilities, and English Learners.	Section I of the performance framework relates to Academic performance and includes indicators for Student Achievement and Growth and State and Federal Accountability Systems. Subgroup performance is embedded in CCRPI.*		N/A	Y
Financial, operational and governance standards are grounded in best practice. Standards in these areas that are in addition to legal requirements are reasonable and not overly burdensome.	Standards are grounded in best practice.	APS provides a feedback survey to charter school leaders each year that includes responding to the prompt “The Office of Charter + Partner Schools has minimized as much as possible your school’s administrative and reporting burdens.”	N/A	Y
The authorizer measures financial performance standards that enable the authorizer to assess and monitor schools’ financial viability. These include clearly defined metric and targets to assess near-term performance and long-term financial sustainability.	Financial Performance Standards as published in the annual report (pg. 33) include metrics and targets for near term and sustainability.		N/A	Y
Operational standards include measures in the following areas: educational program compliance, financial oversight, governance and transparency, protecting the rights of students and employees, and ensuring a safe school environment.	Operational standards published in the annual report (pg 36) include measures in education program, students and employees, and school environment. There is a separate		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

	section that addresses Governance Performance (pg 40)			
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-5	6-7	EX
Evaluator Comments: * While the CCRPI captures subgroup performance, this performance is rolled in with other performance data. As a result, it is harder to discern how an individual campuses' subgroups are performing. It is the evaluator's recommendation that APS include a distinct measure around the performance of English Learners and Students with Disabilities.				

Standard 8. Contract Terms and Agreements. The authorizer executes an initial contract for a term of five years that clearly outlines the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer. Agreements related to funding or in-kind services not required by OGGA §20-2-2068.1 or §20-2-2089 or that are not included in the charter contract, must be negotiated and executed in writing and signed by the local authorizer and charter school (for local charter schools) or the State Charter Schools Commission and state charter school (for state charter schools).

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
Executes a contract with a legally incorporated, nonprofit governing board independent of the authorizer			N/A	Y
Initial contract terms are five years as stated in 691-2-.01 of the State Charter Schools Commission of Georgia.	Original contracts submitted demonstrate initial terms of 5 years.		N/A	Y
The performance contract details the rights and responsibilities of each party regarding school autonomy, funding, oversight, performance measures, and consequences for not meeting performance measures and material terms.	Appendix B includes "Roles and Responsibilities Chart" that details the rights and responsibilities of the charter school nonprofit governing board, charter school management, local school district, etc. Related to autonomy, funding, oversight and performance measures. Consequences for not meeting performance measures mentioned in Appendix A of charter contract and include intervention, probation, termination or non-renewal.		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

The authorizer provides adequate and appropriate guidance to schools regarding what kinds of programmatic or operational changes constitute material changes that require authorizer approval.	Section 28 directly speaks to charter amendments. Material changes related to the Education Service Provider are described in section 17b of the charter contract and include a description as to what a material change is and the process to provide notice to the State and Local Board. Section 3 indicates that changes to the grade range or enrollment would require an amendment. Documentation did not indicate how the authorizer provides guidance regarding programmatic changes or operational changes (beyond ESP changes or enrollment) that require approval.	Per APS: "We would typically consider any changes to elements specifically listed in the charter contract (Essential/Innovative Features, attendance zone, enrollment priorities, etc.) as ones that would necessitate an amendment to the charter contract in order to be implemented. We also consult with the state (previously GaDOE, now the Commission) as to whether an amendment would be needed since they are also parties to the charter contract."	N/A	Y
Specific services provided by the authorizer are negotiated and agreed to by both parties and are outlined in a separate written contract or service agreement, if applicable.	Section 15.h and Appendix C reference and include in-kind service agreements related to Federal Funding. Buy-back services are described on the website here and includes a guide. Per the website, the Office of Charter + Partner Schools facilitate the buy-back services program but does not directly contract with schools.		N/A	Y
Contract and/or related agreements establish equitable per-pupil funding terms or amounts as required by state law.	Section 15c of charter contract.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Standard 9. Authorizer Obligations. The authorizer follows all authorizing obligations outlined in law, State Board Rule, and the charter contract.				
Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer's contracts include or refer to the state and federal laws and other legal requirements the school must meet.	Section 33 of the contract and also included in Appendix A – Charter Accountability and Consequences.		N/A	Y
A local board of education authorizer makes unused facilities (as defined by 20-2-2068.2 (h)(2)) available to local charters. The SCSC follows guidelines from the state properties commission.		Per APS: "Petitioners are directed to the district's inventory of unused facilities maintained by the APS Facilities department. If interested, the APS Property Management team facilitates tours of the facilities for petitioners."	N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

Category IV. Oversight and Evaluation				
Standard 10. Compliance Monitoring. The authorizer protects the public interest and holds charter schools accountable for their obligations of governance, management, and oversight of public funds. The authorizer defines, communicates, and effectively implements the processes, methods, and timing of collecting and reporting school performance and compliance information. The authorizer conducts school visits as appropriate and necessary, and annually publishes school performance data.				
Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

The authorizer has a documented process for oversight and evaluation that aligns with the provisions of the performance contract.	Protocol and tools for site visits are in place. Compliance - Epicenter Compliance Items list submitted and align with the performance contract/performance framework. Annual Report published with performance data aligned with the contract.		N/A	Y
The authorizer has a documented process for conducting school site visits that includes a review of school performance and compliance in alignment with the contract, and/or subsequent agreements.	Site visit protocol submitted and Includes review of school performance and compliance in alignment with the contract.		N/A	Y
The authorizer clearly communicates its oversight processes, including site visits, and how information gleaned from those activities is used to hold schools accountable.	The contract describes charter accountability and consequences under Appendix A. Accountability Monitoring and Review is described in the Appendix as well as Consequences - described as including intervention, probation, termination, or recommendation for nonrenewal. The site visit protocol clearly states the purpose, frequency, and scope of site visits. Procedurally, next steps are shared regarding findings of concerns and potential corrective action plans to address the areas of concern.		N/A	Y
The authorizer conducts an on-site visit to each charter school at least once during the school's charter term.	Site visit protocol indicates that learning walks and focus groups will occur at least twice per charter term. Building and Grounds Walkthrough, Records Audit and Governance Meeting Observation will happen annually.		N/A	Y
Each year, the authorizer publishes a report on its website with individual and aggregate level school performance results based on evaluation measures included in the contracts, comparing academic, financial,	Annual Report published on the website here .		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

and organizational performance of each school to established expectations.				
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

Standard 11. Intervention. The authorizer gives schools evidence-based, and timely notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies and allows schools reasonable time and opportunity for remediation.				
Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer has an intervention protocol which determines when it may intervene and what consequences are possible (from a conversation to probation or other more serious actions). The intervention protocol includes actions that result from annual reviews using the performance framework and interventions required outside of “normal” monitoring findings (i.e. parent phone calls). This protocol is clearly communicated to schools.	Standard Operating Procedure submitted by the authorizer for issuing Letters of Direction demonstrate authorizer action is connected to the performance expectations established by the contract.	Standard operating procedure for issuing letters of concern or direction submitted. Per APS: “Any specific action steps or follow-up to a letter of concern or direction would be outlined in the specific letter. We do not currently have any schools subject to an intervention beyond any corrective actions noted in a letter of concern of direction. If a more significant formalized intervention was necessary, it would be tailored to the specifics of the issue(s) confronting the school.”	N/A	Y
Following each compliance site visit the authorizer provides timely written notification that includes information collected during the site visit, a summary of findings and areas needing improvement. The findings are tied directly to applicable law or contract requirements.	The site visit report submitted via the desk audit was delivered in October 2024 following the site visits of both Kindezi School campuses (9/25 and 10/3) and the board meeting (10/11)		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

	Summary of findings and areas of improvement were highlighted and tied directly to applicable law/contract requirements.			
The authorizer provides written notice to the school of any contract breaches or areas of noncompliance in a reasonable timeframe.	Based on a review of notices, one month is given for school action following authorizer notice. Letter of concern was issued to KIPP March 5, 2025, citing the contract breach, and authorizer requested school action by June 30, 2025 (notice to governing board and school community). Given the nature of this notice, this is considered a reasonable timeframe.		N/A	Y
The authorizer allows the school adequate time to remedy any identified areas of noncompliance, respecting the school's autonomy to determine how to remediate the noncompliance, when appropriate.	See comment above. Notice sent to Wesley International Academy due to chronic absenteeism was issued requesting the school submit an action plan – the authorizer did not dictate what must be included in that action plan, respecting the school's autonomy.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (Ni)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3-4	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

Standard 12. Upholds Charter School Autonomy. The authorizer upholds charter school autonomy in school level governance, including personnel decisions, financial decisions, curriculum and instruction, resource allocation, establishing and monitoring the achievement of school improvement goals, and school operations.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
---------------------	----------------------	--------------------	---------------	---------------------

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

The contract and the authorizer's practices recognize the school's autonomy in school governance, instructional program implementation, personnel, and budgeting.	See Appendix B in charter contract.		N/A	Y
Specific requirements not otherwise required under state law are either included in the charter contract or charter schools are <i>notified at least one year prior</i> to the requirement going into effect.		Per APS: "Each year schools are given a Letter of Assurances that outlines APS requirements of the charter school under its contract with APS (see attached for most recent Letter of Assurances). If there were ever to be a change in the requirements, we would notify schools the year prior to it taking effect. For example, in SY23 we began requiring charter schools to follow the APS code of conduct and use APS's Office of Student Discipline to manage their schools' disciplinary hearings, and we gave notice of that change the school year before it was to take effect."	N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

Category V. Renewal and Termination

Standard 13. Renewal and Termination Process. The authorizer clearly communicates to schools the criteria for charter termination, renewal and non-renewal that are consistent with the terms of the charter contract. The renewal process includes a written application and an opportunity for an interview.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
Renewal process, criteria, and a general timeline are clearly communicated to schools well in advance of renewal and are published in a publicly accessible location. The process includes a written renewal application and an	The charter renewal process is generally outlined on the website here and references an initial meeting to provide an overview to		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

opportunity interview to make factual corrections or present supplementary evidence of performance.	the process, a charter renewal petition application, and panel interview. The renewal kickoff meeting document submitted via the desk audit references the OCSC renewal website for guidance. The kickoff meeting indicates an opportunity to make factual corrections and present supplementary evidence of performance.			
Renewal criteria are transparent, specific and align to performance standards and expectations outlined in the charter contract.	Section 4 specifically of the renewal application asks for applicants to share their past performance related to the expectations outlined in the charter contract.		N/A	Y
The authorizer uses a track record of performance over multiple years to make renewal determinations.	Renewal recommendations reference the track record of performance throughout the charter term.		N/A	Y
Revocation criteria are clearly communicated to schools. The authorizer provides written warning, timeline, and notice of anticipated termination prior to the end of the charter school renewal period.	The contract makes clear in Section 26 renewal, non-renewal, and probationary terms. Section 24 describes termination grounds. Notice of concerns include language related to termination should the concerns remain.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	EX
Evaluator Comments:				
Standard 14. Renewal Decisions. The authorizer bases renewal decisions on a thorough analyses of the criteria outlined in the charter contract, with objective and verifiable measures of student achievement and growth as the primary measure of school quality. The authorizer ensures the renewal decision-making processes are free of conflicts of interest. The authorizer communicates renewal decisions to the school community and public within a timeframe that allows parents and students to exercise choices for the coming school year.				

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
Renewal/nonrenewal recommendations are provided through prompt, written notification to the school's governing board and the public within a reasonable timeframe, following the availability of necessary data, as to provide parents and students time to exercise choices for the upcoming school year.	Board meetings are public and therefore information is available immediately. The Atlanta Board of Education Meeting for the renewal of Atlanta Classical Academy was held 12/4/2023. Email notification was sent to the governing board of ACA the following day 12/4/23.		N/A	Y
Standard (5-year) renewal terms are only granted to schools that met established performance expectations outlined in the charter contract.	In the last 3 years, the authorizer has conducted renewals for 6 schools. 5/6 renewals received a standard 5-year term. 1 school (Kindezi) received a 2 year extension due to academic performance concerns.		N/A	Y
Recommendations include a detailed, objective and evidence-based explanation for the decision.	Recommendations include an Executive Summary and a Performance Summary that highlights Academic Goals and Achievement and Organizational Goals and Achievements. The recommendation also includes a Summary of the Petition for New Charter Term.		N/A	Y
The authorizer uses policy or procedure to ensure individuals involved in the renewal decision are free from conflicts of interest.		Per APS: "The COI form previously uploaded to our shared folder is required for renewal and start-up petitioners to sign and submit."	N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Standard 15. Closure. In the event of school closure, either at the conclusion of the charter term or during the charter term, the authorizer oversees and ensures the school governing board and leadership carry out a detailed closure protocol that includes the provisions outlined in the charter contract, such as ensuring 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, rule and contract terms.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer has a written policy for termination procedures that ensures timely notification to parents, orderly transition of students and student records to new schools, disposition of school funds, property, and assets in accordance with law and effectively implements policy in the event of a school closure.	Authorizer has a Standard Operating Procedure for closure. The SOP addresses all elements of this criterion.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1		EX
Evaluator Comments:				