



Georgia Charter School Authorizer Evaluation

District Authorizer Evaluation Rubric | 2025

District Name: Clayton County Public Schools

Reviewer Name: Brittany Monda

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Evaluation Rubric

Authorizer Name: Clayton County Public Schools

Date: September 1, 2025

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

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: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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.	The authorizer has 3 staff members that are dedicated to supporting the charter schools within its portfolio. The organizational chart is posted on the website HERE. It is unclear, past the Director of Charter Schools, how much the other two positions support charters.		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).	The 3 staff members that support charter schools have relevant education and/or accountability backgrounds; however there is not a direct support of school funding/finance, education law or legal compliance.		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.	The Director of Charter Schools job description highlights that they are the district's lead for authorization, renewal, and partnership efforts. Additionally, it states that a key responsibility is to review and report on how well charters are performing and oversee performance management. Dr. Chantara Rumph-Carter is on the website as the main contact for charter schools found HERE.		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

<i>Districts:</i> Board members attend trainings on principles 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 authorizer has three staff members assigned to support its charter school portfolio, with the Director of Charter Schools clearly identified as the lead for authorization, oversight, and performance management. While the organizational chart is publicly available, it is unclear how the other two staff members allocate their time to charter-specific responsibilities. Staff bring relevant backgrounds in education and accountability, though there is limited evidence of expertise in school finance, education law, or legal compliance.

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.	The funding for schools found HERE highlights the initial allotment, revisions (as necessary) Title I Allocations/Budget on the website. Within these documents you can find the state, local and federal funds and allocations that are to be provided, and/or revisions as necessary.		N/A	Y
Budget allocations for the school reflect an administrative fee that aligns with the charter contract and applicable law.	The Authorizer fee for FY24 is 2.5% of State and Local funding for charter schools as listed on the publicly posted FY 24 Administrative Withholding Report found on their Finance page . The amounts that can be collected can be found HERE . This aligns with the state law as it is below 3%.		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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.	The budget that has been published on the Clayton County Public Schools website does not reflect the total amount received from authorizing fees and how those funds are allocated internally. The fees are withheld by school found HERE highlighting the initial allotment, revisions (as necessary) Title I Allocations/Budget on the website. This shows the 2.5% monthly that will be withheld.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3	AD
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer publicly shares the calculation of current and anticipated public funding for each charter school, including state, local, and federal allocations, as well as revisions when applicable. The FY24 administrative fee is set at 2.5%, in compliance with state law, and is documented in the publicly posted Administrative Withholding Report. While individual school allotments and fee withholdings are accessible, the authorizer does not publish a comprehensive budget showing the total amount received from authorizing fees or how those funds are internally allocated to support administrative services.				

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.	The authorizer publishes information in two sections on their website: Charter School Petition Guidelines and Charter Petition Start-Up Timeline and Renewal Timeline/Materials/Process . On the website there is a timeline that is up to date and posted with relevant dates.		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

The authorizer clearly articulates petition requirements. Requirements are focused on written content rather than form (i.e. application length, font size, etc.).	The authorizer posts the start-up petition application along with discussion of submission requirements within its CCPS Charter School Petition Guidelines document found on the Charter School Petition Guidelines page .	The authorizer discussed that they host a petition workshop for applicants to discuss the application.	N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes times and locations for petition submission that are reasonable and easy to be met by the petitioner.	Within the CCPS Charter School Petition Guidelines document, the first page discusses the timeline and submission of materials via Dropbox links. Additionally, there is a section that discusses the authorization timeline, which includes the Dropbox links again. The authorizer also extends that hard copy can be hand delivered to the location, but it is not in lieu of hard copies.		N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes staff contact information for technical assistance.	Dr. Chantara Rumph-Carter's contact information is in relevant locations and provides both email and phone. Additionally, there is a charter school specific email address that is listed for people to contact. Contact information is on the main page of the CCPS Charter School Department Pages.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	EX
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer's website provides clear, well-documented petition materials with up-to-date timelines, submission instructions, and accessible staff contacts for support.				

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)
---------------------	----------------------	--------------------	---------------	---------------------

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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 review team has at least 3 individuals with varied and relevant skills; however, there is no information on relevant training for those individuals.	The authorizer discussed that there are upwards of 20 people that are included in the review process. This includes department leaders who work with charters, along with external reviews who had led and/or worked in charter schools. Additionally, the authorizer discussed that they train review committee members, which is conducted by NACSA. The authorizer also states that there is Board training that occurs.	N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes the petition evaluation criteria and the requirements for petition approval on the authorizer's website.	Some of the requirements for petition approval are included as a part of the CCPS Charter School Petition Guidelines (p. 10-11); however the authorizer does not have an evaluation criteria published.	The authorizer stated that while there is a rubric, it is more qualitative and does not have a standardized scoring system. Overall, the review team votes to identify if the petition meets standard or not.	N/A	N
The review process includes an interview.	Based on the information included in the CCPS Charter School Petition Guidelines the authorizer hosts a founding board capacity interview as a part of its timeline where all founding board members are required to attend. Additionally on page 6 there is a		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

	narrative about the capacity interview purpose that is provided.			
Petition review and interview process are free of conflict of interest.	The authorizer has a survey that all reviewers complete to ensure they are free from conflict as a part of the petition review process.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer conducts founding board interviews, publishes partial approval requirements, and shares reviewer bios and conflict-of-interest surveys, but full evaluation criteria and a standardized scoring system are not publicly available.				
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)	The Board decision was not made within 90 days of receipt of the application. Per the timeline provided Tapestry Charter School applications were received on February 28, 2025; which notes May 29, 2025 as 90 days. Per the emails and documentation, the Board vote schedule was changed multiple times. Although it was past the 90 days, there was confirmation from Dr. Mueller and the charter applicant acknowledged the delay and in agreement with an extension.		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Authorization decisions are based on evidence tied to the petition evaluation criteria, applicable accountability metrics, and legal requirements.	The documentation of feedback from reviewers is not clearly related to the overall evaluation criteria and applicable accountability metrics and legal requirements. While there are discussions as a part of documentation of Zoom meetings, there is not a standardized criteria for approval.	The authorizer stated that while there is a rubric, it is more qualitative and does not have a standardized scoring system. Overall, the review team votes to identify if the petition meets standard or not.	N/A	N
If denied, petitioner is provided a written detailed description of deficiencies and information about how to reapply in the future.	In a letter for Movement Atlanta, the authorizer indicates that the petition can submit a petition to the school district next year, but does not provide any additional details. Within the letter it does highlight reasons for denial on the second page.		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.	The authorizer did not provide evidence that there is a public record of why the application was denied to support its reapplication in the future.		N/A	N
Recommendations are shared with petitioners at least one week prior to the authorizing board meeting.	Recommendations are shared with petitions at least one week prior to the authorizing board meeting - per the example related to Tapestry Charter School's materials.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4-5	AD
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer missed the 90-day action deadline on Tapestry's petition (later extended) and lacks standardized scoring, clear reviewer feedback, or public reapplication guidance. While denial reasons are provided, board records show no applicant support, and recent changes now involve board training, participation in interviews, and review of office ratings.				

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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.	The Authorizer has a link that is posted on their website that states that new petitions should use this checklist as a guide to opening a school. The checklist that is referred to is NACSA's Core Pre-opening Monitoring Guidance and sample requirements; however it is the NACSA document and has not been modified. Additionally, while the webpage notes that there is the possibility of pre-opening suspension, it is unclear of what the specific requirements that have to be met as a part of this. Additionally, the webpage refers to the contracts. The pre-opening checklists are a part of Appendix C of the school contracts.	The authorizer stated that pre-opening checklists are a part of school contracts; and there is a point of discussion in the contract should a pre-opening checklist not be met.	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.	The pre-opening expectations included in Appendix C the Utopian Elementary Charter Contract specify facility requirements including site approval and architectural review, certificates of occupancy, and submission of an emergency plan.	The authorizer stated that pre-opening checklists are a part of school contracts.	N/A	N
Pre-opening expectations specify student enrollment requirements including a minimum and maximum threshold to operate.	The pre-opening expectations included in Appendix C of the Utopian Elementary Charter Contract specific student enrollment projections exceeding enrollment.	There are no minimum enrollment thresholds outlined in the pre-opening expectations.	N/A	N
Pre-opening expectations specify board development requirements including required trainings, policy development and operational oversight procedures.	There are no expectations to specify board development requirements.		N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	NI
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer references a pre-opening checklist on its website, directing applicants to NACSA's Core Pre-Opening Monitoring Guidance, which the authorizer has proactively reached out to NACSA about creating and aligning to GA State Standards; however, this is a resource that is unmodified and not tailored to the district's specific context. The authorizer notes the possibility of pre-opening suspension within the contract as a part of Appendix C (Pre-Opening Procedures); which highlights facility, enrollment, or board development expectations.				

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.	Section 8 in the contract (Charter for 7 Pillars Career Academy) states the performance-based goals, measurable objectives, and consequences with reference to Appendix A within the agreement. Appendix A outlines the Accountability Requirements and Consequences of the charter. The Performance Standards that are listed are grouped by academic, financial governance, and legal compliance. Each has clearly defined thresholds of expectation.		N/A	Y
Evaluation measures allow for annual review.	The evaluation measures that have been identified in Appendix A can be reviewed annually.		N/A	Y
Data sources used to evaluate performance are objective and verifiable.	The data sources that are used to evaluate are objective and verifiable.		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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.	Goal 1 for the school is based on Academic Performance. The Academic performance standards have four standards for the schools. Standard 1 looks at the school performance gap closure, standard 2 looks at the school district comparisons, standard 3 looks at the school statewide comparisons. Under each of the standards there are supports that must be reached. Based on what is said in the accountability section, at least one of the four performance standards in each grade band served must be met. Subgroup performance is embedded in CCRPI. See “Evaluator Comments” for a recommendation.		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.	Goal 2 related to the Financial Performance Standards. Goal 3 related to the Governance Performance Standard. The items included to reach the goals are not burdensome and are related to items that must already be completed as a part of the financial audit and/or the annual report. These goals are separate from Goals 4 and 5 related to legal compliance for the school.		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.	Goal 2 related to the Financial Performance Standards. These items are grounded in best practice to identify items such as audit findings, unrestricted days of cash/fund balance, procurement rules and processes, and financial reporting.		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.	The authorizer does not have a clear way of measuring the areas of educational compliance, financial oversight, student and employee rights and ensuring a safe school environment.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-5	6-7	EX
Evaluator Comments: The 7 Pillars contract includes clear academic, financial, governance, and compliance standards, but subgroup performance is hard to isolate, and operational compliance lacks defined measures. The authorizer is working with NACSA to strengthen its performance framework				

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	Based on the information provided as a part of the contract for 7 Pillars, an authorized representative has included within the contract a legally incorporated nonprofit governing board listed as found on Page 1. This agreement is not executed.		N/A	N
Initial contract terms are five years as stated in 691-2-.01 of the State Charter Schools Commission of Georgia.	Based on the information provided as part of the contract with 7 Pillars Academy, on page 2 it states "This Charter is for Petitioner to operate the Charter School for a 5 -year term"		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.	The contract includes a roles and responsibilities chart outlined in Appendix B which identifies the decision-making authority or responsibility (p. 26-29). Consequences, such as termination are listed in the agreement (Appendix A) including termination items on page 23-25.		N/A	Y
The authorizer provides adequate and appropriate guidance to schools regarding what kinds of programmatic or operational changes constitute material changes that require authorizer approval.	Based on the information provided as part of the contract with 7 Pillars, the authorizer does not provide what a material change would constitute under approval for the school. Within the contract, material term or provision is defined on pg 2 and		N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

	further discussed as a part of ESP on page 10; amendments discussed on page 17; however, guidance of what a material change is not provided.			
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.	The authorizer has provided agreements that show negotiations between the two parties including transportation, school nutrition and lease services.		N/A	Y
Contract and/or related agreements establish equitable per-pupil funding terms or amounts as required by state law.	Of the information provided in the 7 Pillars contract, the base per-pupil funding is established on page 9 discussing the estimate and rate.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	AD
Evaluator Comments: The draft 7 Pillars contract includes required governance, roles, and termination provisions but is unexecuted and lacks clear guidance on material changes needing approval, leaving a key gap despite separate service agreements.				
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.	The contract with 7 Pillars includes state and federal requirements including but not limited to special populations, federal funding, and compliance with all laws, rules, and regulations.		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.	The authorizer has stated that there are no unused facilities - and has this confirmed internally via email; however this information is not posted. There is evidence provided that Utopian is occupying facilities from the school district. Additionally, there is information posted that 7 Pillars Career Academy has a lease with the District.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	EX
Evaluator Comments: The contract with 7 Pillars includes provisions requiring compliance with state and federal laws, including those related to special populations and federal funding. While the authorizer states there are no unused district facilities available, this information is not publicly posted. However, documentation shows that Utopian is currently occupying a facility owned by the district which lends itself to allow charters to have use of the properties available.				

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)
The authorizer has a documented process for oversight and evaluation that aligns with the provisions of the performance contract.	The authorizer stated in the narrative that they are in the process of developing a comprehensive site visit protocol, oversight and evaluation process to align with the performance framework. The applicant discussed in a document narrative that beginning August 1, 2025, all schools and departments will utilize Epicenter to collect and maintain compliance documents; and that these reports will be shared with all stakeholders on the website.	The authorizer noted that prior to the revamp of their frameworks all individual departments were monitoring separately which provided segmented feedback.	N/A	N
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.	The authorizer stated in the narrative that they are in the process of developing a comprehensive site visit protocol, oversight and evaluation process to align with the performance framework. In the narrative it states that the authorizer will begin a new protocol beginning August 1, 2025 where the full team will travel together to schools for one review; however the documentation provided is for the renewal site visit. Based on the	The authorizer noted that they plan to complete 3 authorizer visits per year.	N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

	renewal visit documentation, there is a review of school performance, but it does not include information related to a site visit.			
The authorizer clearly communicates its oversight processes, including site visits, and how information gleaned from those activities is used to hold schools accountable.	The authorizer stated in the narrative that they are in the process of developing a comprehensive site visit protocol, oversight and evaluation process to align with the performance framework. While the main framework is not complete and there is no evidence of communication, the authorizer included the following: - The authorizer's narrative included links to different site visit reports, and also follow-up meetings to address concerns, ultimately leading to a corrective action plan made by the school. SAMPLE, SAMPLE - It should be noted that information about the renewal site visit is on the website here.		N/A	N
The authorizer conducts an on-site visit to each charter school at least once during the school's charter term.	The authorizer stated in the narrative that they are in the process of developing a comprehensive site visit protocol, oversight and evaluation process to align with the performance framework. In the narrative it states that the authorizer will begin a new protocol beginning August 1, 2025 where the full team will travel together to schools for one review. In the narrative it states previously that the site visits were conducted by individual departments with evidence that there was an academic site visit, special education site visit, and nutrition site visit with associated reports.		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,	The authorizer has not published a report on their website that provides an overview of the charter schools served within the district that includes information with individual and aggregated school	The authorizer noted that on the charter school website page there will be reports	N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

financial, and organizational performance of each school to established expectations.	performance based on established expectations. While there is an annual report section on the webpage, annual reports from charter schools are posted most recently in 2022.	that include Epicenter compliance, site visit reports, and accountability reports after their systems and processes have been revamped.		
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	NI
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer is developing a unified oversight and site visit protocol for August 2025, but currently lacks a fully implemented framework, clear processes, or up-to-date performance reports (last posted in 2022).				

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.	The authorizer stated in the narrative that they are in the process of revamping an intervention protocol with NACSA.		N/A	N
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.	While there is no evidence of communication, the authorizer includes the following: - The authorizer’s narrative included links to different site visit reports, and also follow-up meetings to address concerns, ultimately leading to a corrective action plan made by the school. SAMPLE, SAMPLE		N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

	- It should be noted that information about the renewal site visit is on the website here . The items included on the report may be relevant but do not tie to applicable law or contract within.			
The authorizer provides written notice to the school of any contract breaches or areas of noncompliance in a reasonable timeframe.	The authorizer's narrative included links to different site visit reports, and also follow-up meetings to address concerns, ultimately leading to a corrective action plan made by the school. SAMPLE , SAMPLE It is unclear if these are timely based on the dates provided and what portion of the contract was breached.		N/A	N
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.	Based on the documentation provided, the findings and corrective action plan were made together and it is unclear if autonomy has been respected on how to remediate the noncompliance appropriately.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (Ni)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3-4	NI
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer is revising its intervention protocol with NACSA, but current practices lack clear links to laws or contracts, timely notices, and transparency on corrective actions or school flexibility.				

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)
The contract and the authorizer's practices recognize the school's autonomy in school governance, instructional program implementation, personnel, and budgeting.	Listed in the contract (7 Pillars), it states that the governing board shall exercise control over personnel, financial, curriculum and instruction, school improvement, school operations, and resource allocation decisions as examples of autonomy but not limited.		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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.	There are no requirements listed within the charter contract about notification of future requirements.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	AD
Evaluator Comments: The contract for 7 Pillars affirms the school's autonomy in key areas, including governance, curriculum and instruction, personnel, budgeting, school improvement, and operations. This aligns with best practices for preserving charter school independence. There is no evidence in the contract that the authorizer commits to notifying charter schools at least one year in advance of implementing any new requirements not already mandated by state law. This absence may limit transparency and predictability for schools				

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 opportunity interview to make factual corrections or present supplementary evidence of performance.	The renewal process and its timeline are publicly available as they are posted to the website , and include a written application, a site visit , and a capacity interview.		N/A	Y
Renewal criteria are transparent, specific and align to performance standards and expectations outlined in the charter contract.	The renewal criteria is listed in the charter contract (7 Pillars) as a part of the Appendix A: Accountability requirements in Section II: Charter Contract Renewal Possibilities. All items listed under this section discuss the granting of a renewal and the renewal contract term rooted in the performance framework listed right above.		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

The authorizer uses a track record of performance over multiple years to make renewal determinations.	The authorizer has set years that are listed in the Charter Contract Renewal Possibilities that looks at multiple years of data and either meeting or not meeting the expectations throughout the year that would adjust the overall determination either by approval/denial or extension length, including non-renewal.		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 authorizer provided a written notification of the non-renewal in November 2023 for 7 Pillars Academy with listings of the reasons why. Within the notification it discusses that the school will finish the academic year. The notification letter is prior to the board meeting and states official notification will be sent upon resolution.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer's renewal process is publicly posted and includes a written application, site visit, and capacity interview. Renewal criteria are transparent and tied to the performance framework outlined in the charter contract (7 Pillars), specifically in Appendix A under "Charter Contract Renewal Possibilities," which references multi-year performance data to inform renewal decisions. While the authorizer issued a written non-renewal notice for 7 Pillars Academy that included reasons for the decision and allowed the school to complete the academic year. This information is from a notice to the school prior to the board meeting decision.				
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.				
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	The authorizer provides written notification to the school, via email based on the timeline provided. There is no evidence provided that information was shared publicly. Based on the timeline, parents and students would have time to exercise choices for the upcoming school year as an official resolution	The authorizer noted in an anecdote that various departments met with the school a year prior to renewal to	N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

time to exercise choices for the upcoming school year.	was projected for November as listed in the 7 Pillars notification letter data October 24, 2023.	discuss areas of concern.		
Standard (5-year) renewal terms are only granted to schools that met established performance expectations outlined in the charter contract.	The authorizer has set years that are listed in the Charter Contract Renewal Possibilities that looks at multiple years of data and either meeting or not meeting the expectations throughout the year that would adjust the overall determination either by approval/denial or extension length, including non-renewal.		N/A	Y
Recommendations include a detailed, objective and evidence-based explanation for the decision.	The notification letter for denial discussed detailed reasons for the decision; however the notification letter for approval did not discuss detailed support. While there is a copy of a survey for Utopians most recent renewal, it's unclear of the thresholds of data that the school met and why it was recommended for renewal.		N/A	N
The authorizer uses policy or procedure to ensure individuals involved in the renewal decision are free from conflicts of interest.	The applicant has included a copy of Conflict of Interest forms from the Utopian Renewal Petition which lists the COI policy, definitions, and a survey to identify any conflict.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer issues renewal and non-renewal notices with evidence-based reasoning, but public communication and clarity on approval criteria are inconsistent, despite conflict-of-interest safeguards.				

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.

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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.	There is no policy provided that discusses the termination procedures. To note, the closing documentation for 7 Pillars includes toolkits from other states, and the authorizer has a sample closure checklist posted to the website, which appears it was used in the documentation provided. Within these checklists there are materials that support transition of students, records, funds, etc.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1		AD
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer does not provide a written policy outlining formal termination procedures, and it is suggested that the information included forms a policy to execute as part of a termination and/or closing of the school. While these tools demonstrate some implementation of closure practices, the absence of an official, authorizer-specific policy limits clarity and consistency in how school terminations are handled.				