



Georgia Charter School Authorizer Evaluation

District Authorizer Evaluation Rubric | 2025

District Name: DeKalb County School District

Reviewer Names: Jay Whalen and Brittany Monda

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Evaluation Rubric

Authorizer Name: DeKalb County School District

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	EX
5. Petition Decisions	EX
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	AD
OVERALL RATING	Exemplary (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: 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 Organizational chart provides a District overview to support where the Office of Innovation is. The Office of Innovation has 15 positions listed. Of those positions, there seems to be 5 dedicated positions with charter school tags and/or website mentions. Ratio is 8:5.	The authorizer discussed that there are additional positions of student support personnel and psychologists that also support charter schools only.	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 staff have relevant experience in K-12, education accountability, school funding, and special education. Many of the charter specific positions have held the positions for at least 3 years.		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.	Charter School staff is assigned to key areas for responsibility, as supported by job descriptions and identified in the organizational chart. There is a point of contact on the website; however, that person's job description does not mention charter schools.		N/A	Y
<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

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	EX
Evaluator Comments: The district's Office of Innovation has adequate staffing and experienced team members to support charter schools, covering key authorizing responsibilities, though the designated contact's role could more clearly reflect charter duties.				
Advanced Criteria (<i>Optional for Evaluator Review</i>)	Strengths	Areas of Growth		
The authorizer demonstrates its commitment to high-quality authorizing by building a healthy organization: - Organizational values (behavioral expectations) are explicit and enforced. - If applicable, authorizing is a visibly important function of the larger "parent" organization. - Staffing supports the authorizer's goals and plans for the future.	N/A	The submitted materials provide limited insight into how the authorizer builds a healthy organization beyond basic staffing. The materials do not include documentation of explicit organizational values, how authorizing is prioritized within the larger organization, or how staffing supports long-term goals.		
Employment and management practices attract and retain a diverse, effective team of authorizing professionals. This includes leadership and professional development, clear decision-making criteria, and effective onboarding.	N/A	There is also no evidence of employment practices that support attracting, developing, and retaining a diverse and effective team, including onboarding, professional development, or decision-making protocols.		

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	The authorizer posts allocations on the website identifying the state, local and federal allocations per school HERE ; along with a services guide HERE .		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

- Local Districts- allotment sheet itemizing the calculation of state, local and federal allocations to be provided.				
Budget allocations for the school reflect an administrative fee that aligns with the charter contract and applicable law.	Allocations within the budget, and mentioned in other areas support the 3% fee within the contract. This is confirmed in the allocations and contracts; and allowable by State 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.	The authorizer provides materials that show personnel supported by the authorizer fee; however this is not publicly posted. From internal documents provided, funds are budgeted across 5 line items (salaries/benefits, professional services, other purchased services, supplies/materials, and other).	The District plans to do a Charter Schools 101 and a Charter Schools 102 to share how the budget is used for administrative services and fees.	N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3	AD
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer meets funding transparency requirements internally, showing allocations, fee compliance, and budget use, but lack of public posting limits full transparency.				
Advanced Criteria <i>Optional for Evaluator Review</i>		Strengths	Areas of Growth	
The authorizer's budget is sufficient and aligned to the authorizer's goals.		The District plans to do a Charter Schools 101 and a Charter Schools 102 to share how the budget is used for administrative services and fees.	While the budget appears sufficient to support ongoing authorizing functions, the materials do not include information on the authorizer's overarching goals. As a result, alignment between the budget and the authorizer's stated priorities cannot be fully assessed.	

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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 published materials on the district's charter school website labeled " Petition Cycle ". Items are included for start-up, and renewal petitions. Authorizer includes Petition Workshop dates/materials and a timeline.		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.).	Petition requirements are clear discussing content components as a part of the Petitions Workshop.		N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes times and locations for petition submission that are reasonable and easy to be met by the petitioner.	The petitioner's application is submitted via DropBox - including on the website and within the workshop information; however the directions for the LOI are limited and do not provide specific detail.	The authorizer discussed that the Districts IT team posts a banner to the website announcing Letters of Intent about 45-days before LOI's are due. The authorizer states that the banner allows navigation to a sample LOI. All LOIs are emailed to the Delkab Charter School Mailbox. A timeline of LOI submission is found HERE .	N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes staff contact information for technical assistance.	Staff contact information has been identified on the Petition website found HERE for support with name, address, and email.		N/A	Y

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	EX
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer provides accessible petition materials, clear submission procedures, and staff contacts on its website, with announcements and sample Letters of Intent managed through a coordinated email and review process.				
<i>Advanced Criteria Optional for Evaluator Review)</i>	Strengths	Areas of Growth		
The authorizer conducts informational sessions about the petition process.	The authorizer actively supports prospective petitioners by conducting informational sessions that clarify the petition process. The petition materials provided are comprehensive, clearly outlining required content sections, a detailed timeline, and relevant examples of existing district models, which help applicants understand expectations and context.	The authorizer should provide clearer and more detailed guidance regarding the submission process for the Letter of Intent (LOI), particularly in relation to workshop timing and procedural steps. Enhancing clarity in this area would improve petitioner readiness and reduce confusion during the initial stages of the application process.		
The authorizer provides clear guidance around attendance possibilities (e.g., statewide, district, or other geographic limitations), funding structure for budget development, and requirements to align petitions to demonstrated community need.	The authorizer offers comprehensive guidance on charter school funding, referencing the statutory formula, federal funds, and critical budget considerations such as administrative fees, facilities, transportation, and school nutrition. Workshops also include the district's strategic plan and demographic data, helping applicants understand the broader context for petition development and alignment to community needs.	While many important funding factors are addressed, the guidance would benefit from greater specificity, particularly clearer identification of the statutory funding formula. Additionally, the information on attendance possibilities and geographic limitations lacks clarity, which may hinder applicants' ability to fully align their petitions with enrollment and community eligibility requirements.		

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).	Applicant has a Petition Overview Training that overviews Conflict of Interest, the petition process, accountability requirements, monitoring and oversight, and roles/responsibilities. The training presentation was provided and an example communication provided to cultivate varied reviewers. This was a relevant training, however it was for a renewal petition vs. a new start so some detail was limited.		N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes the petition evaluation criteria and the requirements for petition approval on the authorizer's website.	The petition evaluation criteria is posted on the website HERE and include the Board Capacity Rubric and the Final Evaluation Rubric.		N/A	Y
The review process includes an interview.	There is a founding board capacity interview as included in the petition workshop, and evidenced in the Founding Board Capacity Interview rubric which is publicly posted HERE .		N/A	Y
Petition review and interview process are free of conflict of interest.	The applicant provides Conflict of Interest forms to both internal and external reviewers that references the Conflict of Interest Policy. Based on the COI forms provided for ESOL and PATH the process was free of conflict.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	EX
Evaluator Comments: The petition evaluation team has at least three members with relevant expertise, receives training on procedures and conflicts of interest, and conducts reviews transparently using published criteria, rubrics, and safeguards.				
Advanced Criteria (Optional for Evaluator Review)	Strengths	Areas of Growth		
The authorizer trains evaluators to ensure consistent application of petition evaluation criteria. Evaluators discuss ratings and develop a list of questions to inform the interview.	The authorizer provides a Petition Review Orientation that covers key topics such as conflict of interest, the renewal petition process, accountability requirements, district monitoring and oversight, and the evaluator's role. This	There is no clear evidence that evaluators receive training to calibrate their ratings consistently against the rubric or that they have dedicated time to discuss ratings and develop interview questions collaboratively. Providing more detailed		

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

	orientation supports evaluator preparedness and understanding of the petition review framework.	information about the scope of the orientation—including specific examples or tailoring to the petition type—would strengthen the evaluation process and ensure that these elements are included as a part of the review process collaboratively.		
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 approval and denial decisions are made by the board; however it is unclear if the board resolution is within the 90 day window for approval or denial.	The authorizer discussed that the decision processes and timelines are all worked backwards based on the 90-day timelines. Additionally an example was given that the board called a Special Called meeting in 2021 to ensure compliance with the law.	N/A	Y
Authorization decisions are based on evidence tied to the petition evaluation criteria, applicable accountability metrics, and legal requirements.	The items that have been included as reason for denial are supported by the evaluation rubrics that have been presented by the ratings and the support comments/concerns.		N/A	Y
If denied, petitioner is provided a written detailed description of deficiencies and information about how to reapply in the future.	The applicant receives a notification that includes the agenda information (and supporting links), along with the memorandum of the objective. While this information is included, there is not additional information related to applying in the future.	The authorizer discussed anecdotes about giving applicants feedback, either after their application was not completed and/or giving applicants the opportunity to meet.	N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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 Board Agenda Item provides points of discussion for the concerns related to a denied application - which includes links to the supporting documentation (rubrics, response to memo, evaluation rubric, capacity interview rubric, and final petition). Additionally, along with the follow-up email, including an attachment sent after the Board had voted to deny the application.		N/A	Y
Recommendations are shared with petitioners at least one week prior to the authorizing board meeting.	There is no immediate evidence of what was shared with the petition prior to the authorizing board meeting.	The authorizer stated that during the governing board capacity interview, the authorizer discusses that items are posted 7 days before the meeting.	N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4-5	EX
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer's board makes approval or denial decisions using documented criteria, rubrics, and legal requirements, adhering to a 90-day timeline. Denied petitioners receive detailed feedback, though evidence of clear guidance on reapplication is limited, and recommendations are shared at least one week before board meetings.				
Advanced Criteria (Optional for Evaluator Review)	Strengths	Areas of Growth		
Application decisions reflect rigorous consideration of the following: - The educational program's likelihood of success and the applicants' capacity for educating children well, - The business and organizational plans' viability, - The experience and capacity of the applicant team (board and proposed leaders) to implement the proposed educational, business, and organizational program, and to manage any service provider contracts.	The authorizer's application decisions reflect thoughtful consideration of applicants' capacity, educational program viability, and overall likelihood of success, as evidenced by summaries included in the petition review materials and board agenda items.	To strengthen the evaluation process, the Board Capacity Interview could include more targeted questions related to service provider oversight and organizational governance. This would ensure deeper assessment of the applicant team's capacity to manage key operational functions and enhance alignment with final application ratings.		

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

The authorizer board's decisions generally align with staff recommendations. Conditional approvals are only granted for making specific technical changes and not as a means to allow the applicants to further develop proposals.	The authorizing board's decisions consistently align with staff recommendations, and conditional approvals are issued only to address specific technical needs, not to allow for incomplete proposals to advance.	N/A
--	---	-----

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.	A comprehensive pre-opening checklist outlines the readiness requirements along with deadlines.		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 checklist includes these required facility items.		N/A	Y
Pre-opening expectations specify student enrollment requirements including a minimum and maximum threshold to operate.	Student enrollment requirements are outlined. It is unclear where minimum and maximum thresholds are outlined.	The applicant discussed that there are maximum thresholds outlined in contracts, but no minimum thresholds.	N/A	N
Pre-opening expectations specify board development requirements including required trainings, policy development and operational oversight procedures.	The board trainings and other requirements are included in the pre-opening checklist.		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	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments: The pre-opening checklist includes the required readiness items and due dates for schools planning to open. The timelines are appropriate and each clearly communicated. Maximum enrollment thresholds are outlined in contracts. Minimum thresholds are not detailed, though the pre-opening checklist notes additional actions necessary if enrollment is “significantly below projections.”				
Advanced Criteria <i>(Optional for Evaluator Review)</i>	Strengths	Areas of Growth		
The authorizer uses the pre-opening process to build relationships, set expectations for school performance, and provide technical assistance to schools.	N/A - Based on the documentation provided, there is not enough information to score strengths and areas of growth for this section.			
Is there a history of schools opening despite not meeting all of the pre-opening requirements? If so, why?				
Is there a history of schools not opening on time? If so, why?				
In cases where a school’s opening was delayed, did the authorizer make the decision early enough so that students and parents could make other arrangements?				

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.	Defined goals and targets are outlined in performance contracts.		N/A	Y
Evaluation measures allow for annual review.	The defined measures allow for annual review and evaluation.		N/A	Y
Data sources used to evaluate performance are objective and verifiable.	The data sources used in annual evaluations are objective and variable.		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.	The academic performance measures includes content mastery and growth measures for whole school and grade bands. 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.	Financial and governance standards are included. Operational compliance measures broadly just mirror legal requirements.		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.	The performance standards are clear and effectively evaluate financial viability.		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.	Governance and transparency are the strongest of these areas that are outlined in the contract. Also, the School Climate Star Rating is used. Specific measures related to financial oversight and protecting the rights of students and employees is not explicitly named, though maybe included in measures that require schools to “implement all legal requirements.”	Within the school contract, there are sections that speak to the rights of students with disabilities.	N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-5	6-7	EX

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Evaluator Comments: While the academic performance measures capture subgroup performance, this performance is rolled in with other GaDOE performance data. As a result, it is harder to discern how individual subgroups are performing. It is recommended that the district performance measures include a distinct measure around English Learner and Students with Disabilities performance. Additionally, more clearly defined operational measures and targets would be beneficial, especially related to financial oversight and protecting the rights of students and employees.		
Advanced Criteria (<i>Optional for Evaluator Review</i>)	Strengths	Areas of Growth
The authorizer reviews financial data and determines, based on the circumstances of each school, whether the school presents a low, medium, or high risk for financial failure. This includes assessing whether the school maintains and implements compliant policies and procedures for expending state and federal funds and maintains an appropriate and legally compliant level of transparency regarding budgeting and finance.		It's unclear how risk assessments are used and if the district has a formalized way of categorizing schools. A potential area of growth is developing a financial risk assessment framework to prioritize oversight.
The authorizer verifies that its schools: - Adhere to applicable open meetings and records requirements. - Maintain compliant policies and procedures for serving special student populations, including students with disabilities and those identified as gifted, experiencing homelessness, or as English Learners (EL). - Adhere to the requirements of the charter contracts and applicable education laws, rules, and regulations.	These criteria are included in contracts and performance measures. Governance measures and legal compliance is explicitly outlined in contracts.	

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

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Executes a contract with a legally incorporated, nonprofit governing board independent of the authorizer	Contracts are executed with each approved school's governing board.		N/A	Y
Initial contract terms are five years as stated in 691-2-.01 of the State Charter Schools Commission of Georgia.	Initial charter terms are 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.	The contract outlines the responsibilities of all parties.		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.	The contact includes changes that require amendments of material terms. It's unclear what other guidance is provided to support schools.		N/A	N
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.	N/A		N/A	N/A
Contract and/or related agreements establish equitable per-pupil funding terms or amounts as required by state law.	Contracts outline per pupil funding terms and amounts.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	EX
Evaluator Comments: Scoring for this standard is based on 5 available criteria, meaning the authorizer scored EX with 4/5. Contracts are comprehensive and include required terms.				
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)

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

The authorizer's contracts include or refer to the state and federal laws and other legal requirements the school must meet.	Legal requirements referencing applicable state and federal laws are included.		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.	No unused facilities are available at present.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	EX
Evaluator Comments: N/A				
Advanced Criteria (Optional for Evaluator Review)	Strengths	Areas of Growth		
The authorizer publicly posts a current list of unused facilities concurrently with the regular charter petition process.	This list is posted with petition materials on the website even though it communicates there are none at this time.			

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 oversight process aligns with the performance contract, including the data sources used for evaluation.	-	N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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 district documentation outlines the process for conducting both semi-annual operational and annual site visits that included a review of school performance and compliance data.		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 district website includes links to the site visit protocol, the full evaluation process and activities, and the data sources used for monitoring.		N/A	Y
The authorizer conducts an on-site visit to each charter school at least once during the school’s charter term.	According to the documentation submitted, multiple site visits are conducted 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, and organizational performance of each school to established expectations.	Individual school reports and an aggregate charter school annual report are published on the district website .		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	EX
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer has the documentation in place to outline what compliance monitoring should look like, including site visits and data collection. It’s unclear the extent to which the oversight process is conducted with fidelity, but the documentation is in place.				
Advanced Criteria		Strengths	Areas of Growth	
The authorizer knows, at any given time, how a school is doing.		N/A - Based on the documentation provided, there is not enough information to score strengths and areas of growth for this section.		

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

The authorizer provides clear technical assistance to schools to ensure timely compliance with new or revised laws.	
The authorizer differentiates its oversight to ensure that time and resources are allocated effectively based on school performance and capacity, as well as the authorizer's goals.	
Site visits are structured in a way that enables the authorizer to gather the information needed to evaluate the school appropriately and that respects school autonomy.	
School leaders understand their performance status.	

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 district has a clear intervention protocol with multiple ranges of interventions with conditions and consequences. However, it's unclear how the intervention protocol is communicated to schools.		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.	A summary of findings example was provided from a school compliance site visit.		N/A	Y
The authorizer provides written notice to the school of any contract breaches or areas of noncompliance in a reasonable timeframe.	Examples of written notifications to schools of contract breaches are		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

	included that detail concerns or issues.			
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.	Schools appear to have adequate time to respond to notices of concern or contract breaches and to implement corrective action plans.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (Ni)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3-4	EX
Evaluator Comments: Intervention protocols are in place, and examples of compliance site visit documentation was provided. The protocols include reasons for intervention and possible consequences. It is not clear how the protocol is communicated to schools.				

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.	Contracts clearly outline the autonomies and responsibilities of schools in the areas noted.		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.	Legal requirements are clearly outlined in the charter contract and assurances.	Charter Schools are able to attend the monthly principal meetings and monthly area office meetings to ensure timely updates to	N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

		changes in the law. Additionally during quarterly collaborative meetings changes are discussed within department guidelines.		
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	EX
Evaluator Comments: The contracts contain an appendix with roles and responsibilities to delineate autonomy. Additionally, legal requirements are outlined in the contract. Charter Schools are able to attend the monthly principal meetings and monthly area office meetings to ensure timely updates to changes in the law. Additionally during quarterly collaborative meetings changes are discussed within department guidelines.				

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.	All required renewal petition materials are linked and publicly accessible on the district website . The process includes both a capacity interview and the ability to submit supplementary evidence.		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Renewal criteria are transparent, specific and align to performance standards and expectations outlined in the charter contract.	Performance standards are clearly outlined in evaluation rubrics and posted on the district website .		N/A	Y
The authorizer uses a track record of performance over multiple years to make renewal determinations.	Data from each year of the charter term is reported in the renewal petition and evaluated.		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.	Broadly the reasons for termination are presented during a renewal presentation.	Is there any example of termination or related documentation?	N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	EX
Evaluator Comments: The renewal process is clear and communicated via the authorizer’s website. The renewal criteria are aligned with performance standards and multiple years of data are used. While the authorizer communicates broadly what constitutes criteria for revocation, more detailed documentation was not submitted.				
Advanced Criteria		Strengths	Areas of Growth	
<u>Expansion and Replication</u> The authorizer communicates clear processes, criteria, and standards for expansion and replication, so schools know when such applications are likely to be successful.		N/A - Based on the documentation provided, there is not enough information to score strengths and areas of growth for this section.		
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)

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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.	Emails detail the timelines and public posting of recommendations via eBoard.		N/A	Y
Standard (5-year) renewal terms are only granted to schools that met established performance expectations outlined in the charter contract.	Generally, 5-year renewal terms are used. In some instances, 2-year extensions are granted.		N/A	Y
Recommendations include a detailed, objective and evidence-based explanation for the decision.	Evaluation rubrics are detailed and comprehensive and recommendations are supported by explanations.		N/A	Y
The authorizer uses policy or procedure to ensure individuals involved in the renewal decision are free from conflicts of interest.	Sample conflict of interest forms from a past renewal are included.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	EX
Evaluator Comments: Renewal recommendations and decisions are detailed and objective. They are also communicated to schools promptly.				
Advanced Criteria	Strengths	Areas of Growth		
<u>Expansion and Replication</u> The authorizer evaluates the prior performance of existing schools and the organization's capacity to grow in making expansion or replication decisions.		It's unclear what specifically the authorizer does, if anything, to encourage expansion and replication. The authorizer could provide more clarity on the renewal standards that would support expansion or replication.		

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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.	The closure policy and procedures outline all the key processes and activities related to school closure.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1		AD
Evaluator Comments: The closure policies and procedures are clear. The authorizer has not closed a school in the past 5 years.				
Advanced Criteria	Strengths	Areas of Growth		
The authorizer has a plan that establishes clear roles and responsibilities with required steps for the orderly closure of a school. The authorizer provides support for transition of students to other schools.	The closure protocol document includes a detailed table of activities with a column for the responsible party and completion date. Activities related to student transitions include both the authorizer and school, demonstrating support.			