

Georgia Charter School Authorizer Evaluation

District Authorizer Evaluation Rubric | 2025

District Name: Douglas County School System

Reviewer Name: LaMarius Moultrie Agbaje

Evaluation Rubric

Authorizer Name: Douglas County School System Date: August 2025

SUMMARY	RATING
Category I. Authorizer Commitment & Capacity	
1. Human Resources	AD
2. Financial Resources	EX
Category II. The Petition Process	
3. Petition Application	AD
4. Petition Review	AD
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	NI
11. Intervention	NI
12. Upholds Charter School Autonomy	EX
Category V. Renewal and Termination	
13. Renewal Process	NI
14. Renewal Decisions	NI
15. Closure/Termination	NI
OVERALL RATING	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 expect 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

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.	One person (Pam Nail) is listed on the charter site for the district. Charter School Division Douglas County School System	Pam Nail has retired since the start of the evaluation. Chelsie Goodman is now the dedicated staff member for the one active locally approved charter school.	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).	Staff resumes reflect adequate experience.		N/A	Υ
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.	Based on the documents provided, roles and responsibilities did not cover key components.		N/A	N
Districts: 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	(N/A for 2025)
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD

Evaluator Comments:

Education law and legal compliance are two areas of expertise that the authorizer could consider adding to their charter staff expertise.

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.	Budget is published on the website here and shares calculation of current public funding.		N/A	Υ
Budget allocations for the school reflect an administrative fee that aligns with the charter contract and applicable law.	The budget reflects the allocation for the admin fee.		N/A	Υ
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.	Budget published <u>online</u> shows authorizing fees.		N/A	Υ
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3	EX

Evaluator Comments:

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.	Petition information is published online <u>here</u> .		N/A	Υ
The authorizer clearly articulates petition requirements. Requirements are focused on written content rather than form (i.e. application length, font size, etc.).	Information for petition requirements are located online here.		N/A	Υ
The authorizer publishes times and locations for petition submission that are reasonable and easy to be met by the petitioner.	Times for the petition submission are provided, however the location for submission is not published online. View Board Policy IBB: Charter Schools		N/A	N
The authorizer publishes staff contact information for technical assistance.	Contact information for technical assistance related to the petition process is not published online.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD

Evaluator Comments:

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

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The petition evaluation team includes at least three individuals that have varied and relevant skills and backgrounds (i.e. education, finance, school governance, charter experience) trained in petition review or have completed a relevant training).	The authorizer does have a petition evaluation team.	-	N/A	Y

The authorizer publishes the petition evaluation criteria and the requirements for petition approval on the authorizer's website.	The published criteria is provided <u>here</u> .		N/A	Y
The review process includes an interview.	Interviews are conducted.		N/A	Υ
Petition review and interview process are free of conflict of interest.	Documentation is not provided.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD

Evaluator Comments:

Evaluators recommend seeking expertise in charter experience (specifically school governance) for future petition evaluations.

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)	A board decision to approve or deny is made within 90 days.		N/A	Y
Authorization decisions are based on evidence tied to the petition evaluation criteria, applicable accountability metrics, and legal requirements.	Decisions are based on the evidence provided in the petition evaluation.		N/A	Υ
If denied, petitioner is provided a written detailed description of deficiencies and information about how to reapply in the future.	Denials provide a description of deficiencies. Based on the documentation provided, information on how to reapply is not included, however it was explained and showed		N/A	Υ

	the steps on how to reapply via the board policy.			
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.	Detailed feedback is provided, and the petitioner can resubmit a revised petition to address any deficiencies cited in the denial. View Board Policy IBB: Charter Schools		N/A	Υ
Recommendations are shared with petitioners at least one week prior to the authorizing board meeting.	Documentation shared did not demonstrate that recommendations were shared at least one week before the authorizing board meeting.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4-5	EX
Evaluator Comments:			•	

Category III. Performance Contracting

Standard 6. Pre-Opening Period. The authorizer establishes clear and necessary, but not overly burdensome expectations for the pre-opening period

including, but not limited to, expectations regarding facilities, student enrollment and board development.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer has a pre-opening checklist or other process that clearly communicates to schools what key readiness requirements must be met to open. The checklist or process includes adequate timelines, deliverables, responsible parties, and notes which criteria may defer opening.	A pre-opening checklist is in place.	DCPS clarified that the * in the provided pre- opening checklist does not have significance. Therefore, the checklist does not notate which criteria may defer opening.	N/A	N
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.	All pre-opening expectations are specified.		N/A	Y

Student enrollment for minimum and maximum is evident in the pre- opening checklist.		N/A	Y
All board training and operational procedures are evident in the preopening document.		N/A	Y
Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
0-1	2-3	4	AD
	and maximum is evident in the pre- opening checklist. All board training and operational procedures are evident in the pre- opening document. Needs Improvement (NI)	and maximum is evident in the preopening checklist. All board training and operational procedures are evident in the preopening document. Needs Improvement (NI) Adequate (AD)	and maximum is evident in the preopening checklist. All board training and operational procedures are evident in the preopening document. Needs Improvement (NI) Adequate (AD) Exemplary (EX)

Evaluator Comments:

Authorizer could consider including a date range in the pre-opening checklist for greater clarity.

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.	All performance standards are included in each contract.		N/A	Y
Evaluation measures allow for annual review.	All evaluation measures allow for annual review.		N/A	Y
Data sources used to evaluate performance are objective and verifiable.	All data sources are easy to identify as objective and verifiable.		N/A	Υ
The authorizer measures academic performance using a framework that includes clearly defined expectations for: • Student achievement	Student achievement is measured from the CCRPI Content mastery and measures students' progress.		N/A	Y

Student progress measures Expectations consider ALL students, including students with special needs, students with disabilities, and English Learners.	Subgroup performance is embedded in CCRPI. *			
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.	Evident that all financial, operational, and governance practices are implementing best practices.		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.	All financials are visible and available for public view.		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.	Evident that all operational standard in measures of compliance, financial oversight, and safe school environment.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-5	6-7	EX (7/7)

Evaluator Comments:

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 SchoolsCommission and state charter school (for state charter schools).

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

^{*}While the CCRPI captures subgroup performance, this performance is rolled in with other performance data. As a result, it is harder to discern how an individual campuses' subgroups are performing. It is the evaluator's recommendation that FCS include a distinct measure around the performance of English Learners and Students with Disabilities.

Executes a contract with a legally incorporated, nonprofit governing board independent of the authorizer	The contract is legally incorporated by a nonprofit authorizer.		N/A	Υ
Initial contract terms are five years as stated in 691-201 of the State Charter Schools Commission of Georgia.	Initial contracts are at least 5 years		N/A	Υ
The performance contract_details the rights and responsibilities of each party regarding school autonomy, funding, oversight, performance measures, and consequences for not meeting performance measures and material terms.	"Appendix B - Locally-Approved Charter School Partner Roles and Responsibilities Chart" within the school's contract defines the rights and responsibilities of each party regarding autonomy is a standard and essential practice.		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.	Guidance is provided in the contract requiring any reasonable changes is in the amendment section of the contract.		N/A	Υ
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.	Specific services such the "In -Kind Services" is outlined in a separate contract.		N/A	Υ
Contract and/or related agreements establish equitable per-pupil funding terms or amounts as required by state law.	Contract clearly defines equitable pupil funding under the Fiscal Control section of the contract.		N/A	Υ
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

Evaluator Comments:

Standard 9. Authorizer Obligations. The authorizer follows all authorizing obligations outlined in law, State Board Rule, and the charter contract.

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

Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	EX
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
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.	There are no unused facilities in Douglas County per document published online here.		N/A	Υ
The authorizer's contracts include or refer to the state and federal laws and other legal requirements the school must meet.	All state and federal laws are included in the contracts.		N/A	Y

Evaluator Comments:

Category IV. Oversight and Evaluation

Standard 10. Compliance Monitoring. The authorizer protects the public interest and holds charter schools accountable for their obligations of governance, management, and oversight of public funds. The authorizer defines, communicates, and effectively implements the processes, methods, and timing of collecting and reporting school performance and compliance information. The authorizer conducts school visits as appropriate and necessary, and annually publishes school performance data.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer has a documented process for oversight and evaluation that aligns with the provisions of the performance contract.	Documentation not provided.		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.	Documentation not provided.		N/A	N

The authorizer clearly communicates its oversight processes, including site visits, and how information gleaned from those activities is used to hold schools accountable.	Documentation not provided.		N/A	N
The authorizer conducts an on-site visit to each charter school at least once during the school's charter term.	Documentation not provided.		N/A	N
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.	Report published online but outdated. Brighten Academy Annual School Performance Report		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	NI
Evaluator Comment:	1		ı	

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.	Documentation not provided.		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.	Documentation not provided.		N/A	N

The authorizer provides written notice to the school of any contract breaches or areas of noncompliance in a reasonable timeframe.	Documentation not provided.		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.	Documentation not provided.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (Ni)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3-4	NI

Evaluator Comments:

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

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The contract and the authorizer's practices recognize the school's autonomy in school governance, instructional program implementation, personnel, and budgeting.	Authorizer recognizes school's autonomy through the contract and authorizer practices.		N/A	Υ
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.	Academic Performance Standards provide 3 standards of achievement in which the school must meet one of those standards.	Any changes in requirements are communicated through conversations and a record of that conversation is kept via email.	N/A	Υ
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	EX
Evaluator Comments:	,	1		

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 timeline is published online. Renewal process and criteria documents are not published on the website. While DCPS links to the state's website, the linked page only includes information for start-up petitioners.		N/A	N
Renewal criteria are transparent, specific and align to performance standards and expectations outlined in the charter contract.	Performance standards are outlined in the contract. No documentation was provided related to renewal criteria.		N/A	N
The authorizer uses a track record of performance over multiple years to make renewal determinations.	Performance of charter monitored over years to make a decision.		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.	Documentation not provided.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	NI

Evaluator Comments:

Standard 14. Renewal Decisions. The authorizer bases renewal decisions on a thorough analyses of the criteria outlined in the charter contract, with objective and verifiable measures of student achievement and growth as the primary measure of school quality. The authorizer ensures the renewal decision-making processes are free of conflicts of interest. The authorizer communicates renewal decisions to the school community and public within a timeframe that allows parents and students to exercise choices for the coming school year.

Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
Document not provided.	Pam Nail makes the recommendation to the Superintendent, and the Superintendent makes the recommendation to the board.	N/A	N
5 year renewal term provided to Brighten Academy.		N/A	Y
Documentation not provided.		N/A	N
Documentation not provided.		N/A	N
Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
0-1	2-3	4	NI
	Document not provided. 5 year renewal term provided to Brighten Academy. Documentation not provided. Documentation not provided.	Document not provided. Pam Nail makes the recommendation to the Superintendent, and the Superintendent makes the recommendation to the board. 5 year renewal term provided to Brighten Academy. Documentation not provided.	Document not provided. Pam Nail makes the recommendation to the Superintendent, and the Superintendent makes the recommendation to the board. S year renewal term provided to Brighten Academy. N/A Documentation not provided. N/A N/A

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 leadershipcarry 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.

				Met
Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Criteria?
		ridinonizer Debrier	30.1331.34.132,	
				(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.	Documentation not provided	DCPS noted that they defer to state board rule for anything related to closure. Board rules were said to be accessible online, however evaluators were unable to review.	N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1		NI
Evaluator Comments:	ı			I