

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation



Georgia Charter School Authorizer Evaluation

District Authorizer Evaluation Rubric | 2025

District Name: Fulton County Schools

Reviewer Name: Morgan Powell & LaMarius Moultrie Agbaje

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Evaluation Rubric

Authorizer Name: Fulton County Schools

Date: August 2025

SUMMARY	RATING
Category I. Authorizer Commitment & Capacity	
1. Human Resources	EX
2. Financial Resources	AD
Category II. The Petition Process	
3. Petition Application	AD
4. Petition Review	AD
5. Petition Decisions	AD
Category III. Performance Contracting	
6. Pre-Opening Period	AD
7. Performance Standards	EX
8. Contract Terms and Agreements	EX
9. Authorizer Obligations	EX
Category IV. Oversight and Evaluation	
10. Compliance Monitoring	AD
11. Intervention	EX
12. Upholds Charter School Autonomy	EX
Category V. Renewal and Termination	
13. Renewal Process	AD
14. Renewal Decisions	AD
15. Closure/Termination	AD
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 except as designated for NI or E
Exemplary (EX)	Earned a majority E (8 or more) and no NI across all standards
First Time Authorizer (FTA)	Charter authorizer in its first year of authorizing

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Category I. Authorizer Commitment & Capacity

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

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer has dedicated staff to supporting the charter schools in its portfolio. Whether staff are dedicated solely to charter school authorizing or have other duties, sufficient staff time and resources are allocated for the authorizer to fulfill its obligations, in light of the number of schools in the portfolio.	Authorizer currently has 2 FTE with a staff to school ratio of 1:3.5.		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).	A Cooper Gatewood – charter board experience, school oversight, policy implementation, community engagement, B.A. in Economics and Finance D. Berry – Assessment, student Support Services Education law experience is lacking, however taken together, the two FTE staff members have adequate experience in authorizing and other relevant experience.		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.	Per the JD submitted, the Director of Charter Schools and Specialist I, Charter Schools covers the roles and responsibilities.		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

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

				(N/A for 2025)
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

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 current fiscal year allotment sheet itemizing the calculation of state, local and federal allocations can be found on the website here .		N/A	Y
Budget allocations for the school reflect an administrative fee that aligns with the charter contract and applicable law.	Allotment sheet includes a line item titled “3% administration cost for district”		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.	Not found on the website or within documents shared by the district. Per Amana Academy budget here , FCS indicates administrative fee, however there is no evidence that demonstrates how those funds are allocated internally.	Per Dr. Moore the administrative withhold covers costs in the charter department and other indirect costs e.g. Student Information, Title I Support, and IT Team support.	N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3	AD
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 materials are listed on authorizer’s website here and include a timeline. Petitioner questionnaire, letter of intent, petition, petition checklist, budget template and directions, and charter roles & responsibilities.		N/A	Y
The authorizer clearly articulates petition requirements. Requirements are focused on written content rather than form (i.e. application length, font size, etc.).	The petition checklist includes page limitations and format requirements. The recent petition recommendation for Precious Pearls Leadership Academy cite submission format as reasons for denial, however the bulk of the recommendation is grounded in deficiencies of the written content.		N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes times and locations for petition submission that are reasonable and easy to be met by the petitioner.	The timeline available on the website indicates that the letter of intent will need to be received by the 3rd Friday in June 2025 and the application will need to be received by FCS by the 3rd Friday at noon in January of 2026. The petition checklist mentions that the submission must be hand-delivered to the FCS Charter School	State of the Charter presentation posted January 14, 2025 (see website) and board policy include additional information about the petition timeline. FCS noted that they have	N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

	Department and references FCS policy/operating guidelines – the links provided link to an email address. Given the information provided - the location and time for petition submission is not clear and therefore considered not easy to be met by the petitioner.	multiple touchpoints with applicants. New start applications were due January 17, 2025, therefore this publicly available information did not provide clarity for petitioners.		
The authorizer publishes staff contact information for technical assistance.	Andrea Cooper Gatewood and Diane Berry's contact information is listed on the website.		N/A	Y
	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).	Per documentation provided, Atlanta Cultural Academy included and Precious Pearls Urban Leadership Academy in February 2023 included 11 reviewers. Reviewers: Diane, Andrea, Gina Forester (Governance), Clara O'Rourke (research and evaluation), Erin Nusnbaum (Governance), Ashley Garrison (Budget and performance reporting), Susan Baker (SPED), Steven Moody (learning & teaching),	Per FCS: "FCS provides a comprehensive evaluation tool to all raters. First-time reviewers receive the tool early and are invited to have a 1:1 Q&A session with the authorizer before evaluating petitions." FCS also confirmed that the new start-up petition reviews is the	N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

	Wendy Newbold (ESOL), Angela Lane (no longer with FCS), and Laura Lashley (law)	same process as renewal petition reviews. Evaluation tools were noted to be similar, and examples were provided here.		
The authorizer publishes the petition evaluation criteria and the requirements for petition approval on the authorizer's website.	Evaluation criteria and requirements for petition approval are published on the authorizer's website "New Charter Start-Up Petition Evaluation Tools"		N/A	Y
The review process includes an interview.	The timeline published on the website notes that a "Petitioner Interview occurs in February/March of Year 2.		N/A	Y
Petition review and interview process are free of conflict of interest.	Authorizer shared a conflict of interest form template for future cycles. There was no evidence from previous cycles of signed forms.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments:				
Standard 5. Petition Decisions. The authorizer grants charters only to petitioners that have demonstrated competence and capacity to succeed in all aspects of the school, including a strong plan for improving student opportunities and outcomes. The authorizer makes petition decisions that are free from conflicts of interest.				
Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
Board decision to approve or deny an application is made by the board within 90 days of receiving the complete application (GA Code § 20-2-2064)	Recent completed petition cycle that received petitions was in 2023. Using Precious Pearls petition as an example: Completed petition received by authorizer January 20, 2023. Interview occurred February 2023. Board Meeting discussed school – meeting categorized as a	Current cycle – as published on the Final State of Charter document (slide 15) indicates the New Petition Application Submission was due January 17, 2025. 4	N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

	discussion and “First Read” - occurred April 13, 2023 Motion was made during this meeting to accept the denial recommendation for Precious Pearls. (83 days)	petitioners were expected, however all withdrew. Per FCS: “Two stated they were applying to different LEAs and two stated they were postponing. I uploaded the e-mails where I inquired about their petitions and their responses.”		
Authorization decisions are based on evidence tied to the petition evaluation criteria, applicable accountability metrics, and legal requirements.	Authorization decisions for petitioners are tied to the evaluation criteria submitted.		N/A	Y
If denied, petitioner is provided a written detailed description of deficiencies and information about how to reapply in the future.	Final recommendations are published as part of the FCS Board Meeting documents. Example here . Information on how to apply was not included.	Per the authorizer: “we maintain an open-door policy and ongoing communication with prior applicants.”	N/A	N
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.	Final recommendations are published as part of the FCS Board Meeting documents. Example here . Recommendations include detailed feedback.		N/A	Y
Recommendations are shared with petitioners at least one week prior to the authorizing board meeting.	No evidence was submitted to demonstrate recommendations were shared with petitioners one week prior to authorizing board meetings.	Per FCS “Precious Pearls withdrew from the decision cycle. For Atlanta Cultural Academy, I was unable to locate the specific email documentation due to the volume of correspondence; however, efforts to review archived communications are ongoing.”	N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

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

Category III. Performance Contracting

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

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer has a pre-opening checklist or other process that clearly communicates to schools what key readiness requirements must be met to open. The checklist or process includes adequate timelines, deliverables, responsible parties, and notes which criteria may defer opening.	FCS has provided a pre-opening checklist that includes deliverables and indication of responsible parties (FCS or school staff). The sign-off sheet identifies the criteria that must be completed prior to opening. The timeline provided is adequate in that it indicates that January through April FCS and the school are checking in on progress, May through July the school submits documentation related to the sign-off sheet, and July serves as the period in which a decision to open is made. *	FCS has not opened a new charter school recently so has not needed to leverage a pre-opening process.	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.	Facility Readiness is addressed in the Pre-Opening documentation.		N/A	Y
Pre-opening expectations specify student enrollment requirements including a minimum and maximum threshold to operate.	Pre-Opening documentation includes Enrollment Thresholds that align with the charter contract and LOA language.	Per FCS: "The Letter of Assurance (LOA) is typically presented to charter schools at the beginning of each	N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

		school year. The requirement for a board president/leader's signature on the LOA is communicated as a compliance item in Epicenter.”		
Pre-opening expectations specify board development requirements including required trainings, policy development and operational oversight procedures.	Section 6e in the Letter of Assurances under “Charter School Obligations” specifies governance requirements and pre-opening includes Operational Oversight Procedures in the sign-off sheet.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments: *While FCS provides a general timeline for pre-opening activities, greater detail and cohesion with the pre-opening sign-off list would support transparency and prioritization for FCS and school staff.				

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.	Appendix A includes Charter Accountability and Consequences. Targets are defined and goals are clearly defined.		N/A	Y
Evaluation measures allow for annual review.	Contract frames performance expectations with the following language “during each year of its charter contract term”		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Data sources used to evaluate performance are objective and verifiable.	Section I: Academic – CCRPI & State Accountability Section II: School Climate – Climate Star Rating Section III: Financial Performance – financial reports, audits Section IV: Governance Performance – compliance reporting Section V: Legal Compliance Performance Standards – compliance reporting & authorizer evidence		N/A	Y
The authorizer measures academic performance using a framework that includes clearly defined expectations for: • Student achievement • Student progress measures Expectations consider ALL students, including students with special needs, students with disabilities, and English Learners.	Section I of the performance framework relates to Academic performance. First Look – School Performance Gap Closure based on CCRPI scores. Second Look – School-Local School System Comparisons based on CCRPI scores and district comparison school system Subgroup performance is embedded in CCRPI.*		N/A	Y
Financial, operational and governance standards are grounded in best practice. Standards in these areas that are in addition to legal requirements are reasonable and not overly burdensome.	Financial, operational and governance standards and indicated in the Performance Standards and Intervention Protocol (2021) are grounded in best practice.	FCS staff collect feedback from schools in a variety of ways regarding reporting burdens – via Epicenter, surveys, and during trainings and meetings with charter school staff.	N/A	Y
The authorizer measures financial performance standards that enable the authorizer to assess and monitor schools’ financial viability. These include clearly defined metric and targets to assess near-term performance and long-term financial sustainability.	Financial performance standards addressed in the charter contract include – (1) Debt Default (2) Liquidity Ratio (3) Current Ratio (4) Debt to Asset Ratio (5) Unrestricted Days Cash (6) Sustainability Ratio (7) Annual Audit		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

	Near Term: Current Ratio; Unrestricted Days Cash; Debt Default Long Term: Debt to Asset Ratio			
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.	Sections IV and V in Appendix A of the contract specify Governance Performance Standards and Legal Compliance Performance Standards. As written in the contract, it is not clear that measures cover educational program compliance, financial oversight, governance and transparency, protecting the rights of students and employees, and ensuring a safe school environment. The Letters of Assurance that charters sign every year cover areas related to protecting the rights of students and employees, ensuring a safe school environment, education program compliance, financial oversight, and governance and transparency.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-5	6-7	EX
Evaluator Comments: *While the CCRPI captures subgroup performance, this performance is rolled in with other performance data. As a result, it is harder to discern how an individual campuses' subgroups are performing. It is the evaluator's recommendation that FCS include a distinct measure around the performance of English Learners and Students with Disabilities.				

Standard 8. Contract Terms and Agreements. The authorizer executes an initial contract for a term of five years that clearly outlines the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer. Agreements related to funding or in-kind services not required by OGGA §20-2-2068.1 or §20-2-2089 or

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

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	Documentation provided.		N/A	Y
Initial contract terms are five years as stated in 691-2-.01 of the State Charter Schools Commission of Georgia.	Per the authorizer data summary (column G), Hapeville Career Academy had an initial term of 2009 – 2019.	The initial contract for Hapeville Career Academy, given the dates, was removed as grounds for “Not Met”. Initial contracts executed since this instance have been 5 years.	N/A	Y
The performance contract details the rights and responsibilities of each party regarding school autonomy, funding, oversight, performance measures, and consequences for not meeting performance measures and material terms.	Appendix B includes “Roles and Responsibilities Chart” that details the rights and responsibilities of the charter school nonprofit governing board, charter school management, local school district, etc. Related to autonomy, funding, oversight and performance measures. Consequences for not meeting performance measures mentioned in Appendix A of charter contract and include intervention, probation, termination or non-renewal.		N/A	Y
The authorizer provides adequate and appropriate guidance to schools regarding what kinds of programmatic or operational changes constitute material changes that require authorizer approval.	Section 28 directly speaks to charter amendments. Material changes related to the Education Service Provider are described in section 17b of the charter contract and include a description as to what a material change is and the process to	Every year charter schools receive an LOA that they sign and material change guidance is embedded within. FCS submitted documentation that outlines clear	N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

	provide notice to the State and Local Board. Section 3 indicates that changes to the grade range or enrollment would require an amendment.	guidance on what constitutes a material change and the process for requesting.		
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.	Letter of Assurances provided which includes mention of in-kind services provided by the authorizer. This document is signed by both parties.	Per authorizer, FCS does not have separate negotiated services contracts with charter schools.	N/A	N
Contract and/or related agreements establish equitable per-pupil funding terms or amounts as required by state law.	Section 15c of charter contract.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	EX
Evaluator Comments:				
Standard 9. Authorizer Obligations. The authorizer follows all authorizing obligations outlined in law, State Board Rule, and the charter contract.				
Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer's contracts include or refer to the state and federal laws and other legal requirements the school must meet.	Section 33 of the contract and also included in Appendix A – Charter Accountability and Consequences.		N/A	Y
A local board of education authorizer makes unused facilities (as defined by 20-2-2068.2 (h)(2)) available to local charters. The SCSC follows guidelines from the state properties commission.	List of unused facilities is posted on the website here . Currently there are no facilities available.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

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.	Overview of oversight and monitoring provided.		N/A	Y
The authorizer has a documented process for conducting school site visits that includes a review of school performance and compliance in alignment with the contract, and/or subsequent agreements.	Submitted documentation provides a “proposed site visit process” from Charter Schools: Strategy and Governance but a documented process is not established.		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.	No documentation provided. See comment above re: site visits.		N/A	N
The authorizer conducts an on-site visit to each charter school at least once during the school’s charter term.	Per the oversight and monitoring document submitted, Operational Site Visits are conducted semi-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.	State of Charter Schools is published on the website here .		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	AD

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Evaluator Comments:

Standard 11. Intervention. The authorizer gives schools evidence-based, and timely notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies and allows schools reasonable time and opportunity for remediation.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer has an intervention protocol which determines when it may intervene and what consequences are possible (from a conversation to probation or other more serious actions). The intervention protocol includes actions that result from annual reviews using the performance framework and interventions required outside of “normal” monitoring findings (i.e. parent phone calls). This protocol is clearly communicated to schools.	Intervention Protocol was provided.		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.	FCS provided documentation of findings from Special Education Compliance and Instructional Review for Amana Academy (November 2023), Hapeville Career Academy (2024), RISE Grammar (12/21/22), RISE Prep (2/17/23), Main Street Academy (2024)		N/A	Y
The authorizer provides written notice to the school of any contract breaches or areas of noncompliance in a reasonable timeframe.	Written notice letters were submitted as part of the desk audit.		N/A	Y
The authorizer allows the school adequate time to remedy any identified areas of noncompliance, respecting the school’s autonomy to determine how to remediate the noncompliance, when appropriate.	Most recent letter of concern issued to Chattahoochee Hills Charter School was sent March 14, 2025 with expected response with a comprehensive plan submitted to FCS by April 16, 2025.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (Ni)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3-4	EX

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

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.	Appendix B – Locally Approved Charter School Partner Roles and Responsibilities Chart recognizes that the Charter School Nonprofit Governing Board is responsible for school governance, instructional program implementation, personnel, and budgeting. The intervention protocol names upholding school autonomy as a fundamental responsibility of FCS.		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.	Documentation was not provided.	FCS noted that the changes are communicated through the LOA which schools review and sign off on yearly, Epicenter, and in Board Meetings.	N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

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 website includes links to the renewal petition application, a sample letter of intent, and checklist. The renewal petition checklist mentions that the submission must be hand-delivered to the FCS Charter School Department and references FCS policy/operating guidelines – the links provided link to an email address. The general timeline is published on the website and notes the inclusion of an interview, however the timeline provided does not clearly communicate the process.	FCS communicates upcoming renewals in a variety of ways – state of the charter, announcements at charter board meetings, renewal orientations, Principal meetings, monthly meetings with schools and ongoing conversations when questions arise. FCS mentioned interest in including renewal information in their bi-monthly Charter School Newsletter.	N/A	Y
Renewal criteria are transparent, specific and align to performance standards and expectations outlined in the charter contract.	The section titled “Performance from Current Contract Term” in the renewal petition asks schools to share their past performance related to the expectations outlined in the charter contract.		N/A	Y
The authorizer uses a track record of performance over multiple years to make renewal determinations.	Renewal recommendations reference the track record of performance throughout the charter term.		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

Revocation criteria are clearly communicated to schools. The authorizer provides written warning, timeline, and notice of anticipated termination prior to the end of the charter school renewal period.	The contract makes clear in Section 26 renewal, non-renewal, and probationary terms. Section 24 describes termination grounds. The authorizer provided a letter template that was sent to families for the closure of RISE Grammar as well as an outline for a community meeting on February 6. Based on the evidence provided, the authorizer does not provide written warning, timeline, and/or notice of anticipated termination prior to the end of the charter school renewal period.	Written evidence provided for the closure of Hapeville, however no documentation provided demonstrating written notice, timeline, and/or notice of anticipated termination for RISE Grammar and RISE Prep.	N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
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.				
Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
Renewal/nonrenewal recommendations are provided through prompt, written notification to the school's governing board and the public within a reasonable timeframe, following the availability of necessary data, as to provide parents and students time to exercise choices for the upcoming school year.	The nonrenewal decision for FW RISE Grammar was communicated with the school board February 27, 2023. Board decision was made on February 23, 2023. Board documents are public.		N/A	Y
Standard (5-year) renewal terms are only granted to schools that met established performance expectations outlined in the charter contract.	The renewal decision documents provided are detailed and evidence-based, however the evidence that is provided to justify the decision do not clearly align	Closing Gaps and Readiness is not explicitly outlined in the contract, however it is included in the	N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

	with the established expectations outlined in the charter contract. First Look and Second Look goals outlined in the contract include – CCRPI single score, CCRPI Content Mastery or CCRPI Progress. For the renewal of The Main Street Academy indicates that TMSA achieved a perfect score for Closing Gaps (elementary) and Readiness (exceeding the district average) for the middle school. Closing Gaps and Readiness is not outlined in the contract, however it is included in the reasons for renewal.	reasons for the probationary renewal for The Main Street Academy. During the debrief conversation, FCS acknowledged that while this measure isn't explicit in the contract, it is an important data point to demonstrate a school's success in reaching at-risk populations. *		
Recommendations include a detailed, objective and evidence-based explanation for the decision.	Recommendations can be found via the Board Meeting Link. Recommendations are detailed and evidence based. See comment for criteria above.		N/A	Y
The authorizer uses policy or procedure to ensure individuals involved in the renewal decision are free from conflicts of interest.		Per authorizer: Going forward, all raters will complete a conflict of interest/confidentiality form. Previously, FCS vetted potential raters individually and had instances (e.g., an FCS Title I rater who was asked not to participate due to her grandchild's enrollment at a school under review) demonstrating FCS's commitment to maintaining integrity in the process.	N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation

	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments: *As noted in Standard 7, 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. The intention of FCS naming Closing Gaps in the renewal decision demonstrates their desire that all students succeed, however given that Closing the Gaps is not named in the contract, the criteria remains "Not Met".				

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.	Closure task list shared. Tasks include parent/guardian notification and student school assignments, Student Records, Faculty/Staff Notification and Employee Records, Financial Records and Obligation, School Asset Inventory, and Annual Report and Financial Audit.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1		AD
Evaluator Comments:				