



Georgia Charter School Authorizer Evaluation

District Authorizer Evaluation Rubric | 2025

District Name: Greene County Schools

Reviewer Name: Jay Whalen

Evaluation Rubric

Authorizer Name: Greene County Schools

Date: September 1, 2025

SUMMARY	RATING
Category I. Authorizer Commitment & Capacity	
1. Human Resources	EX
2. Financial Resources	NI
Category II. The Petition Process	
3. Petition Application	AD
4. Petition Review	NI
5. Petition Decisions	NI
Category III. Performance Contracting	
6. Pre-Opening Period	AD
7. Performance Standards	EX
8. Contract Terms and Agreements	EX
9. Authorizer Obligations	AD
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	AD
14. Renewal Decisions	NI
15. Closure/Termination	NI
OVERALL RATING	Adequate (AD)

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

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing 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.	Dr. Rhodes has oversight of the charter school portfolio. She serves as Assistant Superintendent over other divisions as well. With a small portfolio of schools, there is currently capacity for oversight with just one individual; but it is unclear how much of that 1 FTE time is dedicated to charters.	In a district the size of Greene Co, it is common for district staff to wear multiple hats. Dr. Greene has sufficient capacity to oversee the 1 authorized school and is able to lean on other departments in the district for support.	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).	Dr. Rhodes has extensive experience and expertise in education. Though not authorizing specifically, her past experience is relevant and sufficient to manage the oversight of public schools.		N/A	Y
The roles and responsibilities of the authorizing office cover key responsibilities in a coherent structure, specifically: - Petition receipt and review, - Oversight of academic, financial, and operational performance, and - Designated point of contact for charter stakeholder inquiries.	The roles are clear as they are all assigned to Dr. Rhodes. She serves as the designated point of contact listed on the district website.		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	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3	EX
Evaluator Comments: The exemplary rating for this standard is reflective of the portfolio size in the district as well as the expertise brought by the Assistant Superintendent. However, the Asst. Superintendent also has several other duties and responsibilities, and should the portfolio grow, additional capacity would be needed.				
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.	Allotment sheets are not published.		N/A	N
Budget allocations for the school reflect an administrative fee that aligns with the charter contract and applicable law.	Individual allotment sheets are not provided to determine if the administrative fee aligns with state law.	The district does have a policy for holding back the 3% administrative fee, though has not always held back the full fee.	N/A	N
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.	A general district budget was provided, but did not include details of the authorizing fees or allocation for services.	There have been a lot of conversations in the past year about the fee with schools. Though it is not currently communicated publicly how it's used, the process is very collaborative.	N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3	NI
Evaluator Comments: With only one school, the charter portfolio is integrated into the submitted district financials. The allotments and authorizing fees need to be separately published in accordance with Georgia law.				

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing 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 district website has a link on the charter school landing page that is clearly labeled to download petition materials.		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 authorizer uses the petition published by the SCSC. Requirements outlined in the petition are clear and focused on content.	In the event a new petition is received, the authorizer would plan to follow the process outlined by the SCSC.	N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes times and locations for petition submission that are reasonable and easy to be met by the petitioner.	Timelines and deadlines for the petition process are not listed on the district website.		N/A	N
The authorizer publishes staff contact information for technical assistance.	Dr. Rhodes is listed on the website as the main point of contact with phone and email information.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

Evaluator Comments: The authorizer uses SCSC petition materials, though times and location for petitioners are not published. The authorizer has not received a petition in many years.

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. For the review of local charter petitions at least one of the individuals on the evaluation team shall have local district administrative 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).	Only 1 reviewer was used in the evaluation of the only school in the authorizer's portfolio. That person did have local district administrative experience. However, that school was approved in 2007 and the process has changed since then.	-	N/A	N/A
The authorizer publishes the petition evaluation criteria and the requirements for petition approval on the authorizer's website.	Petition evaluation criteria and the requirements for petition approval are not published on the authorizer's website.		N/A	N
The review process includes an interview.	The authorizer has not had a recent petition, but uses the SCSC petition documents and the process likely mirrors the process outlined in the SCSC	In the event a new petition is received, the authorizer would plan to follow the process outlined by the SCSC.	N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

	petition, including a panel interview.			
Petition review and interview process are free of conflict of interest.	The authorizer has not had a recent petition, but does not have a clear process to identify conflicts of interest. It would be beneficial to draft a conflict of interest template to use in the event a petition is submitted.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	NI
Evaluator Comments: The ratings in this section may not be completely indicative of current practice in Greene County. Only one charter school operates in the county and it was approved in 2007 under different legal and process requirements. The authorizer now appears to follow much of the SCSC petition process and uses materials developed by the SCSC. It would be helpful and transparent for the public and future petitioners if the authorizer published updated process guidance that aligns with this standard.				

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)
Authorization decisions are based on evidence tied to the petition evaluation criteria, applicable accountability metrics, and legal requirements.	The past rubric provided includes comments, but it's unclear how ratings and decisions were tied to the evaluation criteria. The district uses a new petition now,		N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

	though has not had an application to evaluate. It is unclear what evaluation criteria would be used currently.			
If denied, petitioner is provided a written detailed description of deficiencies and information about how to reapply in the future.	Without a recent petition, there has not been an opportunity to demonstrate this criterion.		N/A	N/A
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.	Without a recent petition, there has not been an opportunity to demonstrate this criterion.		N/A	N/A
Recommendations are shared with petitioners at least one week prior to the authorizing board meeting and within 90 days of receiving the complete application.	Without a recent petition, there has not been an opportunity to demonstrate this criterion.		N/A	N/A
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	NI
Evaluator Comments: As noted above, the authorizer has not had recent applications related to this standard. While the petition documents are in place, the evaluation criteria and procedures for notifications should be updated and clear to ensure they align with the criteria above for when they would be needed.				

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

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

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.	Greene County utilizes the pre-opening checklist published by the SCSC. It clearly outlines required submissions and readiness requirements.		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 all the required facility requirements.		N/A	Y
Pre-opening expectations specify student enrollment requirements including a minimum and maximum threshold to operate.	Certain enrollment requirements are outlined, but minimum and maximum thresholds are not in the pre-opening checklist. The maximum enrollment threshold is noted in the charter contract.		N/A	N
Pre-opening expectations specify board development requirements including required trainings, policy development and operational oversight procedures.	Required training is outlined in the pre-opening checklist.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments: Overall, the authorizer uses a strong and comprehensive contract to outline the performance expectations and legal requirements of its charter schools.				

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.

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

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.	The charter contract includes performance measures and clearly defined targets.		N/A	Y
Evaluation measures allow for annual review.	The evaluation measures used can be reviewed annually. The authorizer uses the GaDOE CCRPI framework.		N/A	Y
Data sources used to evaluate performance are objective and verifiable.	The authorizer met this criterion. The authorizer uses the GaDOE CCRPI framework. Financial and operational measures are verifiable.		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.	The academic performance measures include content mastery and growth measures for whole school and grade bands via the CCRPI. Subgroup performance is embedded in CCRPI. See "Evaluator Comments" for 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.	While outlined in the contracts, these performance standards are measured internally but not shared publicly like academic standards.	N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

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.	Standards for financial viability are outlined in the charter contract.		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."		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-5	6-7	EX
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, and both financial and operational performance standards should be reported publicly.				

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).

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

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	Executed contract for Lake Oconee provided.		N/A	Y
Initial contract terms are five years as stated in SBOE rule 160-4-9.-05	Executed contract for Lake Oconee is for a 5-year term.		N/A	Y
The performance contract details the rights and responsibilities of each party regarding school autonomy, funding, oversight, performance measures, and consequences for not meeting performance measures and material terms.	Contract terms and appendices address this criterion.		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 charter contract outlines certain provisions that require contract amendments. Unclear when/how additional guidance is provided.		N/A	Y
Specific services provided by the authorizer are negotiated and agreed to by both parties and are outlined in a separate written contract or service agreement, if applicable.	N/A		N/A	N/A
Contract and/or related agreements establish equitable per-pupil funding terms or amounts as required by state law.	Contract terms address this criterion.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	EX
Evaluator Comments:				

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

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.	Contract terms address this criterion.		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.	There are currently no unused district facilities. It is unclear how those would be made available, if there were unused facilities.		N/A	N/A
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	AD
Evaluator Comments: N/A				

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 and evaluation documentation has little detail and is focused on site visits only.		N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing 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 authorizer's website includes documentation of how and when site visits occur, including the purpose of each visit.	.	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.	It is unclear exactly how oversight processes are communicated outside of posting on the website.	The oversight process is primarily communicated between the district Supt. and the school CEO or from the district board to the school board. While informal, the process is collaborative.	N/A	N
The authorizer conducts an on-site visit to each charter school at least once during the school's charter term.	The authorizer documentation outlines semi-annual on-site visits to monitor school operations and annual site visits to observe the instructional program.	Though a schedule is documented, it hasn't always been adhered to. But the authorizer has already instituted a process for semi-annual site visits to take place	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.	A link to the GaDOE CCRPI reports is included on the authorizer's website .	Organizational and financial performance standards are measured internally but not shared publicly like academic standards.	N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	NI
Evaluator Comments: Site visit schedules and purposes or clearly outlined and beginning to be implemented with more fidelity; though additional oversight and compliance monitoring protocols/documentation were not submitted and should be developed. Organizational and financial performance standards should be reported publicly.				

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.

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

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.	No documentation was submitted for this standard. Per the authorizer: There are no documents for this standard as there have been no site visits, no corrective action plans, no noncompliance communication to schools, and no interventions.	There are no current interventions right now. Communication about performance or concerns is informal but has become much more collaborative with the school in recent years.	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.	No documentation was submitted for this standard.		N/A	N
The authorizer provides written notice to the school of any contract breaches or areas of noncompliance in a reasonable timeframe.	No documentation was submitted for this standard.		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.	No documentation was submitted for this standard.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (Ni)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3-4	NI
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer does not have official intervention protocols and has not had the need for other intervention documentation based on the performance of its current school. This is an area of oversight the district needs to build out.				

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

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.	The charter contract includes and recognizes the school autonomy.		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.	Other requirements not in state law are included in the contract. It is unclear if/how schools are notified at least one year in advance.	The district is in continuous conversation with its school and new requirements are mentions. It would be helpful to formalize this process.	N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	EX
Evaluator Comments: The "Locally Approved Charter School Roles and Responsibilities Chart" included in Appendix B of the contract is clear and a very helpful resource to outline school autonomies.				

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)

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

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 authorizer uses the SCSC renewal petition materials and a link is published on the website .	Currently the Supt. leads the renewal with support from other district departments. The Board receives school data, which is heavily focused on student achievement. Supt. and board chair make recommendation to full board.	N/A	Y
Renewal criteria are transparent, specific and align to performance standards and expectations outlined in the charter contract.	Renewal criteria, rubrics, and/or recommendation reports were not submitted.		N/A	N
The authorizer uses a track record of performance over multiple years to make renewal determinations.	Data from each year of the charter term is included in the renewal petition and considered as evidence in the renewal petition.		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.	Revocation criteria were not submitted nor is it clear how they are communicated to schools.	Renewal criteria are communicated informally to the charter school.	N/A	N
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments: While the process and documentation for renewal petitions is clear, the evaluation criteria and standard for renewal/revocation is not. Rubrics or other documentation communicating these standards would be beneficial.				

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-

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

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.	Timelines and notifications for the renewal decisions were not provided.	Renewal decisions are communicated informally to the charter school.	N/A	N
Standard (5-year) renewal terms are only granted to schools that met established performance expectations outlined in the charter contract.	Renewal terms are 5 years.		N/A	Y
Recommendations include a detailed, objective and evidence-based explanation for the decision.	A recommendation report was not provided.	Renewal decisions are communicated informally to the charter school.	N/A	N
The authorizer uses policy or procedure to ensure individuals involved in the renewal decision are free from conflicts of interest.	A general conflict of interest policy was submitted, but not documentation related to COI in the renewal decision was submitted.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	NI
Evaluator Comments: Improving transparency and communication regarding renewal decisions should be a priority along with developing documentation for conflict of interest.				

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

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing Evaluation Rubric

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 authorizer has a brief documented list of procedures that include the items listed in the criterion, though there is little detail and it is not an approved policy.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1		NI
Evaluator Comments: The district has just recently renewed their only school, ideally meaning no closures are imminent. However, a more comprehensive Closure and Termination Policy and plan is needed.				