



Georgia Charter School Authorizer Evaluation

District Authorizer Evaluation Rubric | 2025

District Name: Savannah-Chatham County Public Schools

Reviewer Names: Jay Whalen & Brittany Monda

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Evaluation Rubric

Authorizer Name: Savannah-Chatham County Public 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	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	NI
11. Intervention	NI
12. Upholds Charter School Autonomy	AD
Category V. Renewal and Termination	
13. Renewal Process	AD
14. Renewal Decisions	AD
15. Closure/Termination	NI
OVERALL RATING	Adequate (AD)

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

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Category I. Authorizer Commitment & Capacity				
Standard 1. Human Resources. The authorizer identifies appropriate personnel to carry out its authorizing obligations, including the point(s) of contact who will coordinate charter school support.				
Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer has dedicated staff to supporting the charter schools in its portfolio. Whether staff are dedicated solely to charter school authorizing or have other duties, sufficient staff time and resources are allocated for the authorizer to fulfill its obligations, in light of the number of schools in the portfolio.	The authorizer has a Charter School liaison, that is full time and reports to the Executive Director of Accountability and Assessment. This position changed from part-time to full-time in 2024.		N/A	Y
Taken together, staff have adequate experience in charter authorizing or other relevant experience (e.g., education accountability, school funding and finance, education law and legal compliance).	The 10 staff members on the review committee staff have experience in education accountability, school funding and finance, and compliance. The Charter liaison has specific charter 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.	Based on the job description provided for the Charter School Liaison has the key responsibilities of petition receipt and review, oversight of academic, financial, and operational performance. The liaison is the point of contact for charter schools as listed on the 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 for 2025	(N/A for 2025)

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	EX
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer has a full-time Charter School Liaison and a 10-member review committee with relevant expertise, providing sufficient staffing and structure to support petition review, oversight, and stakeholder communication.				
Advanced Criteria (Optional for Evaluator Review)	Strengths	Areas of Growth		
The authorizer demonstrates its commitment to high-quality authorizing by building a healthy organization: - Organizational values (behavioral expectations) are explicit and enforced. - If applicable, authorizing is a visibly important function of the larger “parent” organization. - Staffing supports the authorizer’s goals and plans for the future.	The authorizer stated in the Authorizer Survey that they have made strides towards long-term authorizing goals by identifying areas of misalignment with state and national standards including hiring a charter liaison and greater leadership support to eliminate the absence of delayed implementation on tasks.	The submitted materials provide limited insight into how the authorizer builds a healthy organization beyond basic staffing. The materials do not include documentation of explicit organizational values, how authorizing is prioritized within the larger organization, or how staffing supports long-term goals.		
Employment and management practices attract and retain a diverse, effective team of authorizing professionals. This includes leadership and professional development, clear decision-making criteria, and effective onboarding.	N/A	There is also no evidence of employment practices that support attracting, developing, and retaining a diverse and effective team, including onboarding, professional development, or decision-making protocols.		

Standard 2. Financial Resources. Pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 20-2-2068.1 and O.C.G.A. § 20-2-2089, the authorizer allocates the required financial resources to support charter schools, treats charter schools no less favorably than other local schools within the system unless otherwise provided by law, and provides transparency on the availability and allocation of charter school funding.

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

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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.	While the authorizer has provided some financial calculations and documents on their website previously under 'Performance Framework', the information is not up to date and does not specify the specific district allotment sheets and/or allocations for its current portfolio of schools.		N/A	N
Budget allocations for the school reflect an administrative fee that aligns with the charter contract and applicable law.	While the information is not up to date on the website under the Performance Frameworks, within the past 5 years, the authorizer historically has shown a 3% administrative fee percentage included in its budget allocations.		N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes a budget reflecting the total amount received from any authorizing fees and other sources, and how those funds are allocated internally. The authorizer publishes the administrative services provided based on the administrative fees withheld.	The Authorizer does not publish a budget that reflects the total amount received from authorizing fees and the administrative services provided.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2	3	NI
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer has previously published financial information under its Performance Framework, including evidence of a 3% administrative fee aligned with charter contracts and state law. However, the published information is outdated and lacks current district allotment sheets or detailed funding allocations for the existing portfolio of schools. Additionally, the authorizer does not publish a budget showing the total authorizing fees received or how those funds are used to provide administrative services, limiting overall financial transparency.				
Advanced Criteria <i>Optional for Evaluator Review</i>		Strengths	Areas of Growth	
The authorizer's budget is sufficient and aligned to the authorizer's goals.		N/A	The authorizer does not provide a detailed budget outlining authorizer fees received or the administrative services funded by those fees. Without this information, it is unclear how the budget aligns with	

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

		authorizing goals or how resources are allocated to support specific services.
--	--	--

Category II. The Petition Process

Standard 3. Petition Application. The authorizer publishes a written petition application in accordance with state requirements and timelines. The authorizer provides reasonable and timely technical assistance and is responsive to petitioner questions.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer publishes petition materials (application, timelines, process and guidance) online in an easy-to- find location.	The applicant publishes a timeline for the charter petition process of their website and refers to the Charter Petition on the GA Dept of Education Charter Petition Application (broken link)..		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.).	Some petition requirements are found on the website page: Charter Application Review Process ; however much of the requirements are focused on the process versus the content of the application.		N/A	N
The authorizer publishes times and locations for petition submission that are reasonable and easy to be met by the petitioner.	Applications are due to a set location no later than 5pm with a set of requirements that must be met: Charter Application Review Process . Additional information is included about its submission to the GA Department of Education.		N/A	Y
The authorizer publishes staff contact information for technical assistance.	The website lists a technical assistance contact, which is the Charter School liaison.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD

Evaluator Comments:

The authorizer publishes key petition materials, including a timeline and submission requirements, in a generally accessible location on its website. However, while a process is outlined, much of the guidance focuses on procedural steps rather than the content of the petition itself. Submission deadlines and requirements are clearly stated, and a

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

designated staff contact—the Charter School Liaison—is listed for technical assistance. Notably, the link to the state charter petition application is broken, and additional clarity around content expectations would strengthen the overall guidance.		
Advanced Criteria <i>Optional for Evaluator Review</i>	Strengths	Areas of Growth
The authorizer conducts informational sessions about the petition process.	N/A	There is no evidence that the authorizer conducts informational sessions about the petition process for potential applicants.
The authorizer provides clear guidance around attendance possibilities (e.g., statewide, district, or other geographic limitations), funding structure for budget development, and requirements to align petitions to demonstrated community need.	N/A	There is no evidence that the authorizer conducts informational sessions about the petition process for potential applicants and included information related to attendance possibilities, funding structures, and demonstrated community need.

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 10 review committee resumes that have been provided have varied experiences and relevant skills to support educational management, finance, and charter experience. There is no documentation provided that supports relevant training for the petition review.		N/A	N
The authorizer publishes the petition evaluation criteria and the requirements for petition approval on the authorizer’s website.	While the ‘New Charter School Application Review Committee’ document has been provided as evidence, the evaluation criteria and requirements for approval are not posted on the authorizer’s website.		N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

The review process includes an interview.	As a part of the application review process, the applicant states that revision and clarification groups will be invited to a panel interview per the specifications of the law. This information is also publicly posted HERE .		N/A	Y
Petition review and interview process are free of conflict of interest.	The authorizer has not provided documentation that shows documentation of collecting conflict of interest statements (i.e. policy, signed documents, etc.), therefore, it is unable to be determined that the petition review is conflict free.		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's petition review team has relevant expertise in education, finance, and charter operations, supporting a comprehensive evaluation. However, there is no documentation of formal reviewer training, limited public information on application criteria, and absent conflict-of-interest policies, leaving review integrity unconfirmed.				
Advanced Criteria (Optional for Evaluator Review)		Strengths	Areas of Growth	
The authorizer trains evaluators to ensure consistent application of petition evaluation criteria. Evaluators discuss ratings and develop a list of questions to inform the interview.		N/A	There is no clear evidence that evaluators receive training to calibrate their ratings consistently against the rubric or that they have dedicated time to discuss ratings and develop interview questions collaboratively. Providing an orientation— would strengthen the evaluation process and ensure that these elements are included as a part of the petition review process.	
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)

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Board decision to approve or deny an application is made by the board within 90 days of receiving the complete application (GA Code § 20-2-2064)	The authorizer provides evidence within the board agenda and board resolutions that the board did not make decisions to approve/deny an application within its 90 day window, as they have provided evidence from the most recent Sustainable Future's Academy documentation. In the documents it states that the application was submitted March 3rd, however a decision was not made until a Special Called meeting on June 16.		N/A	N
Authorization decisions are based on evidence tied to the petition evaluation criteria, applicable accountability metrics, and legal requirements.	Based on the rubric provided for Sustainable Future's Academy, the evidence for decision is tied to the petition evaluation criteria and provides details that support why the indicators were not met. These items are within the BOE's resolution and other notification letters.		N/A	Y
If denied, petitioner is provided a written detailed description of deficiencies and information about how to reapply in the future.	As part of a denial, the authorizer provided a detailed description of deficiencies linked to the application and invites the applicant to reapply in the future; however, it does not provide details on how to do that. The applicant receives a letter prior to the board meeting, and written notice after the board's resolution.		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.	The authorizer provides the applicant with detailed feedback about its application via written letter, and then it is discussed as seen in the board meeting agenda, resolution, and shared with the GA Commission prior to the start of the meeting. While feedback is included, the letters and statements do not indicate details on how to apply in the future.		N/A	N
Recommendations are shared with petitioners at least one week prior to the authorizing board meeting.	The recommendation for denial was shared in a written letter with Sustainable Future's Academy over a week in advance to the scheduled board meeting.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4-5	AD

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Evaluator Comments: The authorizer bases board decisions on evaluation criteria, legal requirements, and accountability metrics, but missed the 90-day decision window for Sustainable Future's Academy and provides limited guidance for reapplication.		
Advanced Criteria <i>(Optional for Evaluator Review)</i>	Strengths	Areas of Growth
Application decisions reflect rigorous consideration of the following: - The educational program's likelihood of success and the applicants' capacity for educating children well, - The business and organizational plans' viability, - The experience and capacity of the applicant team (board and proposed leaders) to implement the proposed educational, business, and organizational program, and to manage any service provider contracts.	Application decisions include consideration of the applicant's organizational plans and overall viability, with discussion points supported by documented evaluation materials.	It is unclear how the authorizer evaluates the educational program's likelihood of success or the applicant team's capacity to implement the proposed plan, particularly in the absence of a capacity interview. Incorporating a structured capacity interview and explicitly documenting how each evaluation area—especially instructional capacity and leadership strength—is assessed would strengthen the rigor of decision-making.
The authorizer board's decisions generally align with staff recommendations. Conditional approvals are only granted for making specific technical changes and not as a means to allow the applicants to further develop proposals.	The authorizer's board decision aligns with staff recommendations and reflects the findings of the review committee. Additionally, no documentation was provided regarding conditional approvals, making it unable to be assessed.	N/A

Category III. Performance Contracting				
Standard 6. Pre-Opening Period. The authorizer establishes clear and necessary, but not overly burdensome expectations for the pre-opening period including, but not limited to, expectations regarding facilities, student enrollment and board development.				
Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer has a pre-opening checklist or other process that clearly communicates to schools what key readiness requirements must be met to open.	The authorizer has a pre-opening checklist that is 6 pages and includes the categories governance, Operations and Fiscal management, education and instruction,		N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

The checklist or process includes adequate timelines, deliverables, responsible parties, and notes which criteria may defer opening.	students and parents, school personnel, and facilities. The list includes the category, task, and timeline. The items within the checklist do not have responsible parties associated and do not identify which criteria would defer opening.			
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 tasks identify facility requirements on page 1 of the Pre-Opening Checklist, including the GaDOE Facilities sign off, Certificate of Occupancy, and submit an Emergency Plan in accordance with state law.		N/A	Y
Pre-opening expectations specify student enrollment requirements including a minimum and maximum threshold to operate.	The pre-opening expectations do not specify student enrollment requirements, including a minimum and maximum threshold to operate.		N/A	N
Pre-opening expectations specify board development requirements including required trainings, policy development and operational oversight procedures.	On page 6 of the Pre-Opening Checklist identifies the board development requirements, including trainings that are required (financial governance and initial governance trainings), by law ratification, and approved board policies. Additionally, it identifies that there is evidence of board meetings and minutes.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments:				
The authorizer’s pre-opening checklist covers key tasks but lacks assigned responsibilities, enrollment thresholds, and criteria for delays or denials, limiting its effectiveness in ensuring school readiness.				
Advanced Criteria (Optional for Evaluator Review)		Strengths	Areas of Growth	
The authorizer uses the pre-opening process to build relationships, set expectations for school performance, and provide technical assistance to schools.		N/A - Based on the documentation provided, there is not enough information to score strengths and areas of growth for this section.		
Is there a history of schools opening despite not meeting all of the pre-opening requirements? If so, why?				

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Is there a history of schools not opening on time? If so, why?	
In cases where a school's opening was delayed, did the authorizer make the decision early enough so that students and parents could make other arrangements?	

Standard 7. Performance Standards. The authorizer, through the performance contract, establishes high academic, financial, and operational performance standards under which schools will be evaluated, using objective and verifiable measures of student achievement and growth as the primary measure of school quality.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
Performance standards are included or referenced in the performance contract. These include clearly defined targets, thresholds or goals for each evaluation measure.	The documents identified by the authorizer as executed contracts include performance standards as a part of Appendix A. The applicant has included an approved technical guidance of the Comprehensive Performance Framework that discusses indicators, measures, formulas, and evidence of success related.		N/A	Y
Evaluation measures allow for annual review.	The indicators that are included in the 'SY 2023 CPFTG document show annual measures that are reviewed.		N/A	Y
Data sources used to evaluate performance are objective and verifiable.	As listed in the CPFTG, the items listed as data sources that can be verified such as enrollment numbers, achievement in subject areas, growth in subject areas, etc. Additionally, there are items within the report that identify "Yes" or "No" based on the presence of reports, or no findings.		N/A	Y
The authorizer measures academic performance using a framework that includes clearly defined expectations for: • Student achievement • Student progress measures	Within the CPFTG there are student achievement and student progress measures that consider all students, including EL and SWD. These are found in Domains 1 and 2 (Academic Performance: State/Federal and Academic Performance: Comparison). Although		N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Expectations consider ALL students, including students with special needs, students with disabilities, and English Learners.	these are included, there are no subgroup academic comparisons or achievement data included, but there is an indicator that identifies necessary support and program requirements.			
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.	Domain 4 of the CPFTG discusses the financial standards of the board and are grounded in best practice. Domain 7 of the CPFTG discusses the Board governance and LEA partnership portion and is grounded in best practice.		N/A	Y
The authorizer measures financial performance standards that enable the authorizer to assess and monitor schools' financial viability. These include clearly defined metrics and targets to assess near-term performance and long-term financial sustainability.	Domain 4 of the CPFTG discusses the financial standards of the board and are grounded in best practice to identify items such as audit findings, unrestricted days of cash/fund balance, procurement rules and processes, and financial reporting.		N/A	Y
Operational standards include measures in the following areas: educational program compliance, financial oversight, governance and transparency, protecting the rights of students and employees, and ensuring a safe school environment.	Domain 5 (Human Resources Management) and Domain 6 (Operational Performance) include indicators that discuss the school's educational compliance, oversight, governance, protecting students and employees rights. Domain 3 (Learning Environment) discusses the safety plan. And Domain 4 discusses the financial oversight.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-5	6-7	EX
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer's charter contracts and Comprehensive Performance Framework set clear academic, financial, governance, and operational standards using objective data, though subgroup academic performance is not disaggregated.				
Advanced Criteria (Optional for Evaluator Review)		Strengths	Areas of Growth	
The authorizer reviews financial data and determines, based on the circumstances of each school, whether the school presents a low, medium, or high risk for financial failure. This includes assessing whether the school maintains and implements compliant policies and procedures for expending state and federal funds and		The authorizer has established a financial performance framework as part of their contract (seen in the Oglethorpe document) with five clear standards	The current financial framework reflects compliance expectations but does not assess the level of financial risk (e.g., low, medium, or high) for schools.	

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

maintains an appropriate and legally compliant level of transparency regarding budgeting and finance.	focused on key compliance indicators, including loan defaults, working capital, debt-to-asset ratios, unrestricted cash, and audit records. These metrics support adherence to applicable laws and regulations and aim to ensure a clean (unmodified) audit opinion.	Incorporating risk-based indicators alongside the existing standards could provide a more comprehensive picture of a school's overall fiscal health, rather than a point-in-time snapshot.
The authorizer verifies that its schools: ● Adhere to applicable open meetings and records requirements. ● Maintain compliant policies and procedures for serving special student populations, including students with disabilities and those identified as gifted, experiencing homelessness, or as English Learners (EL). ● Adhere to the requirements of the charter contracts and applicable education laws, rules, and regulations.	The authorizer has established a governance performance standard, as seen in the Oglethorpe contract, which includes six key compliance indicators such as open governance requirements, required board training, and a minimum number of board meetings. Page 5 of the contract also outlines compliance with state and federal educational service mandates, including provisions for students with disabilities and English learners. Additionally, the contract includes a Legal Compliance Performance Standard section detailing requirements aligned with applicable laws and regulations.	Based on the information provided, there is no information related to compliance policies and procedures for students experiencing homelessness.

Standard 8. Contract Terms and Agreements. The authorizer executes an initial contract for a term of five years that clearly outlines the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer. Agreements related to funding or in-kind services not required by OGGA §20-2-2068.1 or §20-2-2089 or that are not included in the charter contract, must be negotiated and executed in writing and signed by the local authorizer and charter school (for local charter schools) or the State Charter Schools Commission and state charter school (for state charter schools).

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
Executes a contract with a legally incorporated, nonprofit governing board independent of the authorizer	Based on the information provided as a part of the contract for Oglethorpe Charter School, an authorized representative has signed the contract with a legally incorporated nonprofit		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

	governing board listed and signed as the 'governing board chair'. This can be found on pages 1 and 24.			
Initial contract terms are five years as stated in 691-2-.01 of the State Charter Schools Commission of Georgia.	Based on the information provided as part of the contract with Oglethorpe Charter School, on page 2 it states "This Charter is for Petitioner to operate the Charter School for a 5 -year term beginning on July 1, 2025 and expiring on June 30, 2030."		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.	Based on the information provided as part of the contract with Oglethorpe Charter School, the following has been identified: - Autonomy by the Governing Boady is mentioned on page 6 - Funding related to the per-pupil cost, proportionate share and in-kind services (page 7-8) - Material terms (page 12-13) - Performance based goals and measurable objectives (page 3, Appendix A) Additionally, the contract includes a roles and responsibilities chart that identifies the decision-making authority or responsibility (p. 24-28). Consequences, such as termination are listed in the agreement (Appendix A) including termination items beginning on page 13.		N/A	Y
The authorizer provides adequate and appropriate guidance to schools regarding what kinds of programmatic or operational changes constitute material changes that require authorizer approval.	Based on the information provided as part of the contract with Oglethorpe Charter School, the authorizer does not provide what a material change would constitute under approval for the school. Within the contract, material term or provision is defined on pg 2 and further discussed as a part of ESP on page 10; however, guidance is not provided.		N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Specific services provided by the authorizer are negotiated and agreed to by both parties and are outlined in a separate written contract or service agreement, if applicable.	The authorizer has provided agreements that show negotiations between the two parties included amendments to the initial contract, specialized instruction, personnel, and food services.		N/A	Y
Contract and/or related agreements establish equitable per-pupil funding terms or amounts as required by state law.	Of the information provided in the Oglethorpe Charter School contract, the base per-pupil funding is established on page 7 discussing the estimate and rate.		N/A	Y
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	EX
Evaluator Comments: The authorizer executes five-year contracts with independent nonprofit boards, detailing school autonomy, funding, oversight, performance goals, and termination, but lacks clear guidance on what constitutes a material change requiring approval.				
Standard 9. Authorizer Obligations. The authorizer follows all authorizing obligations outlined in law, State Board Rule, and the charter contract.				
Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
The authorizer's contracts include or refer to the state and federal laws and other legal requirements the school must meet.	The contract from Oglethorpe Charter School includes state and federal requirements including but not limited to special populations, federal funding, and compliance with all laws, rules, and regulations.		N/A	Y
A local board of education authorizer makes unused facilities (as defined by 20-2-2068.2 (h)(2)) available to local charters. The SCSC follows guidelines from the state properties commission.	In the Charter School Comprehensive Reference Guide, page 91, there is a listing of the District's Unused Facilities (none listed) as of its time of publishing in 2021.		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: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

The authorizer's contract references applicable state and federal laws, including provisions for special populations, federal funding, and general legal compliance. While the authorizer complies with the legal requirement to make unused facilities available, the most recent publicly available list indicates no unused facilities at that time and has not been updated since. Additional updates would allow for better clarity on any changes.		
Advanced Criteria (Optional for Evaluator Review)	Strengths	Areas of Growth
The authorizer publicly posts a current list of unused facilities concurrently with the regular charter petition process.	N/A	There is no publicly posted list of unused facilities that aligns with the charter petition timeline.

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.	No documentation of the oversight process was submitted.	-	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.	No documentation of the oversight process was submitted.		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.	Process for site visits was not provided. It is also unclear if/how it is communicated to schools.		N/A	N

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

The authorizer conducts an on-site visit to each charter school at least once during the school's charter term.	It is unclear if/when on-site visits are conducted during a charter term.		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.	Financial reports and allotments are published, but performance reports are not.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement (NI)	Adequate (AD)	Exemplary (EX)	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-2	3-4	5-6	NI

Evaluator Comments:

It is generally unclear how compliance monitoring is taking place in practice. This standard is rated NI due to lack of documentation related to the criteria, which may not truly reflect actual oversight practices taking place.

Advanced Criteria	Strengths	Areas of Growth
The authorizer knows, at any given time, how a school is doing.	N/A - Based on the documentation provided, there is not enough information to score strengths and areas of growth for this section.	
The authorizer provides clear technical assistance to schools to ensure timely compliance with new or revised laws.		
The authorizer differentiates its oversight to ensure that time and resources are allocated effectively based on school performance and capacity, as well as the authorizer's goals.		
Site visits are structured in a way that enables the authorizer to gather the information needed to evaluate the school appropriately and that respects school autonomy.		
School leaders understand their performance status.		

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

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

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

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.	How are interventions currently happening or being communicated to schools?	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: No current interventions were documented for schools, so it is unclear the extent to which intervention protocols are currently being implemented. However, there was no documentation submitted to evaluate the criteria in this standard.				

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

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

The contract and the authorizer's practices recognize the school's autonomy in school governance, instructional program implementation, personnel, and budgeting.	Contracts clearly outline the autonomies and responsibilities of schools in the areas noted.		N/A	Y
Specific requirements not otherwise required under state law are either included in the charter contract or charter schools are <i>notified at least one year prior</i> to the requirement going into effect.	Legal requirements are clearly outlined in the charter contract and assurances.	Understand the process and timeline for notifying schools of new requirements.	N/A	N
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1	2	AD
Evaluator Comments: The contracts used are clear and contain legally required information.				

Category V. Renewal and Termination

Standard 13. Renewal and Termination Process. The authorizer clearly communicates to schools the criteria for charter termination, renewal and non-renewal that are consistent with the terms of the charter contract. The renewal process includes a written application and an opportunity for an interview.

Evaluation Criteria	Documentation Review	Authorizer Debrief	School Survey	Met Criteria? (Y/N)
Renewal process, criteria, and a general timeline are clearly communicated to schools well in advance of renewal and are published in a publicly accessible location. The process includes a written renewal application and an opportunity interview to make factual corrections or present supplementary evidence of performance.	The renewal process and timeline are outlined on the district website and in the renewal petition.		N/A	Y
Renewal criteria are transparent, specific and align to performance standards and expectations outlined in the charter contract.	The renewal criteria and rubric is aligned to performance standards.		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

The authorizer uses a track record of performance over multiple years to make renewal determinations.	Past performance and multiple years of data are considered in renewal decisions.		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.	It is unclear how/where revocation criteria is communicated to schools. No recent revocations have occurred.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments: The processes and documentation submitted for the renewal process are clear and aligned to performance standards, including multiple years of performance data. The process is also outlined and linked on the district website. It is however, unclear if/how revocation criteria are communicated to schools.				
Advanced Criteria	Strengths		Areas of Growth	
<u>Expansion and Replication</u> The authorizer communicates clear processes, criteria, and standards for expansion and replication, so schools know when such applications are likely to be successful.	N/A - Based on the documentation provided, there is not enough information to score strengths and areas of growth for this section.			
Standard 14. Renewal Decisions. The authorizer bases renewal decisions on a thorough analysis 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.	Renewal timelines are reasonable and notifications are prompt.		N/A	Y

Georgia Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing: Authorizer Evaluation Rubric

Standard (5-year) renewal terms are only granted to schools that met established performance expectations outlined in the charter contract.	The district grants standard 5-year terms for schools meeting expectations.	How/when have 2-year extensions been used?	N/A	Y
Recommendations include a detailed, objective and evidence-based explanation for the decision.	Renewal letters to the district BOE include broad reasons for renewal and recommendations. Are more detailed rubrics/ assessments shared?		N/A	N
The authorizer uses policy or procedure to ensure individuals involved in the renewal decision are free from conflicts of interest.	A COI policy from a school was submitted, but documentation or policy of how the district ensures the process is free of conflicts of interest was not.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0-1	2-3	4	AD
Evaluator Comments: Generally, the timelines and notifications are prompt and meet the criteria. Additionally the district grants 5-year charter terms. However, the recommendations presented to the Board include broad reasons, not detailed, objective-based explanations and a clear plan and policy for conflicts of interest was not submitted.				
Advanced Criteria		Strengths	Areas of Growth	
<u>Expansion and Replication</u> The authorizer evaluates the prior performance of existing schools and the organization’s capacity to grow in making expansion or replication decisions.		N/A - Based on the documentation provided, there is not enough information to score strengths and areas of growth for this section.		

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: Authorizer 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.	No written closure policy or documentation was submitted.		N/A	N
	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Exemplary	Rating
Number of Criteria Met:	0	1		NI
Evaluator Comments: While documentation was not submitted, it's unclear if closure protocols have been used at all in practice to close a school.				
Advanced Criteria	Strengths		Areas of Growth	
The authorizer has a plan that establishes clear roles and responsibilities with required steps for the orderly closure of a school. The authorizer provides support for transition of students to other schools.			The district should create documentation that clearly outlines the responsibilities of all parties to ensure the orderly closure of a school.	