

Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System (MAPES) Rubric

Summary of Authorizer Performance Measures

Performance Measures A: Authorizer Capacity and Infrastructure – 25 Percent Weight of Overall Rating

- A.1: Authorizing Mission (2.5 percent overall weight)
- A.2: Authorizer Organizational Goals (1.25 percent overall weight)*
- A.3: Authorizer Structure of Operations (2.5 percent overall weight)
- A.4: Authorizing Staff Expertise (2.5 percent overall weight)
- A.5: Authorizer Knowledge and Skill Development of Authorizing Leadership and Staff (2.5 percent overall weight)*
- A.6: Authorizer Operational Budget for Authorizing the Portfolio of Charter Schools (2.5 percent overall weight)
- A.7: Authorizer Operational Conflicts of Interest (2.5 percent overall weight)
- A.8: Ensuring Autonomy of the Charter Schools in the Portfolio (2.5 percent overall weight)
- A.9: Authorizer Self-Evaluation of Capacity, Infrastructure and Practices (1.25 percent overall weight)*
- A.10: Authorizer High-Quality Authorizing Dissemination (1.25 percent overall weight)*
- A.11: Authorizer Compliance to Responsibilities Stated in Statute (3.75 percent overall weight)

Performance Measures B: Authorizer Processes and Decision-Making – 75 Percent Weight of Overall Rating

- B.1: New Charter School Decisions (11.25 percent overall weight)
- B.2: Interim Accountability Decisions (11.25 percent overall weight: 3.75 percent for expansion requests; 3.75 percent for ready to open standards; 3.75 percent for change in authorizers)
- B.3: Contract Term, Negotiation and Execution (7.5 percent overall weight)
- B.4: Performance Outcomes and Standards (11.25 percent overall weight)
- B.5: Authorizer's Processes for Ongoing Oversight of the Portfolio of Charter Schools (7.5 percent overall weight)
- B.6: Authorizer's Standards and Processes for Interventions, Corrective Action and Response to Complaints (3.75 percent overall weight)*
- B.7: Charter School Support, Development and Technical Assistance (3.75 percent overall weight)*
- B.8: High-Quality Charter School Replication and Dissemination of Best School Practices (3.75 percent overall weight)*
- B.9: Charter School Renewal and Termination Decisions (15 percent overall weight)

**Continuous Improvement Measures*

Acknowledgements

The development of MAPES was funded in part by an implementation grant in 2012 from the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) Fund for Authorizer Excellence. Through this grant, TeamWorks International was selected as the contractor to help the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) develop the initial plan and performance measures.

MAPES Measures and Indicators Overview

MAPES was established to review authorizers' performance per [Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, subdivision 5](#), and to identify high-quality authorizing practices to promote authorizer excellence in Minnesota.

Evaluation system objectives include:

- Setting clear expectations between authorizers and MDE regarding authorizer performance;
- Ensuring authorizer accountability and the fulfillment of approved authorizer applications;
- Promoting high-quality charter schools and authorizing excellence in order to improve all pupil learning and all student achievement;
- Promoting national principles and standards for quality charter school authorizing; and
- Evaluating authorizer performance through a lens of continuous improvement.

Authorizers are evaluated against:

- Nationally recognized standards and state expectations for high-quality authorizing;
- Established standards and processes stated in their commissioner-approved authorizer application (AAA) or commissioner-approved authorizing plan (AAP); and
- How they applied standards and processes with fidelity across their portfolio of charter schools over the current five-year term.

There are two elements to each measure, the Performance Measure and the Indicators. These elements set clear expectations of performance levels for measures in Part A and Part B to apply consistent criteria across all measures for evaluation. The Performance Measure includes:

- **Measure:** Title of the measure.
- **Guiding Question(s):** Defines what is being evaluated.
- **Measure Origin:** Identifies source from which the measures originate. These sources are used as reference documents in the evaluation.
- **Evaluation Data Source:** These key sources contribute fundamental data when evaluating authorizers on a particular measure. These are used as the primary evaluation data sources for the evaluation process; however, review documents are not limited to those stated. Review documents are any type of documentation that is available and exists to verify the measure rating.
- **Level Ratings:** Refers to criteria listed in Performance Measure levels. An authorizer will receive one of five performance ratings for each measure:
 - **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - **Level 3: Commendable**

- **Level 4: Exemplary**

Timeframes are applied to certain measures in Part A and Part B to clearly delineate among the performance indicator levels. In general:

- Authorizers must meet Satisfactory (Level 2) performance indicator(s) in at least three years to receive a Level 2 rating for a measure;
- Authorizers must meet Satisfactory (Level 2) performance indicator(s) in at least four years to receive a Level 3 rating for a measure; and
- Authorizers must meet Satisfactory (Level 2) performance indicator(s) for the authorizer term to date to receive a Level 4 rating for a measure.

Definitions

Nationally recognized quality authorizing standards:

- NACSA's Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing, 2018 Edition
- NACSA's Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing, 2015 Edition
- NACSA's Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing, 2012 Edition
- Other nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing established by a reputable external organization as vetted by the evaluator

Current statutory performance standards: Per [Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision 1\(c\)](#): "A charter school must design its programs to at least meet the outcomes adopted by the commissioner for public school students, including world's best workforce goals under section [120B.11, subdivision 1](#). In the absence of the commissioner's requirements governing state standards and benchmarks, the school must meet the outcomes contained in the contract with the authorizer. The achievement levels of the outcomes contained in the contract may exceed the achievement levels of any outcomes adopted by the commissioner for public school students."

High-quality charter school:

- A charter school that has been identified by MDE as a "high-quality charter school" through Minnesota's [Federal Charter Schools Program Grant Project's methodology and process](#)
- A charter school that has been recognized by a reputable external organization for achieving the primary purpose of charter schools and for exceptional performance in the areas of academics, finance and operations as vetted by the evaluator

Continuous Improvement Measure: A performance measure that focuses on ongoing efforts to improve authorizer operations to increase the quality of authorizing and charter schools in the state.

Internal verification at authorizing organization: May include the primary decision maker(s) and/or other employees, board members, officers, volunteers and contractors of the authorizing organization.

External verification with school representatives: May include charter school representatives within the authorizer's portfolio such as charter school leaders and staff and/or board chair and other board members. If responses from external interviews are inconsistent, MDE may seek responses from additional charter school representatives within the authorizer's portfolio.

Authorizing staff: Individuals both paid (e.g., staff) and unpaid (e.g., board members) as well as contractors hired by the authorizer.

Expertise: Having knowledge, education, training, etc. in the areas of charter school academics, finance, operations and law.

Experience: Length of time working in the areas of charter school academics, finance, operations and law.

Skills: Effective application of experience and expertise in the areas of charter school academics, finance, operations and law.

Credentials: Certificates or other documentation awarded by a reputable external organization demonstrating a person's expertise, experience, and/or skills.

Income: Examples include fees collected annually from charter schools and additional funds from outside sources.

Expenditures: Examples include staff, travel, consultants and office costs.

Conflicts of interest: As defined in [MDE's Guidance on Conflict of Interest for Authorizers and Charter Schools](#) document.

Performance Measures A: Authorizer Capacity and Infrastructure

A.1 Measure: Authorizing Mission

Guiding Question

- Does the authorizer have a clear and compelling mission for charter school authorizing?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, subdivision 4(a)(1)
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Interviews and surveys
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria
- Evidence of mission documented at the authorizing organization
- Documentation of external references to authorizing mission

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Mission is missing or vague
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Mission is stated, but inadequately aligns with Minnesota charter school statute **and/or**
 - The response inadequately describes how the authorizer carries out its mission by chartering schools **and/or**
 - Mission being implemented is not consistent with AAA/AAP
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Mission is stated and fully aligns with Minnesota charter school statute **and**
 - The response adequately describes how the authorizer carries out its mission by chartering schools **and**
 - Authorizer implements mission from AAA/AAP
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 **and**
 - Mission is verified internally in practice and documentation at authorizing organization **and**
 - Authorizer's mission is verified internally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 **and**
 - Mission is verified by external references **and**
 - Authorizer's mission is consistently verified externally by school representatives

A.2 Measure: Authorizer Organizational Goals

Guiding Question

- Does the authorizer have clear organizational goals and timeframes for achievement that are aligned with its authorizing mission and Minnesota charter school statute?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards
- Continuous Improvement Measure

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Interviews and surveys
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria
- Evidence of measurable organizational goals documented at the authorizing organization
- Evidence of authorizer engaged in evaluating its work against authorizing mission and progress towards organizational goals, including strategic plan and/or continuous improvement plans

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Organizational goals are not clearly related to charter school authorizing or aligned to state statute **and**
 - Organizational goals implemented are not consistent with AAA/AAP
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Organizational goals are not clearly related to charter school authorizing or aligned to state statute **or**
 - Organizational goals implemented are not consistent with AAA/AAP
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Authorizer has clear organizational goals, criteria and timeframes for achievement **and**
 - Authorizer implements organizational goals from AAA/AAP **and**
 - Authorizer's organizational goals align with authorizing mission
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 **and**
 - Authorizer is actively measuring progress on its organizational goals
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 **and**
 - Authorizer evaluates its work regularly against its authorizing mission and organizational goals, and implements plans for improvement

A.3 Measure: Authorizer Structure of Operations

Guiding Question

- To what degree does the authorizer operate with a clear structure of duties and responsibilities sufficient to effectively oversee its portfolio of charter schools?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, subdivision 4(a)(2)
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Interviews and surveys
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria
- Job descriptions of authorizing staff (if not already provided in AAA/AAP)
- Organizational chart that shows clear lines of reporting and authority/decision-making (if not already provided in AAA/AAP)
- If applicable, authorizer staffing changes since the AAA/AAP was approved including staffing size (FTE) compared to portfolio size

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Structure of duties and responsibilities is unclear, inconsistent and/or at a level insufficient to meet the needs of the portfolio of charter schools
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Structure of duties and responsibilities exists, but staffed at a level that does not sufficiently meet the needs of the portfolio of charter schools **or**
 - Level 2 indicators were not met for at least three years
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years:
 - Clear structure of duties and responsibilities is defined, charted and sufficiently meets the needs of the portfolio of charter schools **and**
 - Structure of duties and responsibilities are updated when necessary **and**
 - Authorizer appropriately manages, retains, and safeguards school, student information, and records relating to authorizing
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least four years **and**
 - Structure of duties, responsibilities and staffing levels are verified internally at authorizing organization as being sufficient
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 **and**

- Level 2 indicators were met for the authorizer term to date **and**
- Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally by school representatives as being sufficient

A.4 Measure: Authorizing Staff Expertise

Guiding Question

- To what degree does the authorizer have appropriate experience, expertise and skills to sufficiently oversee the portfolio of charter schools?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, subdivision 4(a)(2)
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Interviews and surveys
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria
- Resumes/vitae of authorizing personnel including contracted individuals with employment/contract terms (if not already provided in AAA/AAP)
- If not included in the resumes: conference or workshop certificates of completion or participation; licenses; certifications; degrees; etc. documenting staff expertise
- Documentation on how the authorizing staff's experience, expertise and skills align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Authorizing staff is underqualified to oversee the portfolio of charter schools
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Authorizing staff has limited experience, expertise and skills in charter school academics, finance, operations and law **and/or**
 - Authorizing staff are not able to sufficiently oversee the portfolio of charter schools **or**
 - Level 2 indicators were not met for at least three years
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years:
 - Authorizing staff has appropriate experience, expertise and skills in charter school academics, finance, operations and law **and**
 - Authorizing staff are able to sufficiently oversee the portfolio of charter schools
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least four years **and**

- Authorizing staff experience, expertise and skills align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 *and*
 - Level 2 indicators were met for the authorizer term to date *and*
 - Authorizing staff has credentials demonstrating experience, expertise and skills in charter school academics, finance, operations and law

A.5 Measure: Authorizer Knowledge and Skill Development of Authorizing Leadership and Staff

Guiding Questions

- To what degree does the authorizer build the knowledge and skill base of its authorizing leadership and staff through professional development?
- Is professional development aligned with authorizer's operations, mission and goals for overseeing its portfolio of charter schools?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards
- Continuous Improvement Measure

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Authorizer Annual Reports
- Interviews and surveys
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding questions and at least Level 2 criteria (if not already provided in authorizer annual report submissions)
- Documentation of professional development offered to authorizing staff during current five-year term, date of professional development, who attended, how the professional development addressed a necessary skill base for authorizing leadership and staff and how the professional development aligns with operations, mission and organizational goals
- If not included in the resumes submitted for A.4: conference or workshop certificates of completion or participation, etc. for authorizing staff

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Professional development is rarely offered or not offered to authorizing leadership and staff
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Professional development for authorizing leadership and staff is sporadic *and/or*
 - Professional development is only incident specific *and/or*

- Professional development attended is insufficient to fulfill professional development commitments provided in authorizer’s AAA/AAP
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Professional development is intentional and planned to build the knowledge and skill base of authorizing leadership and staff **and**
 - Professional development aligns with authorizer’s operations, mission, and organizational goals for overseeing its portfolio of charter schools **and**
 - Professional development attended is sufficient to fulfill professional development commitments provided in authorizer’s AAA/AAP
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 **and**
 - Professional development is attended regularly by authorizing leadership and staff, is ongoing and occurs more than once a year
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 **and**
 - Professional development attended by authorizing leadership and staff is customized to meet the needs of the authorizing leadership and staff **and**
 - Professional development is measured and evaluated

A.6 Measure: Authorizer Operational Budget for Authorizing the Portfolio of Charter Schools

Guiding Question

- To what degree is the authorizer’s actual resource allocation commensurate with its stated budget, and the needs and responsibilities of authorizing the portfolio of charter schools?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, subdivision 4(a)(2)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision 3
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Income and Expenditures Reports
- Interviews and surveys
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria
- Updated five year budget with actuals for years since approval
- Documentation that resource allocations align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards for financial resource commitments
- Documentation that resource allocations are designed to achieve nationally recognized quality authorizing standards

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Resource allocations for authorizing fall short of resources committed in its AAA/AAP **and**
 - Resource allocations are insufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Resource allocations for authorizing fall short of resources committed in its AAA/AAP **or**
 - Resource allocations are insufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities **or**
 - Level 2 indicators were not met for at least three years
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years:
 - Resource allocations for authorizing are at least consistent with resources to portfolio size ratio committed in its AAA/AAP **and**
 - Authorizer demonstrates resource allocations are sufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities and are commensurate with the needs and scale of its portfolio (e.g., income, expenditures, number and size of the charter schools in the portfolio) **and**
 - Authorizer staff changes occurred in relation to portfolio size
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least four years **and**
 - Resource allocations align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards for financial resource commitments
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 **and**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for the authorizer term to date **and**
 - Authorizer allocates resources to achieve nationally recognized quality authorizing standards, revising budgets as necessary

A.7 Measure: Authorizer Operational Conflicts of Interest

Guiding Question

- To what degree does the authorizer implement a clear policy to address conflicts of interest in all decision-making processes concerning the portfolio of charter schools?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.07, subdivision 3(d)
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Interviews and surveys

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria
- Authorizer conflict of interest policy (if not already provided in AAA/AAP)
- Authorizer conflict of interest processes and procedures for implementation and execution (could include forms, checklists, etc.)
- A fully documented example of how the authorizer successfully implemented its conflict of interest policy

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Conflict of interest policy for authorizing does not exist or is not implemented **and/or**
 - Numerous conflicts exist between the authorizer and its charter schools (e.g., staff and board may overlap, authorizer may require school to purchase services from authorizer, funds may be comingled, etc.) **and/or**
 - Schools are offered incentives by the authorizer (e.g., may only contract with an authorizer for various services) **and/or**
 - Authorizer's decisions are improperly influenced by a management company or the school board
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Conflict of interest policy for authorizing exists, but implementation is unclear or does not effectively address conflicts of interest **and/or**
 - Authorizer does not follow its conflict of interest policy as outlined in its AAA/AAP **and/or**
 - Decision-making is not transparent and/or it is unclear what criteria are used by the authorizer to make decisions
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Clear conflict of interest policy for authorizing exists and is intentionally implemented **and**
 - Authorizer avoids conflicts of interest that might affect its capacity to make objective, merit-based application and renewal decisions (e.g., involvement in school's performance) **and**
 - Authorizer is able to provide at least one fully documented example of how it has successfully implemented its conflict of interest policy (includes training staff) **and**
 - Authorizer ensures that application review and decision-making processes are free of conflicts of interest, and requires full disclosure of any potential or perceived conflicts of interest between reviewers or decision-makers and applicants
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 **and**
 - Implementation of policy has successfully prevented or resolved conflicts of interest in a timely, fair and appropriate manner **and**
 - If MDE/evaluator inquires about a specific example known to the department, authorizer is able to provide evidence concerning the situation that demonstrates satisfactory resolution
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 **and**
 - The implementation and effectiveness of the authorizer's conflict of interest policy is verified externally with consistent responses from school representatives

A.8 Measure: Ensuring Autonomy of the Charter Schools in the Portfolio

Guiding Question

- To what degree does the authorizer preserve and support the essential autonomies of the portfolio of charter schools?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.07, subdivision 6
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Interviews and surveys
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria
- Policy on charter school autonomy (if not already provided in AAA/AAP)
- Charter school autonomy processes and procedures for implementation and execution
- Documentation on how the authorizer's policy aligns with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Authorizer policy for ensuring autonomy is missing or vague **and**
 - In practice there is confusion regarding appropriate levels of autonomy with the charter schools in the portfolio **and**
 - Authorizer policy does not clearly relate to charter school authorizing **and**
 - Authorizer oversteps the authority vested in the charter school board to decide and be responsible for policy matters related to operating the school
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Authorizer policy for ensuring autonomy exists but is vague **or**
 - In practice there is confusion regarding appropriate levels of autonomy with the charter schools in the portfolio **or**
 - Authorizer policy does not clearly relate to charter school authorizing **or**
 - Authorizer oversteps the authority vested in the charter school board to decide and be responsible for policy matters related to operating the school
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Authorizer has a clear policy to ensure school autonomy **and**
 - Authorizer's policy on school autonomy establishes and recognizes the schools' authority over academics, financials and operations and respects the school's authority over the schools' day-to-day operations **and**
 - Authorizer's practice aligns with policy; authorizer holds charter schools accountable for performance outcomes and compliance with statute rather than on processes and inputs
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 **and**

- Authorizer’s policy aligns with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 *and*
 - Authorizer’s policy and practices to ensure school’s autonomy is verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals

A.9 Measure: Authorizer Self-Evaluation of Capacity, Infrastructure and Practices

Guiding Question

- To what degree does the authorizer self-evaluate its internal ability (capacity, infrastructure and practices) to oversee the portfolio of charter schools?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards
- Continuous Improvement Measure

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Authorizer Annual Reports
- Interviews and surveys
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria (if not already provided in authorizer annual report submissions)
- Authorizer self-evaluation tool(s), tracking and progress development
- An example of authorizer strategic plan(s), continuous improvement plan(s) and/or staff development based on self-evaluations
- Documentation of how authorizers evaluates its work against nationally recognized quality authorizing standards
- Documentation that continuous improvement plans have resulted in more effective authorizing practices

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Authorizer does not engage in self-evaluation to improve capacity, infrastructure and practices to oversee its portfolio of charter schools
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Authorizer self-evaluations occur but are not intentional or planned to build its capacity, infrastructure and practices to oversee its portfolio of charter schools
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Authorizer regularly evaluates its internal ability to oversee the portfolio of charter schools *and*
 - Self-evaluations are intentional and planned to build the authorizer’s capacity, infrastructure and practices to oversee its portfolio of charter schools

- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 *and*
 - Authorizer develops and implements continuous improvement plans to address findings of self-evaluation
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 *and*
 - Authorizer evaluates its work regularly against nationally recognized quality authorizing standards and implements continuous improvement plans that result in more effective authorizing practices *and*
 - Authorizer utilizes reflective practices to maintain an organizational focus on purposeful improvement

A.10 Measure: Authorizer High-Quality Authorizing Dissemination

Guiding Question

- To what degree does the authorizer disseminate best authorizing practices and/or assist other authorizers in high-quality authorizing?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- Continuous Improvement Measure

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Authorizer Annual Reports
- Interviews and surveys
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria
- Documentation of best practice sharing, engagement or technical assistance with/to other authorizers (if not already provided in authorizer annual report submissions)

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Authorizer does not engage with other authorizers to improve the authorizing community of practice
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Authorizer rarely engages with other authorizers to improve the authorizing community of practice
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Authorizer engages with other authorizers to improve the authorizing community of practice
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 *and*
 - Authorizer regularly shares best practices with and/or provides technical assistance to other authorizers

- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 *and*
 - Authorizer best practices and/or technical assistance are sought out by other authorizers

A.11 Measure: Authorizer Compliance to Responsibilities Stated in Statute

Guiding Question

- To what degree does the authorizer comply with reporting, submissions and deadlines set forth in Minnesota Statutes?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, subdivision 2 (MDE required training)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, subdivision 8 (statement of income and expenditures)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.06, subdivision 4 (new school affidavit)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.06, subdivision 5 (supplemental affidavit)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.06, subdivision 7(a) (merged charter contract)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision 1(a) (new/renewed charter contract)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision 5 (change in authorizers)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.16, subdivision 2(b) (authorizer annual report)
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- MAPES Compliance Data Spreadsheets
- Authorizer document submissions
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Since the start of the current term, the authorizer was less than 85 percent compliant in all the areas stated in the measure origin
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Since the start of the current term, the authorizer was at least 85 percent compliant in all the areas stated in the measure origin
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Since the start of the current term, the authorizer was at least 90 percent compliant in all the areas stated in the measure origin
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Since the start of the current term, the authorizer was at least 95 percent compliant in all the areas stated in the measure origin

- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Since the start of the current term, the authorizer was 100 percent compliant in all the areas stated in the measure origin

Performance Measures B: Authorizer Processes and Decision-Making

B.1 Measure: New Charter School Decisions

Guiding Questions

- To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals?
- To what degree did the authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions align to its stated approval and process standards and promote the growth of high-quality charter schools?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, subdivision 4(a)(3)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.06
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.17(b)
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Final MDE Analysis of Submissions
- Authorizer Annual Reports
- Interviews and surveys
- State Charter School Performance Data
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding questions and at least Level 2 criteria
- New charter school application, policies, procedures, timelines, and processes (if not already provided in AAA/AAP)
- Documentation or summary of applications and authorizer decisions since the start of the current term
- An example of a new charter school application review process, if applicable (from beginning to end)
- Documentation of alignment with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards designed to promote and/or have resulted in high-quality charter schools

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Authorizer’s application process is not comprehensive; does not include clear application questions and guidance; or does not include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria **and**
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools **and**
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA/AAP

- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Authorizer’s application process is not comprehensive; does not include clear application questions and guidance; or does not include fair, transparent procedures, timelines and rigorous criteria **or**
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools **or**
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA/AAP **or**
 - Level 2 indicators were not met for at least three years
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years:
 - Authorizer’s application process is comprehensive; includes clear application questions and guidance; and includes fair, transparent procedures, timelines and rigorous criteria **and**
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio of charter schools **and**
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA/AAP
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least four years **and**
 - Authorizer’s new charter school application and decision process aligns with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards **and**
 - The application and decision process reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 **and**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for the authorizer term to date **and**
 - School representatives consistently verify authorizer’s response to guiding question **and**
 - Authorizer decisions have resulted in high-quality charter schools

B.2 Measure: Interim Accountability Decisions (i.e., site/grade level/early learning expansions, ready to open, and change in authorizer)

Guiding Questions

- To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate proposals of existing charter school expansion requests and other interim changes?
- To what degree did the authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions regarding charter school expansion and other interim changes align to its stated approval and process standards and promote the growth of high-quality charter schools?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.03, subdivision 7(b)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, subdivision 4(a)(6)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.06, subdivision 3(b)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.06, subdivision 3(h)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.06, subdivision 5
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision 5
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards

- NACSA Principles and Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Final MDE Analysis of Submissions
- Authorizer Annual Reports
- Interviews and surveys
- State Charter School Performance Data
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding questions and at least Level 2 criteria
- Site/grade level/early learning expansion request, ready to open, and change in authorizer standards, policies, processes, and timelines (if not already provided in AAA/AAP)
- An example of the following, if applicable (from beginning to end):
 - 1) site/grade level/early learning expansion review process
 - 2) ready to open determination
 - 3) change in authorizer review process
- Documentation of alignment with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards designed to promote and/or have resulted in high-quality charter schools

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - The authorizer’s application processes are not comprehensive; do not include clear application questions and guidance; or do not include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria **and**
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools **and**
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA/AAP
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - The authorizer’s application processes are not comprehensive; do not include clear application questions and guidance; or do not include fair, transparent procedures, timelines and rigorous criteria **or**
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools **or**
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA/AAP **or**
 - Level 2 indicators were not met for at least three years
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years:
 - Authorizer’s application processes are comprehensive; include clear application questions and guidance; and include fair, transparent procedures, timelines and rigorous criteria **and**
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio of charter schools **and**
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA/AAP
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least four years **and**
 - Authorizer’s interim accountability processes align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards **and**
 - Interim accountability processes reflect a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools

- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 **and**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for the authorizer term to date **and**
 - School representatives consistently verify authorizer’s response to guiding question **and**
 - Authorizer decisions have resulted in high-quality charter schools

B.3 Measure: Contract Term, Negotiation and Execution

Guiding Question

- To what degree does the authorizer execute contracts that clearly define material terms and rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, subdivision 4(a)(4)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Final MDE Analysis of Submissions
- Interviews and surveys
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria
- An example of contracting negotiations (from beginning to end) and data to support the contracting decision
- An example of a contract amendment, if applicable, including communications to the school regarding those amendments

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Contracts in authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory requirements **and**
 - Contracts do not clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer **and**
 - Authorizer’s contracting practices are inconsistent across the authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Contracts in authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory requirements **or**
 - Contracts do not clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer **or**
 - Authorizer’s contracting practices are inconsistent across the authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools **or**
 - Level 2 indicators were not met for at least three years
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years:
 - Contracts in authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools meet current statutory requirements **and**
 - Contracts clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer **and**

- Authorizer’s contracting practices are consistent across authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools **and**
 - Contracts were executed no later than the first day of the renewal period
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least four years **and**
 - Authorizer executes contract amendments for material changes to current school plans when necessary and not in lieu of conducting renewal evaluations
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 **and**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for the authorizer term to date **and**
 - School representatives consistently verify authorizer’s response to guiding question

B.4 Measure: Performance Outcomes and Standards

Guiding Questions

- To what degree does the authorizer execute contracts with clear, measurable and attainable performance outcomes and standards?
- To what degree does the authorizer hold charter schools in its portfolio accountable to its academic, financial and operational performance outcomes and standards?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision 1
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Final MDE Analysis of Submissions
- Interviews and surveys
- State Charter School Performance Data
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding questions and at least Level 2 criteria
- Authorizing framework for school academic, financial, and operational performance outcomes and standards (if not already provided in AAA/AAP)
- Documentation of data collected and decisions made in response to charter schools meeting/not meeting academic, financial, and operational performance outcomes and standards
- Documentation of authorizing performance standards that align with nationally recognized quality performance standards designed to promote and/or resulted in high-quality charter schools

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Contracts in authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory performance standards **and**

- Contracts misalign with the performance standards of the authorizer’s AAA/AAP **and**
- Authorizer’s performance standards are inconsistent across the authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Contracts in authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory performance standards **or**
 - Contracts misalign with the performance standards of the authorizer’s AAA/AAP **or**
 - Authorizer’s performance standards are inconsistent across the authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools **or**
 - Level 2 indicators were not met for at least three years
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years:
 - Contracts in authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools meet current statutory performance standards **and**
 - Contracts define clear, measurable and attainable academic, financial and operational performance outcomes and standards, and consequences for meeting or not meeting performance outcomes and standards **and**
 - Performance outcomes and standards are consistent across the portfolio of charter schools **and**
 - Contracts align with the performance standards of its AAA/AAP **and**
 - Authorizers hold charter schools accountable to academic, financial and operational performance outcomes and standards defined in the contract
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least four years **and**
 - Authorizer executes contracts that align with nationally recognized quality performance standards **and**
 - Authorizer’s performance standards reflect a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 **and**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for the authorizer term to date **and**
 - School representatives consistently verify authorizer’s response to guiding question **and**
 - Authorizer’s performance standards have resulted in high-quality charter schools

B.5 Measure: Authorizer’s Processes for Ongoing Oversight of the Portfolio of Charter Schools

Guiding Question

- To what degree does the authorizer monitor and oversee charter schools in the areas of academics, operations, and finances according to the processes outlined in the contract and the AAA/AAP?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, subdivision 4(a)(5)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision 1(a)(7)
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards

- NACSA Principles and Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Authorizer Annual Reports
- Interviews and surveys
- State Charter School Performance Data
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria
- Authorizer oversight plans, including required academic, financial and legal/organizational reporting by schools to the authorizer (if not already provided in AAA/AAP)
- An example of one school's ongoing oversight including oversight/monitoring report(s) (from beginning to end of a contract term)
- Documentation of authorizing oversight processes that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards designed to promote and/or have resulted in high-quality charter schools

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Authorizer does not have clear processes for oversight and monitoring **and**
 - Authorizer's oversight and monitoring activities misalign with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA/AAP **and**
 - Authorizer's oversight and monitoring practices are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Authorizer does not have clear processes for oversight and monitoring **or**
 - Authorizer's oversight and monitoring activities misalign with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA/AAP **or**
 - Authorizer's oversight and monitoring practices are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools **or**
 - Level 2 indicators were not met for at least three years
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years:
 - Authorizer has clear processes for oversight and monitoring **and**
 - Authorizer conducts charter oversight that competently evaluates academic, financial and operational performance and monitors compliance with applicable law **and**
 - Authorizer's oversight activities align with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA/AAP **and**
 - Authorizer's oversight and monitoring practices are consistent across the portfolio of charter schools
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least four years **and**
 - Authorizer's oversight processes align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards **and**
 - Authorizer's processes for ongoing oversight of the portfolio of charter schools reflect a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools

- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 *and*
 - Level 2 indicators were met for the authorizer term to date *and*
 - School representatives consistently verify authorizer’s response to guiding question *and*
 - Authorizer’s oversight has resulted in high-quality charter schools

B.6 Measure: Authorizer’s Standards and Processes for Interventions, Corrective Action and Response to Complaints

Guiding Question

- To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards
- Continuous Improvement Measure

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Authorizer Annual Reports
- Interviews and surveys
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria
- Authorizer’s standards and processes for interventions, corrective action and response to complaints (if not already provided in AAA/AAP)
- Documentation of data collected and decisions made regarding complaints, intervention and corrective actions
- Documentation of one complete example of a charter school’s school improvement plan or notices of interventions put in place by authorizer (if applicable)
- Documentation of authorizing standards and processes for interventions, corrective action and response to complaints that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Authorizer does not have clear standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action *and*
 - Authorizer’s standards and processes for complaints, intervention and corrective action misalign with its stated standards and processes in its AAA/AAP *and*
 - Authorizer inconsistently implements standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Authorizer does not have clear standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action *or*

- Authorizer’s standards and processes for complaints, intervention and corrective action misalign with its stated standards and processes in its AAA/AAP *or*
- Authorizer inconsistently implements standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Authorizer implements clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action *and*
 - Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio of charter schools and align with its stated standards and processes in its AAA/AAP *and*
 - Decisions made regarding complaints, intervention and corrective action are aligned with data generated under oversight and monitoring practices
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 *and*
 - Authorizer’s standards and processes align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 *and*
 - School representatives consistently verify authorizer’s response to guiding question

B.7 Measure: Charter School Support, Development and Technical Assistance

Guiding Question

- To what degree does the authorizer support its portfolio of charter schools through intentional assistance and development offerings?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- Continuous Improvement Measure

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Authorizer Annual Reports
- Interviews and surveys
- State Charter School Performance Data
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria (if not already provided in authorizer annual report submissions)
- Documentation showing extent to which authorizer provided support and technical assistance, how the assistance addressed a need and/or helped prevent future problems
- Documentation of how support, development and technical assistance are designed to promote high-quality charter schools

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Support and technical assistance are not available
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Support and technical assistance are provided only in response to problems *and/or*
 - Support and technical assistance are provided in a manner that does not preserve school autonomy *and/or*
 - Support and technical assistance are provided in a manner that is inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Support and technical assistance are proactive *and*
 - Support and technical assistance are provided in a variety of areas *and*
 - Support and technical assistance are provided in a manner to preserve school autonomy *and*
 - Support and technical assistance are provided in a manner that is consistent across the portfolio of charter schools
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 *and*
 - Support and technical assistance are regularly offered, based on demonstrated need and designed to prevent problems
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 *and*
 - Support and technical assistance are designed to promote high-quality charter schools

B.8 Measure: High-Quality Charter School Replication and Dissemination of Best School Practices

Guiding Question

- To what degree does the authorizer plan and promote model replication and dissemination of best practices of high-quality charter schools?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.17(b)
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards
- Continuous Improvement Measure

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Authorizer Annual Reports
- Interviews and surveys

- State Charter School Performance Data
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and at least Level 2 criteria (if not already provided in authorizer annual report submissions)
- Plan for promoting the model replication and dissemination of best practices of high-quality charter schools
- Documentation of models being replicated and practices being disseminated

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - There is no intentional plan for successful model replication and dissemination of best practices
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - There is an intentional plan for successful model replication and dissemination of best practices, but models/practices have not been identified
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - There is an intentional plan for successful model replication and dissemination of best practices and models/practices have been identified
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 *and*
 - One or more identified models/practices are moving toward replication/dissemination
- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 *and*
 - One or more identified models/practices have been realized at or disseminated to one or more schools beyond the original

B.9 Measure: Charter School Renewal and Termination Decisions

Guiding Questions

- To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to make high stakes renewal and termination decisions?
- To what degree did the authorizer’s renewal and termination decisions align to its stated renewal standards and processes and promote the growth of high-quality charter schools?

Measure Origin

- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, subdivision 4(a)(7)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision 1(a)(8)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision 1(a)(11)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision. 1(a)(13)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision. 1(a)(14)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision 3(a)
- Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision 4
- Minnesota Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principles and Standards

Evaluation Data Source

- AAA/AAP
- Final MDE Analysis of Submissions
- Interviews and surveys
- State Charter School Performance Data
- Authorizer Annual Reports
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding questions and at least Level 2 criteria
- Documentation of authorizer's renewal standards and processes (if not already provided in AAA/AAP)
- An example of contract renewal review process and determination (from beginning to end)
- An example of contract termination decision, if applicable, including intervention processes (from beginning to end)
- Documentation of authorizing renewal and termination standards and processes that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards designed to promote and/or resulted in high-quality charter schools

Level Ratings

- **Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete**
 - Renewal standards and processes are incompletely or insufficiently stated **and**
 - Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools **and**
 - Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA/AAP
- **Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory**
 - Authorizer does not have transparent and rigorous standards and processes designed to use comprehensive academic, financial, operational and student performance data to make merit-based renewal decisions and terminate charters when necessary to protect student and public interests **or**
 - Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools **or**
 - Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA/AAP **or**
 - Level 2 indicators were not met for at least three years
- **Level 2: Satisfactory**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years:
 - Authorizer has transparent and rigorous standards and processes designed to use comprehensive academic, financial, operational and student performance data to make merit-based renewal decisions and terminate charters when necessary to protect student and public interests **and**
 - Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across its portfolio of charter schools **and**
 - Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA/AAP
- **Level 3: Commendable**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for at least four years **and**
 - Authorizer's renewal standards and processes align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards **and**
 - Authorizer's renewal standards and processes reflect a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools

- **Level 4: Exemplary**
 - Level 3 **and**
 - Level 2 indicators were met for the authorizer term to date **and**
 - Decisions resulted in high-quality charter schools **and**
 - School representatives consistently verify authorizer’s response to guiding question