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SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZER PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE - 25% Weight of Overall Rating

Authorizer Mission and Vision
A.1: Authorizer Mission (5%)
A.2: Authorizer Vision and Organizational Goals (10%)

Authorizer Capacity and Infrastructure
A.3: Authorizer Structure of Operations (15%)
A.4: Authorizer Staff Expertise (10%)*
A.5: Authorizer Capacity and Skill Development of Leadership and Authorizing Staff (5%)*
A.6: Authorizer Operational Budget for Authorizing the Portfolio of Charter Schools (10%)
A.7: Authorizer Operational Conflicts of Interest (10%)
A.8: Ensuring Autonomy of the Schools in the Portfolio (15%)
A.10: Authorizer High Quality Authorizing Dissemination (5%)*
A.11: Authorizer Compliance to Responsibilities Stated in Statute (10%)

PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING - 75% Weight of Overall Rating

Authorizer Process and Decision-making
B.1: New Charter School Decisions (20% / 5%)**
B.2: Interim Accountability Decisions (10% / 5%)**

Authorizer Performance Contracting
B.3: Contract Term, Negotiation, and Execution (10%)
B.4: Performance Standards (10%)

Authorizer Ongoing Oversight and Evaluation
B.5: Authorizer’s Processes for Ongoing Oversight of the Portfolio of Charter Schools (10%)
B.6: Authorizer’s Standards and Processes for Interventions, Corrective Action and Response to Complaints (10%)*
B.7: Charter School Support, Development and Technical Assistance (5%)*
B.8: High Quality Charter School Replication and Dissemination of Best School Practices (5%)*

Authorizer Renewal and Decision-Making
B.9: Charter School Renewal or Termination Decision (20%)

*Continuous Improvement Measure
**Weights adjusted for authorizers not engaged in B.1 and/or B.2 activities

The development of the Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System (MAPES) was funded in part by an implementation grant from the National Association of Charter School Authorizer’s (NACSA) Fund for Authorizer Excellence. Through this grant, TeamWorks International was selected as the contractor to help MDE develop the initial plan and performance measures.
Minneapolis Authorizer Performance Evaluation System Measures, Indicators and Specifications Overview

The Minneapolis Authorizer Performance Evaluation System (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;
- Promoting national principles and standards for quality charter school authorizing; and
- Evaluating authorizer performance through a lens of continuous improvement.

Authorizers are evaluated against:

1) Nationally recognized standards and state expectations for high quality authorizing;
2) Established standards and processes stated in their most recently approved authorizer application (AAA); and
3) How they applied standards and processes with fidelity across their portfolio of charter schools. There are two elements to each measure, the **Performance Measure** and the **Specifications**. These elements set clear expectations of performance levels for measures in *Part A: Authorizer Capacity and Infrastructure* and *Part B: Authorizer Decision-Making and Processes* to apply consistent criteria across all measures for evaluation.

The **Performance Measure** includes:

- **Measure**: Title of the measure.
- **Guiding Question**: Defines what is being evaluated.
- **Measure Origin**: Identifies source from which the measures originates. 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.
- **Indicator Level Ratings**: Refers to criteria listed in **Performance Measure** levels. An authorizer will receive one of five performance ratings for each measure:
  - Level 4: Exemplary
  - Level 3: Commendable
  - Level 2: Satisfactory
  - Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory
  - Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete

The **Specifications** include:

- **Definitions (if applicable)**: Used to define terms that are specific to a measure.
- **Specific Data Sources**: Documentation an authorizer submits to demonstrate that the authorizing organization sufficiently meets or exceeds the guiding question. The documents with an * are required documents to at least receive a “Satisfactory” rating. The other documents address “Commendable” and “Exemplary” ratings for the performance measures. Authorizers may submit additional documentation not included on the list.
- **Weight**: There are 11 measures in Part A and 9 measures in Part B. Overall, Part A accounts for 25% of an authorizer’s performance rating and Part B accounts for 75% of an authorizer’s performance rating.
- **Time (duration)**: 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) for at least the last 12 months to receive a Level 2 rating for a measure; Authorizers must meet “Satisfactory” (Level 2) performance indicator(s) for at least the last two years to receive a Level 3 rating for a measure; and Authorizers must meet “Satisfactory” (Level 2) performance indicator(s) for at least the last three years to receive a Level 4 rating for a measure.

Exceptions are made to measures that have only continuous improvement and/or NACSA standard designations under measure origin. These measures are not required components of Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.01 et seq., nor were they addressed in approved authorizer applications from 2010-2012. To receive a Level 2, Level 3 or Level 4 rating in these measures, an authorizer needs to have met the indicators and specifications in the respective level for at least the last 12 months.

Considerations:

- **Guiding Question, Evaluation Data Source and Additional Evidence:** These are used as the primary evaluation data sources for the evaluation process, however, review documents are not limited to those stated above. Review documents are any type of documentation that is available and exists to verify the measure rating.
- **Internal Verification:** May include the main decision maker(s) and/or other employees, officers, volunteers and contractors of the authorizing organization.
- **External Verification:** May include charter school representatives in the authorizer’s portfolio such as the director(s) and/or board chair. If responses from external interviews are inconsistent, MDE may seek responses from additional charter school representatives in the authorizer’s portfolio.
- **Authorizers Not Engaged in B.1 and/or B.2 Activities:** The weight in measure B.1 New Charter School Decisions and B.2 Interim Accountability Decisions are adjusted for authorizers who are not actively chartering, opening and/or expanding charter schools, and/or reviewing/accepting change in authorizer applications. These authorizers can only receive up to “Satisfactory” (Level 2) rating for B.1 and B.2. To mitigate for the rating difference in comparison with authorizers who are engaged in these activities, the weight has been reduced for B.1 and B.2. These measures each have a 5% overall weight in Part B instead of 20% and 10%, respectively.
### Authorizer Mission

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Data Sources</th>
<th>Level 0</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 4(1)  
• MN Authorizer Application Standards  
• NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards | Mission missing or vague | Mission is stated, but inadequately aligns with Minnesota charter school law | Mission is stated and fully aligns with Minnesota charter school law | Mission is verified internally in practice and documentation at authorizing organization | Mission is verified by external references (such as school board validation) |

**Mission**

- **Level 0**: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete
- **Level 1**: Approaching Satisfactory
- **Level 2**: Satisfactory
- **Level 3**: Commendable
- **Level 4**: Exemplary

**Evaluation Data Source**

1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)
2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire

**Weight**

5%

See above indicator

Mission being implemented is not consistent with AAA and/or Mission in AAA does not clearly align with Minnesota charter school law or does not outline what the organization is realizing as a charter school authorizer

Authorizer implements mission from AAA and Mission is aligned with Minnesota charter school law and reflects what the organization is realizing as a charter school authorizer

Level 2 specifications and Authorizer’s mission is verified internally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals

Level 3 specifications and Authorizer’s mission is verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals

---

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**AUTHORIZER MISSION AND VISION**

**A.1 MEASURE**

GUIDING QUESTION | MEASURE ORIGIN | EVALUATION DATA SOURCE | LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete | LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory | LEVEL 2 Satisfactory | LEVEL 3 Commendable | LEVEL 4 Exemplary |
|------------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Authorizer Mission | Does the authorizer have a clear and compelling mission for charter school authorizing? | - MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 4(1)  
- MN Authorizer Application Standards  
- NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards | Mission is missing or vague | Mission is stated, but inadequately aligns with Minnesota charter school law | Mission is stated and fully aligns with Minnesota charter school law | Level 2 and Mission is verified internally in practice and documentation at authorizing organization | Level 3 and Mission is verified by external references (such as school board validation) |

**A.1 SPECIFICATIONS**

### Authorizer Mission

- **Level 0**: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete
- **Level 1**: Approaching Satisfactory
- **Level 2**: Satisfactory
- **Level 3**: Commendable
- **Level 4**: Exemplary

**Specific Data Sources**

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*
- Evidence of mission documented at the authorizing organization*

**Weight**

5%

See above indicator

Mission being implemented is not consistent with AAA and/or Mission in AAA does not clearly align with Minnesota charter school law or does not outline what the organization is realizing as a charter school authorizer

Authorizer implements mission from AAA and Mission is aligned with Minnesota charter school law and reflects what the organization is realizing as a charter school authorizer

Level 2 specifications and Authorizer’s mission is verified internally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals

Level 3 specifications and Authorizer’s mission is verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals
## PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE
### AUTHORIZER MISSION AND VISION (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.2 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorizer Vision and Organizational Goals</strong></td>
<td>Does the authorizer have a comprehensive vision for charter school authorizing with clear organizational goals and time frames for achievement that are aligned with the purposes of MN Law?</td>
<td>• MN Statutes §124E.01, Subd. 1 • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards</td>
<td>Vision is missing or without organizational goals</td>
<td>Vision aligns with state statute with limited measurable organizational goals</td>
<td>Vision aligns with state statute with measurable organizational goals</td>
<td>Level 2 and Vision has clear organizational goals, criteria and timeframes for achievement and Authorizer is actively measuring and achieving most goals</td>
<td>Level 3 and Authorizer is actively engaged in measuring and achieving exceeding goals established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.2 SPECIFICATIONS</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Data Sources</strong></td>
<td>See above indicator</td>
<td>Vision and/or goals implemented are not consistent with the approved AAA and/or Organizational goals are not clearly related to charter school authorizing</td>
<td>Authorizer implements vision from AAA and Authorizer organizational goals aligns with chartering vision and statutory purpose(s)</td>
<td>Level 2 specifications and See above indicator</td>
<td>Level 3 specifications and Authorizer evaluates its work regularly against its chartering vision and organizational goals, and implemented plans for improvement when falling short of its mission and strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*  
*Evidence of measurable organizational goals documented at the authorizing organization*  
*Evidence of authorizer engaged in self-evaluation of work against chartering vision and progress towards organizational goals (e.g. strategic plan and/or continuous improvement plans)*
## PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE
### AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.3 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorizer Structure of Operations | To what degree does the authorizer operate with a clear structure of duties and responsibilities and sufficient resources to effectively oversee its portfolio of charter schools? | • MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 42  
• MN Authorizer Application Standards  
• NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards | 1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)  
2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire | Structure of duties and responsibilities is unclear, inconsistent and/or at a level inadequate to meet the needs of the portfolio | Structure of duties and responsibilities exists, but staffed at a level that does not sufficiently meet the needs of the portfolio | Clear structure of duties and responsibilities is defined, charted and at a level adequate to meet the needs of the portfolio | Level 2 and  
Structure of duties and responsibilities are updated when necessary and  
Authorizer practices are verified externally (such as school board validation) | Level 3 and  
Clear structure of duties and responsibilities are updated when necessary and  
Authorizer practices are verified externally (such as school board validation) |

### A.3 SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Data Sources</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Weight | 15% | See above indicator | The following specifications were met for at least the last 12 months:  
Sufficient resources to meet the needs of the portfolio of schools and  
If applicable, changes were made to the organizational structure when necessary and  
Authorizer appropriately manages and safeguards school, student information, and records relating to authorizing | a) Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years and  
b) Structure of duties, responsibilities and staffing levels are consistently verified internally at authorizing organization for interviewed individuals | Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years and  
Level 3 specification b) and  
Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.4 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorizer Staff Expertise (e.g. advisors, board members, volunteers, etc.) | To what degree does the authorizer have appropriate experience, expertise and skills to sufficiently oversee the portfolio of charter schools? | • MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 4(2)  
• MN Authorizer Application Standards  
• NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards  
• Continuous Improvement Measure | 1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)  
2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire | Authorizing staff has limited experience, expertise and skills in charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance, and/or law with insufficient skills to oversee the portfolio of charter schools | Authorizing staff has experience, expertise and skills in charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance and law | Authorizing staff has diverse experience, expertise and skills in charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance and law | Authorizing staff has diverse experience, documented expertise (licensure, certificates, etc.) and skills in charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance and law |

**A.4 SPECIFICATIONS**

**Definitions**
- Authorizing staff refers to individuals both paid and unpaid as well as contractors hired by the authorizer.
- Expertise is defined as having knowledge, education, training, etc. in the areas of charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance, and law.
- Experience is defined as length of time working in the areas of charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance, and law.
- Skills is defined as effective application of experience and expertise in the areas of charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance, and law.

**Specific Data Sources**
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*  
- Current resumes/vitae of existing personnel including contracted individuals with employment/contract terms if different than AAA*  
- If not included in the resume: conference or workshop certificates of completion or participation; college level course transcripts; licenses; certifications; degrees; etc. documenting staff expertise

**Weight**
- 10%
### Authorizer Capacity and Skill Development of Authorizing Leadership and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.5 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorizer Capacity and Skill Development of Authorizing Leadership and Staff</td>
<td>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 its operations, vision and goals for overseeing its portfolio of charter schools?</td>
<td>• NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards • Continuous Improvement Measure</td>
<td>1. Authorizer Annual Report 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</td>
<td>Professional development is rarely offered or not offered to authorizing leadership and staff</td>
<td>Professional development is offered to authorizing leadership and staff and Aligns with its operations, vision and goals for the portfolio of schools</td>
<td>Level 2 and Professional development is offered regularly to authorizing leadership and staff</td>
<td>Outcomes of professional development are measured and evaluated</td>
<td>Professional development is offered regularly to authorizing leadership and staff, is differentiated, and aligns with operations, vision and goals for the portfolio of schools and Outcomes of professional development are measured and evaluated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A.5 SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Data Sources</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence if different than authorizer annual report submissions*  
• Documentation of professional development offered to authorizing staff within the last 12 months, date of professional development, who attended, how the professional development addressed a needed skill base for authorizing leadership and staff and how the professional development aligns with operations, vision and goals for the portfolio of schools*  
• If not included in the resume submitted for A.4: conference or workshop certificates of completion or participation; etc. for authorizing staff | See above indicator | Professional development is only incident specific and/or Professional Development misaligns with authorizer mission and vision | Within the last 12 months professional development was intentional and planned to build the skill base of the authorizing leadership and staff | Level 2 specification and Professional development is regular, ongoing, and more than once a year | Level 3 specifications and Within the last 12 months professional development is measured, evaluated and customized to meet the needs of the authorizing leadership and staff |
| Weight | 5% | | | | |
**PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.6 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorizer Operational Budget for Authorizing the Portfolio of Charter Schools | To what degree is the authorizer’s actual resource allocation commensurate with its stated budget, needs and responsibilities of authorizing the portfolio of charter schools? | • MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 3(1) and 4(2)  
• MN Authorizer Application Standards  
• NACSA Standard #1 | 1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)  
2. Income and Expenditures Report  
3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire | Resource allocations for authorizing fall short of resources committed in its AAA and Resource allocations are insufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities | Resource allocations for authorizing fall short of resources committed in its AAA or Resource allocations are insufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities | Resource allocations for authorizing are at least consistent with resources committed in its AAA, sufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities and commensurate with the scale of the portfolio | Level 2 and Resource allocations are devoted to achieve nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing | Level 3 and Resource allocations have resulted in attainment of nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing |

**A.6 SPECIFICATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Definitions | • Income: Examples include fees collected annually from charter schools and additional funds from outside sources  
• Expenditures: Examples include staff, travel, consultants and office costs | Specific Data Sources | • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*  
• Updated five year budget with actuals for years 1 - 4 since approval*  
• Documentation that resource allocations are devoted to achieve nationally recognized quality authorizing standards  
• Documentation that resource allocations have resulted in recognition of nationally recognized quality authorizing standards | Weight | 10% |

For at least the last 12 months the following were met:

- Level 2 indicator and Authorizer demonstrates resource allocations are adequate to fulfill authorizing responsibilities and the needs and scale of its portfolio (e.g. income, expenditures, number and size of the charter schools in the portfolio) and Resource allocation aligns with or exceeds its AAA and Authorizer staff changes occurred in relation to portfolio growth

a) Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years and

b) Resource allocations are devoted to align with state and national authorizing principles and standards which enables the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school’s financial stability and viability based on short-term performance and long-term financial sustainability

Level 2 specifications were met for at least three years and

Level 3 specification b) and

Resource allocations have resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards

Resource allocations have resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards
### PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

**AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.7 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.7 SPECIFICATIONS</strong></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td><strong>A.7 SPECIFICATIONS</strong></td>
<td>Specific Data Sources</td>
<td>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 commingled, etc.) and/or Schools are offered incentives by the authorizer (e.g. may only contract with an authorized for various services) and/or Authorizer’s decisions are improperly influenced by a management company or the school board</td>
<td><strong>A.7 SPECIFICATIONS</strong></td>
<td>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 they have successfully implemented their conflict of interest policy and Ensures that the 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</td>
<td><strong>A.7 SPECIFICATIONS</strong></td>
<td>Level 2 specifications and If MDE inquires about a specific example, authorizer is able to provide evidence concerning the situation that demonstrates satisfactory resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Weight**: 10%

**Source**:
- MN Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principle III
- 1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)
- 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire

**Level 0**
- Unsatisfactory or Incomplete

**Level 1**
- Approaching Satisfactory

**Level 2**
- Satisfactory

**Level 3**
- Commendable

**Level 4**
- Exemplary
### A.8 MEASURE

**GUIDING QUESTION**
Ensuring Autonomy of the Schools in the Portfolio

**MEASURE ORIGIN**
- MN Statutes §124E.03, Subd. 1
- MN Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Principle II
- NACSA Standard #4

**EVALUATION DATA SOURCE**
1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)
2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire

**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 schools in the portfolio

**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 schools in the portfolio

**LEVEL 2**
Satisfactory
- Authorizer has a clear policy to ensure school autonomy
- And
- Authorizer’s practices align with its stated policy to uphold school autonomy

**LEVEL 3**
Commendable
- Level 2 and
- Authorizer’s policy aligns with nationally recognized principles and standards for quality authorizing

**LEVEL 4**
Exemplary
- Level 3 and
- School representatives verify authorizer’s response to guiding question

### A.8 SPECIFICATIONS

**LEVEL 0**
Unsatisfactory or Incomplete
- Authorizer policy is missing or does not clearly relate to charter school authorizing or misaligns with Minnesota charter school law and
- Authorizer is overly involved in the processes and operations of the school’s authority over academic, operational, and financial needs

**LEVEL 1**
Approaching Satisfactory
- Authorizer policy does not clearly relate to charter school authorizing or misaligns with Minnesota charter school law or
- Authorizer is overly involved in the processes and operations of the school’s authority over academic, operational and financial needs

**LEVEL 2**
Satisfactory
- Authorizer’s autonomy policy aligns with state statute and
- Authorizer’s policy on school autonomy establishes and recognizes the school’s authority over academic, operational and financial needs and respects the school’s authority over the schools’ day-to-day operations and
- Practice aligns with policy; authorizer holds charter schools accountable for outcomes rather than on processes and operations

**LEVEL 3**
Commendable
- Level 2 specifications and
- See above indicator

**LEVEL 4**
Exemplary
- Level 3 specifications and
- Authorizer’s policy and practices to ensure school’s autonomy is verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals

**Specific Data Sources**
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*
- Current policy on charter school autonomy if different from AAA*
- Charter school autonomy processes and procedures for implementation and execution*
- Documentation on how the authorizer’s policy aligns with nationally recognized principles and standards

**Weight**
15%
### PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

**AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.9 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commandable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorizer Self-Evaluation of Capacity, Infrastructure and Practices | To what degree does the authorizer self-evaluate its internal ability (capacity, infrastructure, and practices) to oversee the portfolio of charter schools? | • NACSA Standard #1
• Continuous Improvement Measure | 1. Authorizer Annual Report 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire | Authorizer does not review its internal ability to oversee the portfolio of charter schools | Authorizer may have an informal review of its internal ability to oversee the portfolio of charter schools | Authorizer regularly reviews its internal ability to oversee the portfolio of charter schools | Level 2 and Authorizer reviews its internal practices against its chartering mission, vision and organizational goals and Authorizer develops continuous improvement plans to address findings of self-evaluation | Level 3 and Implementation of continuous improvement plans have resulted in more effective authorizing practices, one or more of which may be externally recognized such as by MDE, NACSA, and/or another organization |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.9 SPECIFICATIONS</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commandable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Data Sources</td>
<td>Authorizer did not engage in self-evaluation to improve capacity, infrastructure and practice to oversee its portfolio of charter schools</td>
<td>Authorizer self-evaluations occur but are not intentional or planned to build its capacity, infrastructure and practices to oversee its portfolio of charter schools</td>
<td>Within the last 12 months self-evaluations are intentional and planned to build its capacity, infrastructure and practices to oversee its portfolio of charter schools</td>
<td>Level 2 specification and Within the last 12 months the following were met: a) Authorizer addresses any needs for improvement when not meeting its mission, organizational goals or strategic plan and b) Authorizer implements continuous improvement plans and documents its internal reviews</td>
<td>Level 3 specifications and Within the last 12 months authorizer evaluates its work regularly against national standards for quality authorizing and recognized effective practices, and develops and implements timely plans for improvement when needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weight** 5%
## PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE
### AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.10 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorizer High Quality Authorizing Dissemination</td>
<td>To what degree does the authorizer disseminate best authorizing practices and/or assist other authorizers in high quality authorizing?</td>
<td>• Continuous Improvement Measure</td>
<td>1. Authorizer Annual Report 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</td>
<td>Best practices are not shared with authorizers</td>
<td>Best practices are rarely shared with authorizers</td>
<td>Best practices are shared and/or assistance is provided to other authors</td>
<td>Best practices are regularly shared with authorizers and/or assistance is regularly provided to other authors</td>
<td>Level 3 and Authorizer reaches out to other authorizers to offer support and guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A.10 SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Data Sources</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*  
  • Documentation of best practice sharing, engagement or technical assistance with/to other authorizers within the last 12 months if different than authorizer annual report submissions* | See above indicator | See above indicator | Within the last 12 months authorizer engages with other authorizers to improve the authorizing community of practice in the state including sharing best practices and/or providing technical assistance to other authorizers | a) Level 2 specification and  
b) Level 3 indicator was met within the last 12 months | Level 3 specifications and  
Within the last 12 months best practices are sought out by other authorizers |

*Weight 5%
## PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE
### AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.11 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorizer Compliance to Responsibilities Stated in Statute | To what degree does the authorizer comply with reporting, submissions, and deadlines set forth in Minnesota Statute? | - MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 6  
- Report on Income and Expenditures  
- Submission of affidavits and requests  
- Submission of Authorizer Annual Reports  
- Participation in MDE required trainings | 1. Minnesota Statute: Statutory Compliance | Over the last two or more years, the authorizer was consistently non-compliant in one or more of the stated areas | Over the last two or more years, the authorizer was occasionally non-compliant in one or more of the stated areas | Over the last two years, the authorizer was consistently compliant in all the stated areas | Over the last three years, the authorizer was consistently compliant in all the stated areas | Over the last four years, the authorizer was consistently compliant in all the stated areas |

### A.11 SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Data Sources</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</td>
<td>See above indicator</td>
<td>See above indicator</td>
<td>For at least the last two years, the authorizer was 100% compliant in all stated areas</td>
<td>For at least the last three years, the authorizer was 100% compliant in all stated areas</td>
<td>For at least the last four years, the authorizer was 100% compliant in all stated areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance Measures B: Authorizer Processes and Decision Making

**Authorizer Process and Decision Making**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.1 Measure</th>
<th>Guiding Question</th>
<th>Measure Origin</th>
<th>Evaluation Data Source</th>
<th>Level 0: Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>Level 1: Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>Level 2: Satisfactory</th>
<th>Level 3: Commendable</th>
<th>Level 4: Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Charter School Decisions</td>
<td>To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)  2. MDE records and/or review of requests  3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</td>
<td>Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated and Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</td>
<td>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/or Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio and/or Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</td>
<td>Authorizer’s application process is comprehensive; includes clear application questions and guidance; and includes fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria and Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio and Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## B.1 SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorizers actively reviewing new charter school applications</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Data Sources</strong></td>
<td>See above indicator and Decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent with its criteria as stated in its AAA</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months or One or two Level 1 indicators</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months</td>
<td>a) Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last two years and b) Authorizer’s new charter school application process has resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards and c) For at least the last 12 months the application process reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years and Level 3 specification b) and Level 3 specification c) have been met for at least the last two years and Authorizer’s new charter school application standards and processes are verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals and Decisions resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorizers not reviewing new charter school applications</strong></td>
<td>Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated and Authorizer’s AAA indicated they would run a process for seeking new charter schools and they have not followed their AAA</td>
<td>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 or Authorizer’s AAA indicated they would run a process for seeking new charter schools and they have not followed their AAA</td>
<td>Authorizer’s application process is comprehensive; includes clear application questions and guidance; and includes fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria and Authorizer’s actions are aligned with plans presented in the AAA</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weight:** 20%  
**Weight:** 5%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.2 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Interim Accountability Decisions (e.g. site/grade level expansions, ready to open and change in authorizer) | To what degree do Initial Decisions authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process; standards to rigorously evaluate proposals of existing charter school expansion requests and other interim changes? | - MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 4(6)  
- MN Statutes §124E.06, Subd. 5(a)  
- MN Statutes §124E.10, Subd. 5  
- MN Statutes §124E.13, Subd. 3(d)  
- Authorizer Application Standards  
- NACSA Standard #2 | 1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)  
2. MDE Analysis of Renewal Contracts  
3. MDE review of requests  
4. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire  
5. State Portfolio Performance Data  
6. Authorizer provided portfolio performance data through Authorizer Annual Report | Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated and Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA | Authorizer’s application processes are comprehensive; do not include clear application questions and guidance; or do not include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria and/or Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio and/or Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA | The authorizer’s application processes are not comprehensive; do not include clear application questions and guidance; and do not include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria | Authorizer’s application processes have resulted in attainment of nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high quality charter schools | Level 2 and School representatives verify authorizer’s response to guiding question and approvals have resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools |

To what degree do 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? | • Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)  
• MDE Analysis of Renewal Contracts  
• MDE review of requests  
• Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire  
• State Portfolio Performance Data  
• Authorizer provided portfolio performance data through Authorizer Annual Report | Level 2 and Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio and Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA |
## B.2 SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorizers actively engaged in interim accountability decisions (i.e. expansions, new school openings or change in authorizer) in the last 5 years for existing schools</th>
<th>Authorizers with no interim accountability decisions (i.e. no expansions, new school openings or change in authorizer) in the last 5 years for existing schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Data Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specific Data Sources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*&lt;br&gt;- Ready to open standards, processes and timelines to verify a school is ready to opening before serving students if different than AAA*&lt;br&gt;- Expansion application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) if different than AAA*&lt;br&gt;- Change in authorizer application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) if different than AAA*&lt;br&gt;- If actively reviewed/accepted one or more site/grade level expansion applications, provide an example of a site/grade level expansion application review process (from beginning to end) including qualifications of individuals who reviewed the application and those who served on the interview committee, the authorizer’s final decision and resulting actions and MDE’s final decision*&lt;br&gt;- If approved one or more new charter school openings, provide an example of a readiness determination (from beginning to end)<em>&lt;br&gt;- If review/accepted one or more transfer applications, provide an example of a transfer review process and determination (from beginning to end)</em>&lt;br&gt;- Documentation of recognition of national quality authorizing expansion application, ready to open and/or change in authorizer standards and designed to promote and/or resulted in high quality charter schools</td>
<td>- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*&lt;br&gt;- Ready to open standards, processes and timelines to verify a school is ready to opening before serving students if different than AAA*&lt;br&gt;- Expansion application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) if different than AAA*&lt;br&gt;- Change in authorizer application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) if different than AAA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 0</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See above indicators and Authorizer interim accountability decisions are inconsistent with its criteria as stated in its AAA</td>
<td>See above indicators and Authorizer interim accountability decisions are inconsistent with its criteria as stated in its AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching Satisfactory</td>
<td>Approaching Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months or One or two Level 1 indicators</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months or One or two Level 1 indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last two years and&lt;br&gt;b) Interim accountability decisions have resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards and&lt;br&gt;c) For at least the last 12 months interim accountability decisions reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools</td>
<td>a) Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last two years and&lt;br&gt;b) Interim accountability decisions have resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards and&lt;br&gt;c) For at least the last 12 months interim accountability decisions reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years and&lt;br&gt;Level 3 specification b) and&lt;br&gt;Level 3 specification c) have been met for at least the last two years and&lt;br&gt;Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals and&lt;br&gt;Decisions resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years and&lt;br&gt;Level 3 specification b) and&lt;br&gt;Level 3 specification c) have been met for at least the last two years and&lt;br&gt;Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals and&lt;br&gt;Decisions resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Authorizers actively engaged in interim accountability decisions (i.e. expansions, new school openings or change in authorizer) in the last 5 years for existing schools

**Specific Data Sources**

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*
- Ready to open standards, processes and timelines to verify a school is ready to opening before serving students if different than AAA*
- Expansion application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) if different than AAA*
- Change in authorizer application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) if different than AAA*
- If actively reviewed/accepted one or more site/grade level expansion applications, provide an example of a site/grade level expansion application review process (from beginning to end) including qualifications of individuals who reviewed the application and those who served on the interview committee, the authorizer’s final decision and resulting actions and MDE’s final decision*
- If approved one or more new charter school openings, provide an example of a readiness determination (from beginning to end)*
- If review/accepted one or more transfer applications, provide an example of a transfer review process and determination (from beginning to end)*
- Documentation of recognition of national quality authorizing expansion application, ready to open and/or change in authorizer standards and designed to promote and/or resulted in high quality charter schools

**Weight**

10%

### Authorizers with no interim accountability decisions (i.e. no expansions, new school openings or change in authorizer) in the last 5 years for existing schools

**Specific Data Sources**

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*
- Ready to open standards, processes and timelines to verify a school is ready to opening before serving students if different than AAA*
- Expansion application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) if different than AAA*
- Change in authorizer application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) if different than AAA*

**Weight**

5%
### B.3 Measure

**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:**
- MN Statutes §124E.10 Subdivision 1
- MN Authorizer Application Standards
- NACSA Standard #3

**Evaluation Data Source:**
- 1. MDE Analysis of New and Renewal Contracts
- 2. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)
- 3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>Level 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>Level 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>Level 3 Commendable</th>
<th>Level 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory requirements and Contracts in its portfolio do not clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer and Authorizer's contracting practices are inconsistent across authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools</td>
<td>Contracts in authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory requirements and/or Contracts do not clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer and/or Authorizer’s contracting practices are inconsistent across authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools</td>
<td>Contracts in authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools meet current statutory requirements and/or Contracts clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer and/or Authorizer’s contracting practices are consistent across authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools</td>
<td>Level 2 and Authorizer clearly defines the role of the school and the authorizer, and executes contract amendments for material changes to current school plans when applicable</td>
<td>Level 3 and School representatives verify authorizer’s response to guiding question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B.3 Specifications

**Specific Data Sources:**
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*
- An example of contracting negotiations (from beginning to end) and data to support the contracting decision*
- An example of a contract amendment including communications to the school regarding those amendments (if applicable)

**Weight:** 10%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>Level 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>Level 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>Level 3 Commendable</th>
<th>Level 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See above indicator</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months or One or two Level 1 indicators</td>
<td>The following were met for at least the last twelve months: Level 2 indicators and Contracts were executed no later than the first day of the renewal period and Contracts were submitted to MDE within 10 business days of the first day of the renewal period</td>
<td>Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years and Level 3 indicator and Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals</td>
<td>Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years and Level 3 indicator and Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B.4 SPECIFICATIONS

**Specific Data Sources**
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*
- Authorizing framework for school academic, financial and operational performance standards if different than AAA*
- Documentation of authorizing performance standards that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards and designed to promote and/or resulted in high quality charter schools

**Weight**
10%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.4 SPECIFICATIONS</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Un satisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See above indicators and Authorizer’s performance standards are inconsistent across authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months or One or two Level 1 indicators</td>
<td>For at least the last 12 months: Level 2 indicators were met and Performance standards are consistent across the portfolio of charter schools</td>
<td>a) Level 2 specifications have been met for at least the last three years and b) For at least the last 12 months authorizer’s execution of contracts reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools</td>
<td>Level 2 specifications have been met for at least the last three years and Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years and Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING
### AUTHORIZER ONGOING OVERSIGHT AND EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.5 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorizer’s Processes for Ongoing Oversight of the Portfolio of Charter Schools | To what degree does the authorizer monitor and oversee the charter schools in the areas of academics, operations, and finances according to the processes outlined in the contract and approved authorizer application? | • MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 4(5)  
• MN Statutes §124E.10, Subd. 1(a)(7)  
• Authorizer Application Standards  
• NACSA Standard #4 | 1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)  
2. Authorizer Annual Report  
3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire  
4. State Portfolio Performance Data | Oversight processes in the AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated and Authorizer’s oversight and monitoring activities misalign with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA | AAA does not include clear processes for oversight and monitoring and/or Authorizer’s oversight activities misalign with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA | Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months or One Level 1 indicator Authorizer’s oversight and monitoring activities are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools | Level 2 specifications have been met at least the last three years and Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years and Level 4 specifications have been met at least the last three years and | Level 2 specifications have been met at least the last two years and Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years and Level 4 specifications have been met at least the last three years and | Level 2 and Authorizer’s oversight processes align with nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high-quality charter schools | Level 3 and School representatives verify authorizer response to guiding question and oversight has resulted in the promotion of high quality charter schools |

### B.5 SPECIFICATIONS

#### Specific Data Sources
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*
- Authorizer oversight plans, including required academic, financial and legal/organizational reporting by schools to the authorizer if different than AAA*
- 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 and designed to promote and/or resulted in high quality charter schools

#### Weight
- 10%

---

*a) Level 2 specifications have been met for at least the last three years and Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years and Authorized practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals
## PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING
### AUTHORIZER ONGOING OVERSIGHT AND EVALUATION (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.6 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsat satisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authorizer’s Standards and Processes for Interventions, Corrective Action and Response to Complaints | To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action? | • NACSA Standard #4  
• MN Authorizer Application Standards  
• Continuous Improvement Measure | 1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)  
2. Authorizer Annual Report  
3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire  
4. State Portfolio Performance Data | Authorizer’s standards and processes are incompletely or insufficiently stated in its AAA and Authorizer’s standards and processes for complaints, intervention and corrective action misalign with its stated standards and processes in its AAA | AAA does not include clear standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action and/or Authorizer’s standards and processes for complaints, intervention and corrective action misalign with its stated standards and processes in its AAA | Authorizer consistently 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 and align with its stated standards and processes in its AAA | Level 2 and Authorizer’s standards and processes align with nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing  
Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years and Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years and Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals | Level 3 and School representatives verify authorizer response to guiding question |

### B.6 SPECIFICATIONS

**Specific Data Sources**
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*  
- Authorizer’s standards and processes for interventions, corrective action and response to complaints if different than AAA*  
- Documentation of data collected and decision made regarding complaints, intervention and corrective actions for at least the last 12 months*  
- Documentation of one complete example of a charter school’s school improvement plan or notices of interventions put in place by authorizer*  
- Documentation of authorizing standards and processes for interventions, corrective action and response to complaints that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards

**Weight**  
10%
### PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING

**AUTHORIZER ONGOING OVERSIGHT AND EVALUATION** (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.7 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter School Support, Development and Technical Assistance</td>
<td>To what degree does the authorizer support its portfolio of charter schools through intentional assistance and development offerings?</td>
<td>• Continuous Improvement Measure</td>
<td>1. Authorizer Annual Report 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</td>
<td>Support and technical assistance is not available</td>
<td>Support and technical assistance is provided inconsistently and/or Only in response to problems</td>
<td>Support and technical assistance is proactive and Provided in a variety of areas and in a manner to preserve school autonomy</td>
<td>Level 2 and</td>
<td>Level 3 and Support and technical assistance is designed to promote excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B.7 SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIFIC DATA SOURCES</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Data Sources</td>
<td>See above indicator</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months or One Level 1 indicator</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met within the last 12 months</td>
<td>a) Level 2 specification and b) Level 3 indicator within the last 12 months</td>
<td>Level 3 specifications and Level 4 indicator within the last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence if different than 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 the support, development and technical assistance is designed to promote excellence*
**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING**
**AUTHORIZER ONGOING OVERSIGHT AND EVALUATION (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.8 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Quality Charter School Replication and Dissemination of Best School Practices</td>
<td>To what degree does the authorizer plan and promote, within its portfolio, the model replication and dissemination of best practices of high performing charter schools?</td>
<td>• Continuous Improvement Measure</td>
<td>1. Authorizer Annual Report 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</td>
<td>There is no evidence of successful model replication or dissemination of best practices</td>
<td>There is no intentional plan for successful model replication and dissemination of best practices</td>
<td>There is a clear plan for successful model replication and dissemination of best practices and models/practices have been identified</td>
<td>Level 2 and identified models/practices are moving toward replication/dissemination</td>
<td>Level 3 and identified models/practices have been replicated/disseminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.8 SPECIFICATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Data Sources</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence if different than authorizer annual report submissions*</td>
<td>See above indicator</td>
<td>See above indicator</td>
<td>Level 2 indicator was met within the last 12 months</td>
<td>Level 2 specification and One or more models/practices are moving toward replication/dissemination</td>
<td>Level 3 specifications and One or more models/practices have been realized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan for promoting the model replication and dissemination of best practices of high performing charter schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documentation of models being replicated and practices being disseminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING**

**AUTHORIZER RENEWAL AND DECISION MAKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.9 MEASURE</th>
<th>GUIDING QUESTION</th>
<th>MEASURE ORIGIN</th>
<th>EVALUATION DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Comendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Charter School Renewal or Termination Decisions | To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to make high stakes renewal and termination decisions align to its stated renewal standards and processes and promote the growth of high-quality charter schools? | • MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 3(a)(5)  
• MN Statutes §§124E.10, Subd. 1(a)(13) and Subd. 1(a)(14)  
• MN Authorizer Application Standards  
• NACSA Standard #5 | 1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)  
2. MDE Analysis of Renewal Contracts  
3. MDE review of requests  
4. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire  
5. State Portfolio Performance Data  
6. Authorizer Annual Report | Renewal standards and processes in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated and Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio and Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA | AAA 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 and Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio and Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA | AAA 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 | Level 2  
and  
Authorizer’s renewal standards and processes align with nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high-quality charter schools | Level 3  
and  
School representatives verify authorizer’s response to guiding question and renewals have resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools | Level 4  
and  
School representatives verify authorizer’s response to guiding question and renewals have resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools |
### B.9 SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Data Sources</th>
<th>LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete</th>
<th>LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 2 Satisfactory</th>
<th>LEVEL 3 Commendable</th>
<th>LEVEL 4 Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See above indicators</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months or One or two Level 1 indicators</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months</td>
<td>a) Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last two years and b) For at least the last 12 months authorizer’s renewal standards and processes reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools</td>
<td>Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years and Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years and Decisions resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools and Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Specific Data Sources
- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*
- Documentation of authorizer’s renewal standards and processes if different than AAA*
- 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
- Documentation of how the authorizer is promoting high quality charter schools

#### Weight
20%