

## **Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System (MAPES)**

### **Introduction**

The Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System (MAPES) was established to review authorizer performance per [Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, Subdivision 5](#), “*The commissioner shall review an authorizer’s performance every five years in a manner and form determined by the commissioner and may review an authorizer’s performance more frequently at the commissioner’s own initiative or at the request of a charter school operator, charter school board member, or other interested party. The commissioner, after completing the review, shall transmit a report with findings to the authorizer.*” The development of MAPES was funded in part by an implementation grant 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 MDE develop the initial plan and performance measures for MAPES.

### **Development of MAPES**

A main guiding principle in the development of MAPES was engaging stakeholders. It was a priority of the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) to involve stakeholders, particularly authorizers in the development of MAPES to create a fair and transparent evaluation system. The performance measures were initially presented to authorizers in January, 2014. Over the course of a year and a half, approximately 14 stakeholder engagement sessions were hosted by MDE. Stakeholders were engaged in multiple working groups and asked to share their thoughts on various versions of the performance measures in MAPES. All feedback provided to MDE was considered and substantial changes were made to MAPES based on stakeholder engagement. Some notable changes included minimizing the number of performance measures from 34 to 20 and changing the look back period from five years to three years. Performance measures were finalized and shared with authorizers in April, 2014 and specifications clarifying the indicators for the performance measures were sent to authorizers in January, 2015.

To promote an objective, uniform and consistent evaluation process for all four cohorts, a third party vendor was selected through a request for proposal process selected by peer reviewers. SchoolWorks, LLC. was selected as the contractor to facilitate and conduct all authorizer evaluation activities using MAPES performance measures and evaluation processes. Upon selection, each cohort was notified of the SchoolWorks evaluators involved with the evaluation process and asked to notify MDE if any actual or perceived conflict of interest existed. Authorizers were divided into four cohorts dependent on their initial approval as an authorizer.

## MAPES Methodology and Review Process

Authorizers were evaluated by nationally recognized standards and state expectations for high quality authorizing, their established standards and processes stated in their most recently approved authorizer application (AAA) and how they applied standards and processes with fidelity across their portfolio of charter schools.

The performance measures for MAPES were divided into two parts: Part A – Capacity and Infrastructure and Part B – Processes and Decision-Making. Overall, Part A had 11 measures and accounted for 25% of an authorizer’s performance rating, and Part B had 9 measures and accounted for 75% of an authorizer’s performance rating. Please refer to *MAPES Measures, Indicators and Specifications (Appendix A)* for specific information about the performance measures used to evaluate authorizers.

Evaluation activities for a cohort occurred over a course of approximately five months. There were four phases of the evaluation. Phase One – Welcome and Data Collection included the welcome meeting, authorizer document/evidence submission and distribution of the charter school leadership survey. At the welcome meeting, a thorough walk-through was provided to authorizers on the purpose of the evaluation and the evaluation process outlined in the *Review Process Summary (Appendix B)* as well as *MAPES Performance Rating and Outcomes (Appendix C)*. Authorizers were also provided with a USB drive for their document/evidence submission. A list of documents needed to meet at least satisfactory were provided to authorizers at the welcome meeting, but the list was also included in *MAPES Measure, Indicators and Specifications (Appendix A)*. The charter school leadership survey was distributed to key school leadership personnel via email for each Local Education Agency (LEA) in an authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools (*Appendix D*). Survey questions aligned with MAPES performance measures that required external verification.

Phase Two – Data Review involved the evaluator reviewing existing authorizer data on file at MDE and new data submitted by the authorizer in Phase One. Existing MDE data included: approved authorizer applications; executed charter contracts; authorizer annual reports; MDE review data; authorizer income and expenditures reports; state portfolio performance data reports and other data maintained by MDE. Any data submitted to MDE prior to the MAPES Document Request Submission deadline was considered for evaluation purposes.

Phase Three – Field Work was comprised of authorizer interviews and stakeholder meetings. The purpose of the interview and meetings was to provide verification/validation of an authorizer’s established standards and processes outlined in their AAA and their implementation of those standards and processes. Interviews and meetings were conducted in-person or via Adobe Connect, a video conferencing platform. Please note that the interview and meetings did not serve as stand-alone evidence. All cohorts were provided with an opportunity to submit evidence after the interview.

Phase Four – Performance Reports included reviewing, finalizing and distributing MAPES reports. Prior to distributing to authorizers for review and comment, the

evaluator provided a draft of the MAPES reports to MDE for review. The evaluator considered MDE feedback and provided a second draft to MDE for dissemination to authorizers for review and comment. While it was not possible for authorizers to submit new evidence at that time, authorizers had ten (10) business days to review draft report ratings, findings and key evidence and submit a response identifying and explaining any errors upon dissemination. This may have included information not accurately reflected in the report, previous evidence submitted that addressed a measure, but not included in the report, or information that misaligned with MAPES performance measures or with one or more data sources used in the evaluation. The evaluator considered all authorizer feedback and made corrections/updates based on errors of factual nature. Final reports were submitted to MDE and disseminated to authorizers no later than their five year term anniversary.

## **Performance Ratings and Outcomes**

The *Authorizer Performance Ratings and Outcomes (Appendix C)* outlined the next steps for authorizers depending on their overall rating. Authorizers received notification upon dissemination of their final MAPES report detailing next steps. Authorizers with rating outcomes of “*Exemplary*”, “*Commendable*” and “*Satisfactory*” were eligible to submit their next five year plan, also known as their *Commissioner-Approved Authorizing Plans (AAP)* to MDE.

Authorizers receiving an overall rating of “*Unsatisfactory*” or “*Approaching Satisfactory*” were ineligible to submit their AAP and were subjected to corrective action status. Per [Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, Subdivision 6](#), “*The commissioner must notify the authorizer in writing of any findings that may subject the authorizer to corrective action and the authorizer then has 15 business days to request an informal hearing before the commissioner takes corrective action.*” If an authorizer’s overall rating was updated to “*Satisfactory*”, the authorizer was then eligible to submit their AAP. If the informal hearing was waived by the authorizer or if the authorizer was placed in corrective action status after the informal hearing, an authorizer:

- Did not have the authority to charter new schools, accept transfers or initiate expansion requests while in corrective action and until an overall performance rating of “*Satisfactory*” was attained (i.e. out of corrective action status).
- Had up to one year to satisfactorily address all performance measures to be eligible to submit their AAP.
- Was only evaluated on deficient measures during the corrective action period.

An authorizer’s corrective action status was assessed on a case by case basis, depending on the nature and scope of deficiencies. If identified deficiencies remained unaddressed, termination of an authorizer’s approval to charter schools occurred per [Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05 Subdivision 6\(a\)](#).

## Continuous Improvement

It is important to note for the purpose of continuous improvement, minor aspects of MAPES were made after cohort one and after cohort two evaluations; however, the fundamental aspects of MAPES (i.e. performance measures and evaluation processes) remained unchanged throughout all four cohorts to promote consistent evaluations.

The following changes were made during cohort one evaluations:

- Strictly continuous improvement measures A.5, A.9, A.10, B.7 and B8 were updated to reflect relative work *within* the last 12 months and not the *past* 12 months.
- Measures A.11 and B.3 were updated as both included charter contract compliance; contract compliance was taken out of A.11 and remained in B.3.
- The heading for B.6 was updated to Authorizer's Standards and Processes for Interventions, Corrective Action *and* Response to Complaints.
- The guiding question for B.8 was updated to read, "*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.*" This revision clarified that replication and best practices did not have to originate from an authorizer's portfolio, but could come from other sources (e.g. had a clear plan to seek high performing models in other states, or encouraged adaption of high quality models or practices from other schools with the schools in an authorizer's portfolio).
- The heading for B.8 was updated to High Quality Charter School Replication *and* Dissemination of Best School Practices.

The following changes were made starting with cohort two evaluations:

- MDE data for A.11 and B.3 was disseminated to authorizers prior to the evaluators' data review, ensuring accurate submission records were used for MAPES.
- A MDE representative was included at the authorizer and school leader interviews and served as an observer
- The *Review Process Summary* document provided to authorizers at the welcome meeting and *MAPES Performance Ratings and Outcomes* document were updated to clarify outcomes of MAPES.
- It was clarified to authorizers they had up to a week from their interview date to provide additional documentation for MAPES.

The following changes were made starting with cohort three evaluations:

- The corrective action process was clarified at the welcome meeting and in related documents.

## **Conclusion**

MDE commends and appreciates authorizer engagement in the MAPES process and dedication to improving authorizer excellence. MDE enjoyed learning about authorizer oversight work to promote high quality education options for all students in Minnesota. Similar to the development of MAPES, MDE recognized the importance of engaging authorizers and stakeholders in refining MAPES upon completing all four cohort evaluations in December, 2016.

Contact our Charter Center Specialists with questions regarding MAPES:

Shya Tran, [shya.tran@state.mn.us](mailto:shya.tran@state.mn.us), 651-582-8351

Paula Higgins, [paula.higgins@state.mn.us](mailto:paula.higgins@state.mn.us), 651-582-8315

## **Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System (MAPES)**

### **Measures, Indicators and Specifications**

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

**Performance Measures B: Authorizer Processes and Decision Making – 75% Weight of Overall Rating**

# 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.9: Authorizer Self-Evaluation of Capacity, Infrastructure, and Practices (5%)\*
- 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.

## Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System Measures, Indicators and Specifications Overview

The Minnesota 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.

**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
<b>Authorizer Mission</b>	Does the authorizer have a clear and compelling mission for charter school authorizing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 4(1)</li> <li>MN Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	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 <i>and</i> Mission is verified internally in practice and documentation at authorizing organization	Level 3 <i>and</i> Mission is verified by external references (such as school board validation)

A.1 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>Evidence of mission documented at the authorizing organization*</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 5%</p>	See above indicator	<p>Mission being implemented is not consistent with AAA</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Authorizer implements mission from AAA</p> <p>and</p> <p>Mission is aligned with Minnesota charter school law and reflects what the organization is realizing as a charter school authorizer</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's mission is verified internally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals</p>	<p>Level 3 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's mission is verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals</p>

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE  
AUTHORIZER MISSION AND VISION (CONTINUED)**

A.2 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
<b>Authorizer Vision and Organizational Goals</b>	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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MN Statutes §124E.01, Subd. 1</li> <li>MN Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	Vision is missing or without organizational goals	Vision aligns with state statute with limited measurable organizational goals	Vision aligns with state statute with measurable organizational goals	Level 2 <i>and</i> Vision has clear organizational goals, criteria and timeframes for achievement <i>and</i> Authorizer is actively measuring and achieving most goals	Level 3 <i>and</i> Authorizer is actively engaged in measuring and is achieving or exceeding goals established

A.2 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<b>Specific Data Sources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>Evidence of vision documented at the authorizing organization*</li> <li>Evidence of measurable organizational goals documented at the authorizing organization*</li> <li>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)</li> </ul> <b>Weight</b> 10%	See above indicator	Vision and/or goals implemented are not consistent with the approved AAA  <i>and/or</i> Organizational goals are not clearly related to charter school authorizing	Authorizer implements vision from AAA  <i>and</i> Authorizer organizational goals aligns with chartering vision and statutory purpose(s)	Level 2 specifications  <i>and</i> See above indicator	Level 3 specifications  <i>and</i> 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

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

A.3 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
<b>Authorizer Structure of Operations</b>	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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 42</li> <li>MN Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	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 <i>and</i> Structure of duties and, and responsibilities is verified internally at authorizing organization <i>and</i> Staffing level is clearly sufficient to meet the needs of the portfolio	Level 3 <i>and</i> Clear structure of duties and responsibilities are updated when necessary <i>and</i> Authorizer practices are verified externally (such as school board validation)

A.3 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>Job descriptions of authorizer’s personnel (e.g. employees, contractors, volunteers; both paid and unpaid positions, etc.) <i>if different than AAA*</i></li> <li>Most recent organizational chart that shows clear lines of reporting and authority/decision-making*</li> <li>If applicable, authorizer staffing changes since the AAA was approved including staffing size (FTE) compared to portfolio size*</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 15%</p>	See above indicator	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months  <i>or</i> One or more specifications described in Level 2 are only partially met	The following specifications were met for at least the last 12 months:  Sufficient resources to meet the needs of the portfolio of schools <i>and</i> If applicable, changes were made to the organizational structure when necessary  <i>and</i> Authorizer appropriately manages and safeguards school,	a) Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years  <i>and</i> 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  <i>and</i> Level 3 specification b)  <i>and</i> Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals

A.3 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
			student information, and records relating to authorizing		

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE**  
**AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)**

A.4 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
<b>Authorizer Staff Expertise (e.g. advisors, board members, volunteers, etc.)</b>	To what degree does the authorizer have appropriate experience, expertise and skills to sufficiently oversee the portfolio of charter schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 4(2)</li> <li>MN Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards</li> <li>Continuous Improvement Measure</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	Authorizing staff is underqualified to oversee the portfolio of charter schools	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	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Definitions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorizing staff refers to individuals both paid and unpaid as well as contractors hired by the authorizer</li> <li>Expertise is defined as having knowledge, education, training, etc. in the areas of charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance, and law</li> <li>Experience is defined as length of time working in the areas of charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance, and law</li> <li>Skills is defined as effective application of experience and expertise in the areas of charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance, and law</li> </ul> <p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>Current resumes/vitae of existing personnel including contracted individuals with employment/contract terms <b>if different than AAA*</b></li> <li>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</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 10%</p>	See above indicator	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p>or</p> <p>See above indicator</p>	Level 2 indicator was met for at least the last 12 months	<p>a) Level 2 indicator was met for at least the last two years</p> <p>and</p> <p>b) For at least the last 12 months authorizing staff has diverse experience, expertise and/or skills: diverse is defined as a team of authorizing staff having experience, expertise, and/or specialists with advanced skills and expertise in one or multiple areas above</p>	<p>Level 2 indicator was met for at least the last three years</p> <p>and</p> <p>Level 3 specification b)</p> <p>and</p> <p>For at least the last 12 months authorizing staff are credentialed</p>

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE**  
**AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)**

A.5 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
<b>Authorizer Capacity and Skill Development of Authorizing Leadership and Staff</b>	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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards</li> <li>Continuous Improvement Measure</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorizer Annual Report</li> <li>Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	Professional development is rarely offered or not offered to authorizing leadership and staff	Professional development for authorizing leadership and staff is sporadic or in response to a problem	Professional development is offered to authorizing leadership and staff  <i>and</i>  Aligns with its operations, vision and goals for the portfolio of schools	Level 2  <i>and</i>  Professional development is offered regularly to authorizing leadership and staff	Professional development is offered regularly to authorizing leadership and staff, is differentiated, and aligns with operations, vision and goals for the portfolio of schools  <i>and</i>  Outcomes of professional development are measured and evaluated

A.5 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<b>Specific Data Sources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence <i>if different than authorizer annual report submissions*</i></li> <li>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*</li> <li>If not included in the resume submitted for A.4: conference or workshop certificates of completion or participation; etc. for authorizing staff</li> </ul> <b>Weight</b> 5%	See above indicator	Professional development is only incident specific  <i>and/or</i>  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  <i>and</i>  Professional development is regular, ongoing, and more than once a year	Level 3 specifications  <i>and</i>  Within the last 12 months professional development is measured, evaluated and customized to meet the needs of the authorizing leadership and staff

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE**  
**AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)**

A.6 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
<b>Authorizer Operational Budget for Authorizing the Portfolio of Charter Schools</b>	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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 3(1) and 4(2)</li> <li>MN Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>NACSA Standard #1</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>Income and Expenditures Report</li> <li>Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	Resource allocations for authorizing fall short of resources committed in its AAA <i>and</i> Resource allocations are insufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities	Resource allocations for authorizing fall short of resources committed in its AAA <i>or</i> 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 <i>and</i> Resource allocations are devoted to achieve nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing	Level 3 <i>and</i> Resource allocations have resulted in attainment of nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing

A.6 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Definitions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Income: Examples include fees collected annually from charter schools and additional funds from outside sources</li> <li>Expenditures: Examples include staff, travel, consultants and office costs</li> </ul> <p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>Updated five year budget with actuals for years 1 - 4 since approval*</li> <li>Documentation that resource allocations are devoted to achieve nationally recognized quality authorizing standards</li> <li>Documentation that resource allocations have resulted in recognition of nationally recognized quality authorizing standards</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 10%</p>	See above indicator	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months <i>or</i> One Level 1 indicator	For at least the last 12 months the following were met:  Level 2 indicator <i>and</i> 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) <i>and</i> Resource allocation aligns with or exceeds its AAA <i>and</i> Authorizer staff	a) Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years <i>and</i> 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 <i>and</i> Level 3 specification b) <i>and</i> Resource allocations have resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards

A.6 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
			changes occurred in relation to portfolio growth		

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE**  
**AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)**

A.7 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
<b>Authorizer Operational Conflicts of Interest</b>	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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MN Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>NACSA Principle III</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	Conflict of interest policy for authorizing does not exist or is not implemented	Conflict of interest policy for authorizing exists, but implementation is unclear or does not effectively address conflicts of interest	Clear conflict of interest policy for authorizing exists and is intentionally implemented	Level 2 <i>and</i> Implementation of policy has successfully prevented or resolved conflicts of interest in a timely, fair and appropriate manner	Level 3 <i>and</i> School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question

A.7 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>Current authorizer conflict of interest policy <b>if different from AAA*</b></li> <li>Authorizer conflict of interest processes and procedures for implementation and execution (could include forms, check lists, etc.)*</li> <li>A fully documented example of how the authorizer successfully implemented their conflict of interest policy*</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 10%</p>	<p>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.)</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Schools are offered incentives by the authorizer (e.g. may only contract with an authorized for various services)</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions are improperly influenced by a management company or the school board</p>	<p>Authorizer does not follow its conflict of interest policy as outlined in its AAA</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Decision making is not transparent and/or it is unclear what criteria are used by the authorizer to make decisions</p>	<p>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)</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer is able to provide at least one fully documented example of how they have successfully implemented their conflict of interest policy</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Ensures that the application-review and decision making processes are free of conflicts of interest, and requires full</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>If MDE inquires about a specific example, authorizer is able to provide evidence concerning the situation that demonstrates satisfactory resolution</p>	<p>Level 3 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>The implementation and effectiveness of the authorizer's conflict of interest policy is verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals</p>

A.7 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
			disclosure of any potential or perceived conflicts of interest between reviewers or decision makers and applicants		

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE**  
**AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)**

A.8 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
<b>Ensuring Autonomy of the Schools in the Portfolio</b>	To what degree does the authorizer preserve and support the essential autonomies of the portfolio of charter schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MN Statutes §124E.03, Subd. 1</li> <li>MN Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>NACSA Principle II</li> <li>NACSA Standard #4</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	<p>Authorizer policy for ensuring autonomy is missing or vague</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>In practice there is confusion regarding appropriate levels of autonomy with the schools in the portfolio</p>	<p>Authorizer policy for ensuring autonomy exists but is vague</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>In practice there is confusion regarding appropriate levels of autonomy with the schools in the portfolio</p>	<p>Authorizer has a clear policy to ensure school autonomy</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's practices align with its stated policy to uphold school autonomy</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's policy aligns with nationally recognized principles and standards for quality authorizing</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question</p>

A.8 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>Current policy on charter school autonomy <i>if different from AAA*</i></li> <li>Charter school autonomy processes and procedures for implementation and execution*</li> <li>Documentation on how the authorizer's policy aligns with nationally recognized principles and standards</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 15%</p>	<p>Authorizer policy is missing or does not clearly relate to charter school authorizing or misaligns with Minnesota charter school law</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer is overly involved in the processes and operations of the school's authority over academic, operational and financial needs</p>	<p>Authorizer policy does not clearly relate to charter school authorizing or misaligns with Minnesota charter school law</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Authorizer is overly involved in the processes and operations of the school's authority over academic, operational and financial needs</p>	<p>Authorizer's autonomy policy aligns with state statute</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>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</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Practice aligns with policy; authorizer holds charter schools accountable for outcomes rather than on processes and operations</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>See above indicator</p>	<p>Level 3 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's policy and practices to ensure school's autonomy is verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals</p>

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE**  
**AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)**

A.9 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
<b>Authorizer Self-Evaluation of Capacity, Infrastructure and Practices</b>	To what degree does the authorizer self-evaluate its internal ability (capacity, infrastructure, and practices) to oversee the portfolio of charter schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NACSA Standard #1</li> <li>• Continuous Improvement Measure</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Authorizer Annual Report</li> <li>2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	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 <i>and</i> Authorizer reviews its internal practices against its chartering mission, vision and organizational goals <i>and</i> Authorizer develops continuous improvement plans to address findings of self-evaluation	Level 3 <i>and</i> 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

A.9 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence <i>if different than authorizer annual report submissions*</i></li> <li>• Authorizer self-evaluation tool(s), tracking and progress development within the last 12 months*</li> <li>• An example of authorizer strategic plan(s), continuous improvement plan(s) and/or staff development based on self-evaluations*</li> <li>• Documentation of how the authorizer self-evaluation aligns with authorizer chartering mission, vision and organizational goals</li> <li>• Documentation of authorizing practices that were recognized externally (e.g. MDE, NACSA, and/or another organization)</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 5%</p>	Authorizer did not engage in self-evaluation to improve capacity, infrastructure and practice to oversee its portfolio of charter schools	Authorizer self-evaluations occur but are not intentional or planned to build its capacity, infrastructure and practices to oversee its portfolio of charter schools	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	Level 2 specification <i>and</i> 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 <i>and</i>	Level 3 specifications <i>and</i> 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

A.9 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
				b) Authorizer implements continuous improvement plans and documents its internal reviews	

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE**  
**AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)**

A.10 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
<b>Authorizer High Quality Authorizing Dissemination</b>	To what degree does the authorizer disseminate best authorizing practices and/or assist other authorizers in high quality authorizing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuous Improvement Measure</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Authorizer Annual Report</li> <li>2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	Best practices are not shared with authorizers	Best practices are rarely shared with authorizers	Best practices are shared and/or assistance is provided to other authorizers	Best practices are regularly shared with authorizers and/or assistance is regularly provided to other authorizers	Level 3 <i>and</i> Authorizer reaches out to other authorizers to offer support and guidance

A.10 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>Documentation of best practice sharing, engagement or technical assistance with/to other authorizers within the last 12 months <b><i>if different than authorizer annual report submissions*</i></b></li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 5%</p>	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	<p>a) Level 2 specification</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>b) Level 3 indicator was met within the last 12 months</p>	<p>Level 3 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Within the last 12 months best practices are sought out by other authorizers</p>

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE**  
**AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTINUED)**

A.11 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
<b>Authorizer Compliance to Responsibilities Stated in Statute</b>	To what degree does the authorizer comply with reporting, submissions, and deadlines set forth in Minnesota Statute?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 6</li> <li>Report on Income and Expenditures</li> <li>Submission of affidavits and requests</li> <li>Submission of Authorizer Annual Reports</li> <li>Participation in MDE required trainings</li> </ul>	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	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 10%</p>	See above indicator	See above indicator	For at least the last two years, the authorizer was 100% compliant in all stated areas	For at least the last three years, the authorizer was 100% compliant in all stated areas	For at least the last four years, the authorizer was 100% compliant in all stated areas

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING**  
**AUTHORIZER PROCESS AND DECISION MAKING**

B.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
<p><b>New Charter School Decisions</b></p>	<p>To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals?</p> <p>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?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MN Statutes §124E.06, Subd. 4(3)</li> <li>• MN Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #2</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>2. MDE records and/or review of requests</li> <li>3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	<p>Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</p>	<p>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</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</p>	<p>Authorizer's application process is comprehensive; includes clear application questions and guidance; and includes fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's application process has resulted in attainment of nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question and approvals have resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</p>

B.1 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Authorizers actively reviewing new charter school applications</b></p> <p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>• Charter school application, policies, procedures, timelines, and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) <i>if different than AAA*</i></li> <li>• Documentation/summary of applications and authorizer decisions since the AAA was approved*</li> <li>• An example of a new charter school application review process (from beginning to end) including qualifications of individuals who reviewed the application and those who served on the interview committee*</li> <li>• Documentation of recognition of national quality authorizing new charter school application standards and designed to promote and/or resulted in high quality charter schools</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 20%</p>	<p>See above indicator</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent with its criteria as stated in its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>One or two Level 1 indicators</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months</p>	<p>a) Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>b) Authorizer's new charter school application process has resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>c) For at least the last 12 months the application process reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 specification b)</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 specification c) have been met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's new charter school application standards and processes are verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Decisions resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</p>
<p><b>Authorizers not reviewing new charter school applications</b></p> <p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>• Charter school application, policies, procedures, timelines, and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) <i>if different than AAA*</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 5%</p>	<p>Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's AAA indicated they would run a process for seeking new charter schools and they have not followed</p>	<p>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</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's AAA</p>	<p>Authorizer's application process is comprehensive; includes clear application questions and guidance; and includes fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's actions are aligned with plans presented in</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>

B.1 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
	their AAA	indicated they would run a process for seeking new charter schools and they have not followed their AAA	the AAA		

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING**  
**AUTHORIZER PROCESS AND DECISION MAKING (CONTINUED)**

B.2 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
<p><b>Interim Accountability Decisions (e.g. site/grade level expansions, ready to open and change in authorizer)</b></p>	<p>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?</p> <p>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?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 4(6)</li> <li>• MN Statutes §124E.06, Subd. 5(a)</li> <li>• MN Statutes §124E.10, Subd. 5</li> <li>• MN Statutes §124E.13, Subd. 3(d)</li> <li>• Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #2</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>2. MDE Analysis of Renewal Contracts</li> <li>3. MDE review of requests</li> <li>4. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> <li>5. State Portfolio Performance Data</li> <li>6. Authorizer provided portfolio performance data through Authorizer Annual Report</li> </ol>	<p>Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</p>	<p>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</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</p>	<p>Authorizer's application processes are comprehensive; include clear application questions and guidance; and include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's application processes have resulted in attainment of nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question and approvals have resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</p>

B.2 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>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</b></p> <p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>• Ready to open standards, processes and timelines to verify a school is ready to opening before serving students <i>if different than AAA*</i></li> <li>• Expansion application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) <i>if different than AAA*</i></li> <li>• 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) <i>if different than AAA*</i></li> <li>• 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*</li> <li>• If approved one or more new charter school openings, provide an example of a ready to open determination (from beginning to end)*</li> <li>• If review/accepted one or more transfer applications, provide an example of a transfer review process and determination (from beginning to end)*</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 10%</p>	<p>See above indicators <i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer interim accountability decisions are inconsistent with its criteria as stated in its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>One or two Level 1 indicators</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months</p>	<p>a) Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last two years <i>and</i></p> <p>b) Interim accountability decisions have resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards <i>and</i></p> <p>c) For at least the last 12 months interim accountability decisions reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years <i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 specification b) <i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 specification c) have been met for at least the last two years <i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals <i>and</i></p> <p>Decisions resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</p>
<p><b>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</b></p> <p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>• Ready to open standards, processes and timelines to verify a school is ready to opening before serving students <i>if different than AAA*</i></li> <li>• Expansion application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) <i>if different than AAA*</i></li> <li>• 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) <i>if different than AAA*</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 5%</p>	<p>Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated <i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's AAA indicated they would run a process for seeking new charter schools and they have not followed their AAA</p>	<p>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</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's AAA indicated they would run a process for seeking new</p>	<p>Authorizer's application processes are comprehensive; include clear application questions and guidance; and include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's actions are aligned with plans presented in the AAA</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>

B.2 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
		charter schools and they have not followed their AAA			

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING**  
**AUTHORIZER PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING**

B.3 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
<p><b>Contract Term, Negotiation and Execution</b></p>	<p>To what degree does the authorizer execute contracts that clearly define material terms and rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MN Statutes §124E.10 Subdivision 1</li> <li>• MN Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #3</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MDE Analysis of New and Renewal Contracts</li> <li>2. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	<p>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory requirements</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Contracts in its portfolio do not clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's contracting practices are inconsistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools</p>	<p>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory requirements</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Contracts do not clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's contracting practices are inconsistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools</p>	<p>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools meet current statutory requirements</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Contracts clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's contracting practices are consistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer clearly defines the role of the school and the authorizer, and executes contract amendments for material changes to current school plans when applicable</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question</p>

B.3 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>• An example of contracting negotiations (from beginning to end) and data to support the contracting decision*</li> <li>• An example of a contract amendment including communications to the school regarding those amendments (if applicable)</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 10%</p>	See above indicator	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>One or two Level 1 indicators</p>	<p>The following were met for at least the last twelve months:</p> <p>Level 2 indicators</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Contracts were executed no later than the first day of the renewal period</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Contracts were submitted to MDE within 10 business days of the first day of the renewal period</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 indicator</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 indicator</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals</p>

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING  
AUTHORIZER PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING (CONTINUED)**

B.4 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
<b>Performance Standards</b>	To what degree does the authorizer execute contracts with clear, measureable and attainable performance standards?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MN Statutes §124E.10 Subdivision 1</li> <li>MN Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>NACSA Standard #3</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MDE Analysis of New and Renewal Contracts beginning in 2014</li> <li>Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	<p>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory performance standards</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Contracts misalign with the performance standards of its AAA</p>	<p>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory performance standards</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's performance standards are inconsistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Contracts misalign with the performance standards of its AAA</p>	<p>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools meet current statutory performance standards</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Contracts define clear, measurable and attainable academic, financial and organizational performance standards, and consequences for meeting or not meeting performance standards</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Contracts align with the performance standards of its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer executes contracts that align with nationally recognized quality performance standards and designed to promote high-quality charter school</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer response to guiding question</p>

B.4 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>Authorizing framework for school academic, financial and operational performance standards <i>if different than AAA*</i></li> <li>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</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 10%</p>	<p>See above indicators</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's performance standards are inconsistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>One or two Level 1 indicators</p>	<p>For at least the last 12 months:</p> <p>Level 2 indicators were met</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Performance standards are consistent across the portfolio of charter schools</p>	<p>a) Level 2 specifications have been met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>b) For at least the last 12 months authorizer's execution of contracts reflects</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications have been met for at least the last three years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years</p>

B.4 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
				a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools	<i>and</i> Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING  
AUTHORIZER ONGOING OVERSIGHT AND EVALUATION**

B.5 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
<p><b>Authorizer's Processes for Ongoing Oversight of the Portfolio of Charter Schools</b></p>	<p>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?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 4(5)</li> <li>• MN Statutes §124E.10, Subd. 1(a)(7)</li> <li>• Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #4</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>2. Authorizer Annual Report</li> <li>3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> <li>4. State Portfolio Performance Data</li> </ol>	<p>Oversight processes in the AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's oversight and monitoring activities misalign with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA</p>	<p>AAA does not include clear processes for oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's oversight activities misalign with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA</p>	<p>AAA includes clear processes for oversight and monitoring</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer conducts contract oversight that competently evaluates performance and monitors compliance; ensures charter schools' legally entitled autonomy; protects student rights; and informs intervention, termination, and renewal decisions</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's oversight activities align with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's oversight processes align with nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high-quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer response to guiding question and oversight has resulted in the promotion of high quality charter schools</p>

B.5 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>• Authorizer oversight plans, including required academic, financial and legal/organizational reporting by schools to the authorizer <b>if different than AAA*</b></li> <li>• An example of one school's ongoing oversight including oversight/monitoring report(s) (from beginning to end of a contract term)*</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 10%</p>	<p>See above indicator</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's oversight and monitoring practices are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>One Level 1 indicator</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's oversight and monitoring practices are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools</p>	<p>For at least the last 12 months:</p> <p>Level 2 indicators were met</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's oversight and monitoring practices are consistent across the portfolio of charter schools</p>	<p>a) Level 2 specifications have been met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>b) For at least the last 12 months authorizer's processes for ongoing oversight of the portfolio of charter schools reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools</p>	<p>a) Level 2 specifications have been met for at least the last three years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals</p>

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING  
AUTHORIZER ONGOING OVERSIGHT AND EVALUATION (CONTINUED)**

B.6 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
<p><b>Authorizer's Standards and Processes for Interventions, Corrective Action and Response to Complaints</b></p>	<p>To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NACSA Standard #4</li> <li>• MN Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>• Continuous Improvement Measure</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>2. Authorizer Annual Report</li> <li>3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> <li>4. State Portfolio Performance Data</li> </ol>	<p>Authorizer's standards and processes are incompletely or insufficiently stated in its AAA</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's standards and processes for complaints, intervention and corrective action misalign with its stated standards and processes in its AAA</p>	<p>AAA does not include clear standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's standards and processes for complaints, intervention and corrective action misalign with its stated standards and processes in its AAA</p>	<p>AAA includes clear standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer consistently implements clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio and align with its stated standards and processes in its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's standards and processes align with nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer response to guiding question</p>

B.6 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>• Authorizer’s standards and processes for interventions, corrective action and response to complaints <b>if different than AAA*</b></li> <li>• Documentation of data collected and decision made regarding complaints, intervention and corrective actions for at least the last 12 months*</li> <li>• Documentation of one complete example of a charter school’s school improvement plan or notices of interventions put in place by authorizer*</li> <li>• Documentation of authorizing standards and processes for interventions, corrective action and response to complaints that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 10%</p>	<p>See above indicator</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer inconsistently implements standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>One Level 1 indicator</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Authorizer inconsistently implements standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Decisions made regarding complaints, intervention and corrective action is aligned with data generated under oversight and monitoring practices</p>	<p>a) Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>b) For at least the last 12 months authorizer’s processes for ongoing oversight of the portfolio of charter schools reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals</p>

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING**  
**AUTHORIZER ONGOING OVERSIGHT AND EVALUATION (continued)**

B.7 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
<b>Charter School Support, Development and Technical Assistance</b>	To what degree does the authorizer support its portfolio of charter schools through intentional assistance and development offerings?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuous Improvement Measure</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorizer Annual Report</li> <li>Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	Support and technical assistance is not available	Support and technical assistance is provided inconsistently  <i>and/or</i>  Only in response to problems	Support and technical assistance is proactive  <i>and</i>  Provided in a variety of areas and in a manner to preserve school autonomy	Level 2  <i>and</i>  Support and technical assistance is regularly offered, based on demonstrated need and designed to prevent problems	Level 3  <i>and</i>  Support and technical assistance is designed to promote excellence

B.7 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<b>Specific Data Sources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence <i>if different than authorizer annual report submissions*</i></li> <li>Documentation showing extent to which authorizer provided support and technical assistance, how the assistance addressed a need and/or helped prevent future problems</li> <li>Documentation of how the support, development and technical assistance is designed to promote excellence</li> </ul> <b>Weight</b> 5%	See above indicator	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months  <i>or</i>  One Level 1 indicator	Level 2 indicators were met within the last 12 months	a) Level 2 specification  <i>and</i>  b) Level 3 indicator within the last 12 months	Level 3 specifications  <i>and</i>  Level 4 indicator within the last 12 months

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING**  
**AUTHORIZER ONGOING OVERSIGHT AND EVALUATION (continued)**

B.8 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
<b>High Quality Charter School Replication and Dissemination of Best School Practices</b>	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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuous Improvement Measure</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorizer Annual Report</li> <li>Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> </ol>	There is no evidence of successful model replication or dissemination of best practices	There is no intentional plan for successful model replication and dissemination of best practices	There is a clear plan for successful model replication and dissemination of best practices and models/practices have been identified	Level 2 <i>and</i> Identified models/practices are moving toward replication/dissemination	Level 3 <i>and</i> Identified models/practices have been replicated/disseminated

B.8 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence <i>if different than authorizer annual report submissions*</i></li> <li>Plan for promoting the model replication and dissemination of best practices of high performing charter schools</li> <li>Documentation of models being replicated and practices being disseminated</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 5%</p>	See above indicator	See above indicator	Level 2 indicator was met within the last 12 months	Level 2 specification <i>and</i> One or more models/practices are moving toward replication/dissemination	Level 3 specifications <i>and</i> One or more models/practices have been realized

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING**  
**AUTHORIZER RENEWAL AND DECISION MAKING**

B.9 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
<p><b>Charter School Renewal or Termination Decisions</b></p>	<p>To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to make high stakes renewal and termination decisions?</p> <p>To what degree do the authorizer's renewal and termination decisions align to its stated renewal standards and processes and promote the growth of high-quality charter schools?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 3(a)(5)</li> <li>• MN Statutes §§124E.10, Subd. 1(a)(13) and Subd. 1(a)(14)</li> <li>• MN Authorizer Application Standards</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #5</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA)</li> <li>2. MDE Analysis of Renewal Contracts</li> <li>3. MDE review of requests</li> <li>4. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire</li> <li>5. State Portfolio Performance Data</li> <li>6. Authorizer Annual Report</li> </ol>	<p>Renewal standards and processes in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</p>	<p>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</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</p>	<p>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</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across its portfolio of charter schools</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's renewal standards and processes align with nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high-quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question and renewals have resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</p>

B.9 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence*</li> <li>• Documentation of authorizer’s renewal standards and processes <b><i>if different than AAA*</i></b></li> <li>• An example of contract renewal review process and determination (from beginning to end)*</li> <li>• An example of contract termination decision, if applicable, including intervention processes (from beginning to end)*</li> <li>• Documentation of authorizing renewal and termination standards and processes that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards</li> <li>• Documentation of how the authorizer is promoting high quality charter schools</li> </ul> <p><b>Weight</b> 20%</p>	<p>See above indicators</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>One or two Level 1 indicators</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months</p>	<p>a) Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>b) For at least the last 12 months authorizer’s renewal standards and processes reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Decisions resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals</p>

# **Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System (MAPES)**

## **Review Process Summary**

**Cohort One**

**January, 2015**

# Contents

AUTHORIZER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM PROCESS .....	2
PURPOSE OF EVALUATION .....	2
COHORT ONE EVALUATION TIMELINE .....	3
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES .....	3
PROJECT OVERVIEW .....	3
PHASE ONE – WELCOME AND DATA COLLECTION .....	3
PHASE TWO – DATA REVIEW .....	4
PHASE THREE – FIELD WORK.....	4
PHASE FOUR – PERFORMANCE REPORTS .....	5
NEXT STEPS .....	5
RESOURCES.....	6
ADDENDUM .....	7
MAPES DOCUMENT REQUEST .....	7

# AUTHORIZER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM PROCESS

## PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System (MAPES) is aligned with Minnesota Statutes, section 124D.10, Subdivision 3(h), *“The commissioner shall review an authorizer’s performance every five years in a manner and form determined by the commissioner and may review an authorizer’s performance more frequently at the commissioner’s own initiative or at the request of a charter school operator, charter school board member, or other interested party. The commissioner, after completing the review, shall transmit a report with findings to the authorizer.”*

An authorizer is a public oversight entity approved by the state to authorize one or more charter schools. An authorizer’s fundamental role is to hold a school accountable for the terms of its performance contract – the “charter.” The primary purpose of Minnesota charter schools is to improve all pupil learning and all student achievement (Minn. Stat. § 124D.10, Subd. 1(a)). Through effective oversight, authorizers hold charter schools accountable for realizing this purpose.

Minnesota authorizers may be public schools, charitable non-profit organizations or institutions of higher education approved by the state to charter schools. Authorizer responsibilities include approving, monitoring, evaluating, renewing, and, if necessary, closing charter schools when contract terms are not met.

MAPES was established to review authorizers’ performance per Minnesota Statutes, section 124D.10 Subdivision 3(h), and to identify high-quality authorizing practices to promote authorizer excellence in Minnesota.

MAPES objectives include:

- Setting clear expectations between authorizers and Minnesota Department of Education (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.

The development of this evaluation system 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.

## COHORT ONE EVALUATION TIMELINE

Key Dates for Cohort One Authorizers	*Dates
Welcome Meeting at MDE	January 16, 2015
MDE Issues Charter School Leadership Surveys	January 23, 2015
Charter School Leadership Surveys Due to MDE	February 13, 2015
Authorizer Document Submissions Due to MDE	February 17, 2015
Authorizer and School Meetings and Interviews	March 8-31, 2015
Authorizer Review and Comment on Draft Performance Reports	May 4-15, 2015
Final Performance Reports Issued to Authorizers	May 29, 2015
Final Performance Reports Published and Disseminated	June 2015

\*MDE reserves the right to adjust dates as needed

## ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

**MDE/Evaluator:** MDE/evaluator conducts the authorizer performance evaluation which includes reviewing and analyzing existing and new data. MDE/evaluator will address technical and logistical questions throughout the evaluation process. MDE/evaluator will work with the authorizer to schedule site visit(s) and potentially attend one or more key meetings or interviews the authorizer has scheduled. MDE/evaluator will draft and finalize the performance report while working to ensure the evaluation timeline is followed.

**Authorizer:** The authorizer ensures all requested documents are provided to MDE in a timely manner as outlined in the Addendum. The authorizer will work with MDE to schedule and participate in an in depth interview. The interview may involve the key decision maker(s), governing board, director, coordinator and other staff members of the authorizing organization. If schedules allow, MDE/evaluator may observe school site visits, evaluations, application interviews and/or other key school meetings during the evaluation process. The authorizer will have an opportunity to review and comment on the draft performance report before it is finalized.

**School:** Key school leadership personnel will assist in the authorizer performance evaluation by completing the charter school leadership survey and may be asked to participate in focus group interviews. The school may also be asked to participate in a school site visit, evaluation, application interview and/or other key meetings during the evaluation.

## PROJECT OVERVIEW

### PHASE ONE – WELCOME AND DATA COLLECTION

#### ***Welcome Meeting***

The Welcome Meeting provides time for authorizers to review the process summary and ask questions about the evaluation process. A welcome packet is distributed at the meeting, which includes *MAPES process summary, authorizer performance measures, indicators and specifications* and *MAPES document request* (Addendum).

### ***MAPES Document Request***

*MAPES document request* (Addendum) is a list of documents MDE is requesting to provide additional data or evidence for performance measures. Authorizers may submit other documentation not included on the list if they feel it addresses a performance measure.

The documents and narratives will be submitted to MDE via a USB drive. The USB drive is set up with a folder for each performance measure and a *narrative template* is provided in each folder on the USB drive. Authorizers are to fill out the *narrative template* describing how the guiding question(s) are met and how the submitted documents apply to a specific performance measure. MDE must receive all USB drives on **February 17, 2015**; carefully read the Addendum for detailed guidance.

### ***Charter School Leadership Surveys***

Surveys are completed by key school leadership personnel for each LEA in an authorizer's portfolio of charter schools. Names, position and contact information for charter school leaders are collected by MDE prior to the start of evaluation activities. Surveys are disseminated directly to charter school leaders on **January 23, 2015**. All surveys must be submitted to MDE by 11:59 p.m. Central Standard Time on **February 13, 2015**. The data collected will be used as a data source for the authorizer performance evaluation.

## **PHASE TWO – DATA REVIEW**

### ***Existing Data Review***

MDE/evaluator will review existing authorizer data including: approved authorizer applications; executed charter contracts; authorizer annual reports; new charter school affidavits; grade/site expansion affidavits; change in authorizer requests; authorizer income and expenditures reports; state portfolio performance data reports and other data maintained by MDE.

### ***New Data Review***

MDE/evaluator will review charter school leadership surveys submitted to MDE as well as documents submitted by authorizer in response to the *MAPES document request*.

## **PHASE THREE – FIELD WORK**

### ***Authorizer and School Stakeholder Interviews and Meetings***

Authorizer and school interviews are slotted for **March 8-31, 2015** but may be scheduled at other times during the evaluation process if needed. During this time, MDE/evaluator will conduct extensive interviews with authorizer representatives and group interviews (in person and/or via conference call) with school stakeholders to clarify authorizer performance and review data submitted to MDE. Approximately two days will be allotted per authorizer for onsite meetings and interviews, plus additional follow-up time as necessary.

## PHASE FOUR – PERFORMANCE REPORTS

### ***MDE Draft Performance Reports***

The performance reports will be drafted and sent to authorizers by **May 4, 2015**.

### ***Authorizer Review and Comment on Draft Performance Reports***

Authorizers will have until 11:59 p.m. on **May 15, 2015** to review and comment on the draft performance reports.

### ***MDE Finalize Reports for Publication and Dissemination***

Final performance reports will be issued to authorizers by **May 29, 2015**. MDE will publish the finalized performance reports under each authorizer's performance profile page on MDE's website in June 2015 and disseminate the performance report to the authorizer's portfolio of charter schools.

## NEXT STEPS

The *authorizer performance ratings and outcomes* outline the next steps for authorizers depending on their overall rating. Authorizers with rating outcomes of "*Exemplary*", "*Commendable*" and "*Satisfactory*" are eligible to submit renewal plans to MDE.

Authorizers receiving an overall rating of "*Unsatisfactory*" are ineligible to submit renewal plans and will be placed in corrective action status. Authorizers will **not** have the authority to charter new schools, accept transfers or initiate expansion requests until an overall performance rating of "*Satisfactory*" is attained. Authorizers will have up to one year to achieve a "*Satisfactory*" performance rating in all performance measures in order to be eligible to submit renewal plans.

Authorizer's corrective action status will be assessed on a case by case basis, depending on the nature and scope of deficiencies. Authorizer will only be evaluated on deficient measures during the corrective action period. If identified deficiencies remain unaddressed, termination of an authorizer's approval to charter schools may occur per Minnesota Statutes, section 124D.10 Subdivision 3(h).

## RESOURCES

To access the most up to date MAPES components visit the links below:

Authorizer Performance Evaluation Measures, Indicators and Specifications

<http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/StuSuc/CharterSch/Review/index.htm>

Authorizer Performance Ratings and Outcomes

<http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/StuSuc/CharterSch/Review/index.htm>

### **Additional Resources:**

National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) *Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing*

<http://www.qualitycharters.org/publications-resources/principles-standards.html>

2014 Minnesota Statutes, section 124D.10 Charter Schools

<https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?id=124D.10>

# ADDENDUM

## MAPES DOCUMENT REQUEST

Below is a list of documents MDE is requesting to provide additional data or evidence for performance measures. Authorizers may submit additional documentation not included on the list. The documents are to be submitted to MDE via a USB drive provided at the Welcome Meeting.

The documents with an \* are required documents to at least receive a “*Satisfactory*” rating. The other documents are to address “*Commendable*” and “*Exemplary*” ratings for the performance measures. Please carefully review the guidance and submission instructions below prior to gathering materials for this document request.

### Guidance:

- The USB drive is set up with a folder for each performance measure. Each folder includes a *narrative template*. The *narrative template* includes a fillable table to list data sources for each measure.
- Authorizers are to complete the *narrative template* describing how the guiding question(s) are met and how the data sources apply to a specific performance measure.
- If a data source pertains to multiple measures, save the file in the first applicable measure’s folder and reference the file’s location and folder name in the fillable table for subsequent applicable measures (e.g. if a file applies to measures A.1 and A.3, save the file in A.1, and reference A.1 folder under *Folder Name* when filling out the data source table in A.3 *narrative template*).
  - Please be specific when labeling data sources such that the file name listed on the data source table is consistent with the saved file name.
  - Anytime there are similar documents that apply to a specific situation or measure, combine related materials into one file (e.g. when documenting communications for a review process from beginning to end, consolidate communications into one file versus one file per communication; this could also apply to resumes and reviewer comments).
- If a data source on the *MAPES document request* indicates ***if different than AAA\**** and an updated section to the AAA is not submitted, then that section in the AAA on file at MDE will be used for evaluation purposes.
- If a data source on the *MAPES document request* indicates ***if different from your FY 2014 authorizer annual report submission\**** and you are not submitting anything to MDE, then your FY 2014 authorizer annual report responses to the specific measures (i.e. A.5, A.9, A.10, B.7, B.8) will be used for evaluation purposes.

## Submission Instructions:

MDE must receive all USB drives on **February 17, 2015**. Options for submitting USB drives:

- The USB drives may be dropped off at MDE by 4:30 p.m. Central Standard Time; or
- If mailing, overnight delivery or next day delivery, the USB drive must be received at MDE (not postmarked) by **February 17, 2015**.

Submit to: Minnesota Department of Education  
Attn: Jodi Brenden Amir, Charter Center  
1500 Highway 36 West  
Roseville, MN 55113

## Requested Documents:

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: AUTHORIZER CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE

#### A.1: Authorizer Mission

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

#### A.2: Authorizer Vision and Organizational Goals

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

#### A.3: Authorizer Structure of Operations

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence\*
- Job descriptions of authorizer's personnel (e.g. employees, contractors, volunteers; both paid and unpaid positions, etc.) *if different than AAA\**
- Most recent organizational chart that shows clear lines of reporting and authority/decision-making\*
- If applicable, authorizer staffing changes since the AAA was approved including staffing size (FTE) compared to portfolio size\*

#### A.4: Authorizer Staff Expertise

- 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

#### A.5: Authorizer Capacity and Skill Development of Leadership and Authorizing Staff

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence *if different from your FY 2014 authorizer annual report submission\**

- Documentation of professional development offered to authorizing staff for at least 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

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

- 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

**A.7: Authorizer Operational Conflicts of Interest**

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence\*
- Current authorizer conflict of interest policy *if different from AAA\**
- Authorizer conflict of interest processes and procedures for implementation and execution (could include forms, check lists, etc.)\*
- A fully documented example of how the authorizer successfully implemented their conflict of interest policy\*

**A.8: Ensuring Autonomy of the Schools in the Portfolio**

- 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

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

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence *if different from your FY 2014 authorizer annual report submission\**
- Authorizer self-evaluation tool(s), tracking and progress development for the past 12 months\*
- An example of authorizer strategic plan(s), continuous improvement plan(s) and/or staff development based on self-evaluations\*
- Documentation of how the authorizer self-evaluation aligns with authorizer chartering mission, vision and organizational goals
- Documentation of authorizing practices that were recognized externally (e.g. MDE, NACSA, and/or another organization)

**A.10: Authorizer High Quality Authorizing Dissemination**

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence\*

- Documentation of best practice sharing, engagement or technical assistance with/to other authorizers for the past 12 months ***if different from your FY 2014 authorizer annual report submission\****

#### **A.11: Authorizer Compliance to Responsibilities Stated in Statute**

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence\*

### **PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: AUTHORIZER PROCESSES AND DECISION MAKING**

#### **B.1: New Charter School Decisions**

***The following items are requested from all authorizers:***

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence\*
- Charter school 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\****

***The following items are requested from authorizers who actively reviewed new charter school applications since being approved as an authorizer:***

- Documentation/summary of applications and authorizer decisions since the AAA was approved\*
- An example of a new charter school application review process (from beginning to end) including qualifications of individuals who reviewed the application and those who served on the interview committee\*
- Documentation of recognition of national quality authorizing new charter school application standards and designed to promote and/or resulted in high quality charter schools

#### **B.2: Interim Accountability Decisions**

***The following items are requested from all authorizers:***

- 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\****

***The following items are requested from authorizers who engaged in interim accountability decisions (i.e. expansions, new school opening or incoming transfer requests)***

- 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 ready to open 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

**B.3: Contract Term, Negotiation, and Execution**

- 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)

**B.4: Performance Standards**

- 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

**B.5: Authorizer's Processes for Ongoing Oversight of the Portfolio of Charter Schools**

- 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

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

- 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/or corrective actions for at least the last three years\*
- 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

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

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence *if different from your FY 2014 authorizer annual report submission\**

- 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

**B.8: High Quality Charter School Replication and/or Dissemination of Best School Practices**

- Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence *if different from your FY 2014 authorizer annual report submission\**
- Plan for promoting the replication and dissemination of best practices and model replication
- Documentation of models/practices being replicated and/or disseminated

**B.9: Charter School Renewal or Termination Decision**

- 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

## Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System Ratings and Outcomes

<p><b>Exemplary</b> Overall Rating 3.8-4.0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Exemplary" authorizer performance recognition</li> <li>• Expedited authorizing plans for the next five years</li> <li>• Expedited review and approval of affidavits and other requests from MDE</li> <li>• Eligible to be identified for authorizer best practice</li> <li>• Must receive at least <i>Level 3 – "Commendable"</i> on all performance measures in order to receive this rating</li> </ul>
<p><b>Commendable</b> Overall Rating 3.0-3.79</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Commendable" authorizer performance recognition</li> <li>• Eligible to submit authorizing plans for the next five years</li> <li>• Eligible to be identified for authorizer best practice</li> <li>• Must receive at least <i>Level 2 – "Satisfactory"</i> on all performance measures in order to receive this rating</li> </ul>
<p><b>Satisfactory</b> Overall Rating 2.0-2.99</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eligible to submit authorizing plans for the next five years</li> <li>• Thoroughly addresses identified deficiencies in authorizing plans for the next five years</li> <li>• Must receive an overall performance rating of at least 2.0 in order to receive this rating</li> </ul>
<p><b>Approaching Satisfactory</b> Overall Rating 1.0-1.99 or <b>Unsatisfactory/Incomplete</b> Overall Rating 0-0.99</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ineligible to submit authorizing plans for the next five years</li> <li>• May be subject to corrective action status*</li> <li>• Does not have authority to charter new schools, accept transfers or initiate expansion requests until an overall performance rating of "Satisfactory" is attained</li> </ul>

### \*Corrective Action Status Considerations

- **Authorizers receiving an overall rating of "Unsatisfactory" or "Approaching Satisfactory"**
  - May be subject to corrective action status
  - Per Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05, Subdivision 6, *"The authorizer has 15 business days to request an informal hearing before the commissioner takes corrective action."*
  - If the informal hearing is waived by the authorizer or if the authorizer is placed in corrective action status after the informal hearing, an authorizer:
    - Will *not* have the authority to charter new schools, accept transfers or initiate expansion requests while in corrective action and until an overall performance rating of "Satisfactory" is attained (i.e. out of corrective action status)
    - Will have up to one year to satisfactorily address all performance measures in order to be eligible to submit their AAP
    - Will only be evaluated on deficient measures during the corrective action period
    - If identified deficiencies remain unaddressed, termination of an authorizer's approval to charter schools may occur per [Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.05 Subdivision 6](#)



## Charter School Leadership Survey

The charter school leadership survey includes dichotomous, Likert response scale, contingency and open ended response questions. Please answer the questions to the best of your knowledge and provide examples when relevant. When applicable, rate your agreement from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Please be thoughtful with responses. The survey should take approximately an hour to complete.

This survey plays a key role in evaluating an authorizer's performance. The data collected will be used as an evaluation source to verify and evaluate an authorizer's standards and practices in overseeing their portfolio for charter schools. This is an opportunity for charter schools to share their experience and provide insight on working with their authorizer.

Surveys are due to MDE by 11:59 p.m. Central Standard Time on **Friday, February 13, 2015**. Submit your completed survey to [mde.charterschools@state.mn.us](mailto:mde.charterschools@state.mn.us) or if mailing, overnight delivery or next day delivery, the survey must be received at MDE (not postmarked) by **February 13, 2015**.

Submit to: Minnesota Department of Education  
Attn: Jodi Brenden Amir, Charter Center  
1500 Highway 36 West  
Roseville, MN 55113

Charter School Leader	Contact Information
Name of Individual Completing this Survey	Click here to enter text
Title	Click here to enter text
Name of Charter School	Click here to enter text
Number of Years in Position	Click here to enter text
Email	Click here to enter text
Phone Number	Click here to enter text

Charter School Leadership Survey

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>A.1 Authorizer Mission</b>
<b>Guiding Question</b>	<b>Does the authorizer have a clear and compelling mission for charter school authorizing?</b>

1. I am aware of and knowledgeable about the authorizer’s mission.

Choose an item.

Please provide one or more examples of how the authorizer’s mission was made known to you (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>A.3 Authorizer Structure of Operations</b>
<b>Guiding Question</b>	<b>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?</b>

2. The structure of duties and responsibilities of the authorizer is clear and at a level adequate to meet the needs of the school.

Choose an item.

Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

3. The staffing level of the authorizer is clearly sufficient to meet the needs of the school.

Choose an item.

Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>A.7 Authorizer Operational Conflicts of Interest</b>
<b>Guiding Question</b>	<b>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?</b>

4. Explain how the authorizer implements a clear policy to address conflicts of interest in all decision making processes concerning the school (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

5. Have you experienced any conflict of interest with the authorizer?

Choose an item.

If yes, please explain the conflict and how was it resolved (limit one paragraph). If no, please move on to question 6.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Charter School Leadership Survey

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>A.8 Ensuring Autonomy of the Schools in the Portfolio</b>
<b>Guiding Question</b>	<b>To what degree does the authorizer preserve and support the essential autonomies of the portfolio of charter schools?</b>

6. Explain how the authorizer preserves and supports the essential autonomies of the school (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

7. Have you experienced any situations where you felt the authorizer overstepped their responsibility to preserve autonomy?

Choose an item.

If yes, please explain the situation and how was it resolved (limit one paragraph). If no, please move on to questions 8-11, below.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

**For new schools approved by the authorizer in the last three years, please address questions 8-11, below. If questions 8-11 do not apply, please move on to questions 11-14.**

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>B.1 New Charter School Decisions</b>
<b>Guiding Question</b>	<b>To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals?</b>  <b>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?</b>
<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>B.2 Interim Accountability Decisions (e.g. site/grade level expansions, ready to open and change in authorizer)</b>
<b>Guiding Question</b>	<b>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?</b>  <b>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?</b>

8. Explain the authorizer’s new charter school application and approval criteria (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Give examples of how the authorizer’s new charter school application and approval criteria were made known to you (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

9. Was the new school program replicating a high quality charter school model?

Choose an item.

Charter School Leadership Survey

10. Describe the authorizer's ready to open process (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

**For schools who have applied for a grade and/or site expansion in the last three years, please address questions 11-14, below. If questions 11-14 do not apply, please move on to question 15.**

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>B.1 New Charter School Decisions</b>
<b>Guiding Question</b>	<p>To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals?</p> <p>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?</p>
<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>B.2 Interim Accountability Decisions (e.g. <i>site/grade level expansions, ready to open and change in authorizer</i>)</b>
<b>Guiding Question</b>	<p>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?</p> <p>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?</p>

11. Which of the following has MDE approved for the charter school in the past three years?

[Choose an item.](#)

12. Was your school's expansion replicating a high quality charter school?

[Choose an item.](#)

13. Give examples of how the authorizer's expansion application and approval criteria were made known to you (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

14. Explain the authorizer's expansion application and approval criteria (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>B.2 Interim Accountability Decisions (e.g. <i>site/grade level expansions, ready to open and change in authorizer</i>)</b>
<b>Guiding Questions</b>	<p>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?</p> <p>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?</p>

Charter School Leadership Survey

15. Has the charter school experienced a change in authorizer in the last five years?

Choose an item.

If yes, what was the reason for a change in authorizer? If no, please move on to question 16.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Explain the change in authorizer process you experienced with the authorizer (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>B.3 Contract Term, Negotiation and Execution</b>
<b>Guiding Questions</b>	<b>To what degree does the authorizer execute contracts that clearly define material terms and rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer?</b>

16. The contract has clear material terms and rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer?

Choose an item.

Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Explain the contract process you experienced with the authorizer (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

17. Did you get an opportunity to negotiate any contract terms?

Choose an item.

If yes, which terms of the contract were negotiated (limit one paragraph)? If no, please move on to question 18.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Why were those terms negotiated (limit one paragraph)?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Were you satisfied with the results of the negotiation?

Choose an item.

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>B.4 Performance Standards</b>
<b>Guiding Questions</b>	<b>To what degree does the authorizer execute contracts with clear, measureable, and attainable performance standards?</b>

18. The contract has clear, measureable and attainable performance standards.

Choose an item.

Charter School Leadership Survey

Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

19. Explain what happens if the school does not meet the clear, measureable and attainable performance standards established by the authorizer (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>B.5 Authorizer’s Processes for Ongoing Oversight of the Portfolio of Charter Schools</b>
<b>Guiding Questions</b>	<b>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?</b>

20. The authorizer monitors and oversees the school’s academic performance as outlined in the charter contract.

[Choose an item.](#)

Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

21. The authorizer monitors and oversees the school’s operational performance as outlined in the charter contract.

[Choose an item.](#)

Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

22. The authorizer monitors and oversees the school’s finance performance as outlined in the charter contract.

[Choose an item.](#)

Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

23. If there is a problem or concern about the school’s academic, operational and/or financial performance, the school receives clear feedback from the authorizer.

[Choose an item.](#)

Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>B.6 Authorizer’s Standards and Processes for Interventions, Corrective Action and Response to Complaints</b>
----------------------	---

Charter School Leadership Survey

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>B.6 Authorizer’s Standards and Processes for Interventions, Corrective Action and Response to Complaints</b>
<b>Guiding Questions</b>	<b>To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and/or corrective action?</b>

24. Has the authorizer placed the school on any of the following:

Choose an item.

If the school has been placed on intervention and/or corrective action, explain the authorizer’s intervention and/or corrective action processes (limit one paragraph). If the school has not been placed on intervention and/or corrective action, please move on to question 25.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

25. Has the authorizer responded to complaints they may have received from stakeholders pertaining to the school?

Choose an item.

If yes, explain (limit one paragraph). If no, please move on to question 26.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

<b>MAPES Measure</b>	<b>B.9 Charter School Renewal or Termination Decisions</b>
<b>Guiding Questions</b>	<b>To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to make high stakes renewal and termination decisions?  To what degree do the authorizer’s renewal and termination decisions align to its stated renewal standards and processes and promote the growth of high-quality charter schools?</b>

26. Has the charter school experienced a contract renewal since FY 2010?

Choose an item.

If yes, explain the authorizer’s process to determine contract renewal and contract term (limit one paragraph). If no, please move on to question 27.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

27. The school has a good understanding of where they stand with respect to performance expectations and their status for renewal.

Choose an item.

Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).

[Click here to enter text.](#)