Minnesota Department of Education

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 States, 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 Statues, 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 an as 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, 651-582-8351
Paula Higgins, paula.higgins@state.mn.us, 651-582-8315

Minnesota Department of Education

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

Updated May 2016

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
Authorizer Mission	Does the authorizer have a clear and compelling mission for charter school authorizing?	• MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 4(1) • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards	1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	Mission is missing or vague	Mission is stated, but inadequately aligns with Minnesota charter school law	Mission is stated and fully aligns with Minnesota charter school law	Level 2 *and* Mission is verified internally in practice and documentation at authorizing organization	Level 3 *and* Mission is verified by external references (such as school board validation)

A.1 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • Evidence of mission documented at the authorizing organization* **Weight** 5%	See above indicator	Mission being implemented is not consistent with AAA and/or Mission in AAA does not clearly align with Minnesota charter school law or does not outline what the organization is realizing as a charter school authorizer	Authorizer implements mission from AAA and Mission is aligned with Minnesota charter school law and reflects what the organization is realizing as a charter school authorizer	Level 2 specifications *and* Authorizer's mission is verified internally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals	Level 3 specifications *and* Authorizer's mission is verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals

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

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
Authorizer Vision and Organizational Goals	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?	• MN Statutes §124E.01, Subd. 1 • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards	1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	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 *and* Vision has clear organizational goals, criteria and timeframes for achievement *and* Authorizer is actively measuring and achieving most goals	Level 3 *and* 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
Specific Data Sources • 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) **Weight** 10%	See above indicator	Vision and/or goals implemented are not consistent with the approved AAA and/or Organizational goals are not clearly related to charter school authorizing	Authorizer implements vision from AAA *and* Authorizer organizational goals aligns with chartering vision and statutory purpose(s)	Level 2 specifications *and* See above indicator	Level 3 specifications *and* Authorizer evaluates its work regularly against its chartering vision and organizational goals, and implemented plans for improvement when falling short of its mission and strategic plan

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
Authorizer Structure of Operations	To what degree does the authorizer operate with a clear structure of duties and responsibilities and sufficient resources to effectively oversee its portfolio of charter schools?	• MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 42 • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards	1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	Structure of duties and responsibilities is unclear, inconsistent and/or at a level inadequate to meet the needs of the portfolio	Structure of duties and responsibilities exists, but staffed at a level that does not sufficiently meet the needs of the portfolio	Clear structure of duties and responsibilities is defined, charted and at a level adequate to meet the needs of the portfolio	Level 2 *and* Structure of duties and, and responsibilities is verified internally at authorizing organization *and* Staffing level is clearly sufficient to meet the needs of the portfolio	Level 3 *and* Clear structure of duties and responsibilities are updated when necessary *and* Authorizer practices are verified externally (such as school board validation)

A.3 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • 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* **Weight** 15%	See above indicator	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months *or* 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 *and* If applicable, changes were made to the organizational structure when necessary *and* Authorizer appropriately manages and safeguards school,	a) Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years *and* b) Structure of duties, responsibilities and staffing levels are consistently verified internally at authorizing organization for interviewed individuals	Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years *and* Level 3 specification b) *and* Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals

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		

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
Authorizer Staff Expertise (e.g. advisors, board members, volunteers, etc.)	To what degree does the authorizer have appropriate experience, expertise and skills to sufficiently oversee the portfolio of charter schools?	• MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 4(2) • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards • Continuous Improvement Measure	1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	Authorizing staff 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
Definitions • Authorizing staff refers to individuals both paid and unpaid as well as contractors hired by the authorizer • Expertise is defined as having knowledge, education, training, etc. in the areas of charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance, and law • Experience is defined as length of time working in the areas of charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance, and law • Skills is defined as effective application of experience and expertise in the areas of charter schools, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance, and law **Specific Data Sources** • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • Current resumes/vitae of existing personnel including contracted individuals with employment/contract terms ***if different than AAA**** • If not included in the resume: conference or workshop certificates of completion or participation; college level course transcripts; licenses; certifications; degrees; etc. documenting staff expertise **Weight** 10%	See above indicator	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months *or* See above indicator	Level 2 indicator was met for at least the last 12 months	a) Level 2 indicator was met for at least the last two years *and* 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	Level 2 indicator was met for at least the last three years *and* Level 3 specification b) *and* For at least the last 12 months authorizing staff are credentialed

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
Authorizer Capacity and Skill Development of Authorizing Leadership and Staff	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?	• NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards • Continuous Improvement Measure	1. Authorizer Annual Report 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	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 *and* Aligns with its operations, vision and goals for the portfolio of schools	Level 2 *and* 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 *and* 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
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence ***if different than authorizer annual report submissions**** • Documentation of professional development offered to authorizing staff within the last 12 months, date of professional development, who attended, how the professional development addressed a needed skill base for authorizing leadership and staff and how the professional development aligns with operations, vision and goals for the portfolio of schools* • If not included in the resume submitted for A.4: conference or workshop certificates of completion or participation; etc. for authorizing staff **Weight** 5%	See above indicator	Professional development is only incident specific *and/or* Professional Development misaligns with authorizer mission and vision	Within the last 12 months professional development was intentional and planned to build the skill base of the authorizing leadership and staff	Level 2 specification *and* Professional development is regular, ongoing, and more than once a year	Level 3 specifications *and* Within the last 12 months professional development is measured, evaluated and customized to meet the needs of the authorizing leadership and staff

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
Authorizer Operational Budget for Authorizing the Portfolio of Charter Schools	To what degree is the authorizer's actual resource allocation commensurate with its stated budget, needs and responsibilities of authorizing the portfolio of charter schools?	• MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 3(1) and 4(2) • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #1	1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 2. Income and Expenditures Report 3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	Resource allocations for authorizing fall short of resources committed in its AAA *and* Resource allocations are insufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities	Resource allocations for authorizing fall short of resources committed in its AAA *or* Resource allocations are insufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities	Resource allocations for authorizing are at least consistent with resources committed in its AAA, sufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities and commensurate with the scale of the portfolio	Level 2 *and* Resource allocations are devoted to achieve nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing	Level 3 *and* Resource allocations have resulted in attainment of nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing

A.6 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Definitions • Income: Examples include fees collected annually from charter schools and additional funds from outside sources • Expenditures: Examples include staff, travel, consultants and office costs **Specific Data Sources** • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • Updated five year budget with actuals for years 1 - 4 since approval* • Documentation that resource allocations are devoted to achieve nationally recognized quality authorizing standards • Documentation that resource allocations have resulted in recognition of nationally recognized quality authorizing standards **Weight** 10%	See above indicator	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months *or* One Level 1 indicator	For at least the last 12 months the following were met: Level 2 indicator *and* Authorizer demonstrates resource allocations are adequate to fulfill authorizing responsibilities and the needs and scale of its portfolio (e.g. income, expenditures, number and size of the charter schools in the portfolio) *and* Resource allocation aligns with or exceeds its AAA *and* Authorizer staff	a) Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years *and* b) Resource allocations are devoted to align with state and national authorizing principles and standards which enables the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school's financial stability and viability based on short-term performance and long-term financial sustainability	Level 2 specifications were met for at least three years *and* Level 3 specification b) *and* Resource allocations have resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards

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		

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
Authorizer Operational Conflicts of Interest	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?	• MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Principle III	1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	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 *and* Implementation of policy has successfully prevented or resolved conflicts of interest in a timely, fair and appropriate manner	Level 3 *and* 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
Specific Data Sources • 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* **Weight** 10%	Numerous conflicts exist between the authorizer and its charter schools (e.g. staff and board may overlap, authorizer may require school to purchase services from authorizer, funds may be comingled, etc.) *and/or* Schools are offered incentives by the authorizer (e.g. may only contract with an authorized for various services) *and/or* Authorizer's decisions are improperly influenced by a management company or the school board	Authorizer does not follow its conflict of interest policy as outlined in its AAA *and/or* Decision making is not transparent and/or it is unclear what criteria are used by the authorizer to make decisions	Authorizer avoids conflicts of interest that might affect its capacity to make objective, merit-based application and renewal decisions (e.g. involvement in school's performance) *and* Authorizer is able to provide at least one fully documented example of how they have successfully implemented their conflict of interest policy *and* Ensures that the application-review and decision making processes are free of conflicts of interest, and requires full	Level 2 specifications *and* If MDE inquires about a specific example, authorizer is able to provide evidence concerning the situation that demonstrates satisfactory resolution	Level 3 specifications *and* The implementation and effectiveness of the authorizer's conflict of interest policy is verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals

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		

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
Ensuring Autonomy of the Schools in the Portfolio	To what degree does the authorizer preserve and support the essential autonomies of the portfolio of charter schools?	• MN Statutes §124E.03, Subd. 1 • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Principle II • NACSA Standard #4	1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	Authorizer policy for ensuring autonomy is missing or vague *and* In practice there is confusion regarding appropriate levels of autonomy with the schools in the portfolio	Authorizer policy for ensuring autonomy exists but is vague *or* In practice there is confusion regarding appropriate levels of autonomy with the schools in the portfolio	Authorizer has a clear policy to ensure school autonomy *and* Authorizer's practices align with its stated policy to uphold school autonomy	Level 2 *and* Authorizer's policy aligns with nationally recognized principles and standards for quality authorizing	Level 3 *and* School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question

A.8 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • Current policy on charter school autonomy ***if different from AAA**** • Charter school autonomy processes and procedures for implementation and execution* • Documentation on how the authorizer's policy aligns with nationally recognized principles and standards **Weight** 15%	Authorizer policy is missing or does not clearly relate to charter school authorizing or misaligns with Minnesota charter school law *and* Authorizer is overly involved in the processes and operations of the school's authority over academic, operational and financial needs	Authorizer policy does not clearly relate to charter school authorizing or misaligns with Minnesota charter school law *or* Authorizer is overly involved in the processes and operations of the school's authority over academic, operational and financial needs	Authorizer's autonomy policy aligns with state statute *and* Authorizer's policy on school autonomy establishes and recognizes the school's authority over academic, operational and financial needs and respects the school's authority over the schools' day-to-day operations *and* Practice aligns with policy; authorizer holds charter schools accountable for outcomes rather than on processes and operations	Level 2 specifications *and* See above indicator	Level 3 specifications *and* Authorizer's policy and practices to ensure school's autonomy is verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals

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
Authorizer Self-Evaluation of Capacity, Infrastructure and Practices	To what degree does the authorizer self-evaluate its internal ability (capacity, infrastructure, and practices) to oversee the portfolio of charter schools?	• NACSA Standard #1 • Continuous Improvement Measure	1. Authorizer Annual Report 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	Authorizer does not review its internal ability to oversee the portfolio of charter schools	Authorizer may have an informal review of its internal ability to oversee the portfolio of charter schools	Authorizer regularly reviews its internal ability to oversee the portfolio of charter schools	Level 2 *and* Authorizer reviews its internal practices against its chartering mission, vision and organizational goals *and* Authorizer develops continuous improvement plans to address findings of self-evaluation	Level 3 *and* Implementation of continuous improvement plans have resulted in more effective authorizing practices, one or more of which may be externally recognized such as by MDE, NACSA, and/or another organization

A.9 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence ***if different than authorizer annual report submissions**** • Authorizer self-evaluation tool(s), tracking and progress development within the last 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) **Weight** 5%	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 *and* Within the last 12 months the following were met: a) Authorizer addresses any needs for improvement when not meeting its mission, organizational goals or strategic plan *and*	Level 3 specifications *and* Within the last 12 months authorizer evaluates its work regularly against national standards for quality authorizing and recognized effective practices, and develops and implements timely plans for improvement when needed

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	

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
Authorizer High Quality Authorizing Dissemination	To what degree does the authorizer disseminate best authorizing practices and/or assist other authorizers in high quality authorizing?	• Continuous Improvement Measure	1. Authorizer Annual Report 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	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 *and* 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
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • Documentation of best practice sharing, engagement or technical assistance with/to other authorizers within the last 12 months ***if different than authorizer annual report submissions**** **Weight** 5%	See above indicator	See above indicator	Within the last 12 months authorizer engages with other authorizers to improve the authorizing community of practice in the state including sharing best practices and/or providing technical assistance to other authorizers	a) Level 2 specification *and* b) Level 3 indicator was met within the last 12 months	Level 3 specifications *and* Within the last 12 months best practices are sought out by other authorizers

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
Authorizer Compliance to Responsibilities Stated in Statute	To what degree does the authorizer comply with reporting, submissions, and deadlines set forth in Minnesota Statute?	• MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 6 • Report on Income and Expenditures • Submission of affidavits and requests • Submission of Authorizer Annual Reports • Participation in MDE required trainings	1. Minnesota Statute: Statutory Compliance	Over the last two or more years, the authorizer was consistently non-compliant in one or more of the stated areas	Over the last two or more years, the authorizer was occasionally non-compliant in one or more of the stated areas	Over the last two years, the authorizer was consistently compliant in all the stated areas	Over the last three years, the authorizer was consistently compliant in all the stated areas	Over the last four years, the authorizer was consistently compliant in all the stated areas

A.11 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* **Weight** 10%	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
New Charter School Decisions	To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals? To what degree did the authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align to its stated approval and process standards and promote the growth of high quality charter schools?	• MN Statutes §124E.06, Subd. 4(3) • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #2	1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 2. MDE records and/or review of requests 3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated *and* Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA	Authorizer's application process is not comprehensive; does not include clear application questions and guidance; or does not include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria *and/or* Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio *and/or* Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA	Authorizer's application process is comprehensive; includes clear application questions and guidance; and includes fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria *and* Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio *and* Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA	Level 2 *and* Authorizer's application process has resulted in attainment of nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high quality charter schools	Level 3 *and* School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question and approvals have resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools

B.1 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Authorizers actively reviewing new charter school applications **Specific Data Sources** • 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**** • 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 **Weight** 20%	See above indicator *and* Decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent with its criteria as stated in its AAA	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months *or* One or two Level 1 indicators	Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months	a) Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last two years *and* b) Authorizer's new charter school application process has resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards *and* c) For at least the last 12 months the application process reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools	Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years *and* Level 3 specification b) *and* Level 3 specification c) have been met for at least the last two years *and* Authorizer's new charter school application standards and processes are verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals *and* Decisions resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools
Authorizers not reviewing new charter school applications **Specific Data Sources** • 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**** **Weight** 5%	Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated *and* Authorizer's AAA indicated they would run a process for seeking new charter schools and they have not followed	Authorizer's application process is not comprehensive; does not include clear application questions and guidance; or does not include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria *or* Authorizer's AAA	Authorizer's application process is comprehensive; includes clear application questions and guidance; and includes fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria *and* Authorizer's actions are aligned with plans presented in	Not applicable	Not applicable

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

B.2 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Authorizers actively engaged in interim accountability decisions (i.e. expansions, new school openings or change in authorizer) in the last 5 years for existing schools **Specific Data Sources** • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • Ready to open standards, processes and timelines to verify a school is ready to opening before serving students ***if different than AAA**** • Expansion application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) ***if different than AAA**** • Change in authorizer application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) ***if different than AAA**** • If actively reviewed/accepted one or more site/grade level expansion applications, provide an example of a site/grade level expansion application review process (from beginning to end) including qualifications of individuals who reviewed the application and those who served on the interview committee, the authorizer's final decision and resulting actions and MDE's final decision* • If approved one or more new charter school openings, provide an example of a 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 **Weight** 10%	See above indicators *and* Authorizer interim accountability decisions are inconsistent with its criteria as stated in its AAA	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months *or* One or two Level 1 indicators	Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months	a) Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last two years *and* b) Interim accountability decisions have resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards *and* c) For at least the last 12 months interim accountability decisions reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools	Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years *and* Level 3 specification b) *and* Level 3 specification c) have been met for at least the last two years *and* Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals *and* Decisions resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools
Authorizers with no interim accountability decisions (i.e. no expansions, new school openings or change in authorizer) in the last 5 years for existing schools **Specific Data Sources** • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • Ready to open standards, processes and timelines to verify a school is ready to opening before serving students ***if different than AAA**** • Expansion application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) ***if different than AAA**** • Change in authorizer application policies, procedures, timelines and processes (including charter school application packet that covers, at a minimum, all elements found in this section) ***if different than AAA**** **Weight** 5%	Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated *and* Authorizer's AAA indicated they would run a process for seeking new charter schools and they have not followed their AAA	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 *or* Authorizer's AAA indicated they would run a process for seeking new	Authorizer's application processes are comprehensive; include clear application questions and guidance; and include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria *and* Authorizer's actions are aligned with plans presented in the AAA	Not applicable	Not applicable

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
Contract Term, Negotiation and Execution	To what degree does the authorizer execute contracts that clearly define material terms and rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer?	• MN Statutes §124E.10 Subdivision 1 • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #3	1. MDE Analysis of New and Renewal Contracts 2. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory requirements *and* Contracts in its portfolio do not clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer *and* Authorizer's contracting practices are inconsistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools	Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory requirements *and/or* Contracts do not clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer *and/or* Authorizer's contracting practices are inconsistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools	Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools meet current statutory requirements *and* Contracts clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer *and* Authorizer's contracting practices are consistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools	Level 2 *and* Authorizer clearly defines the role of the school and the authorizer, and executes contract amendments for material changes to current school plans when applicable	Level 3 *and* School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question

B.3 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • An example of contracting negotiations (from beginning to end) and data to support the contracting decision* • An example of a contract amendment including communications to the school regarding those amendments (if applicable) **Weight** 10%	See above indicator	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months *or* One or two Level 1 indicators	The following were met for at least the last twelve months: Level 2 indicators *and* Contracts were executed no later than the first day of the renewal period *and* Contracts were submitted to MDE within 10 business days of the first day of the renewal period	Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years *and* Level 3 indicator	Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years *and* Level 3 indicator *and* Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals

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
Performance Standards	To what degree does the authorizer execute contracts with clear, measureable and attainable performance standards?	• MN Statutes §124E.10 Subdivision 1 • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #3	1. MDE Analysis of New and Renewal Contracts beginning in 2014 2. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory performance standards *and* Contracts misalign with the performance standards of its AAA	Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory performance standards *and/or* Authorizer's performance standards are inconsistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools *and/or* Contracts misalign with the performance standards of its AAA	Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools meet current statutory performance standards *and* Contracts define clear, measurable and attainable academic, financial and organizational performance standards, and consequences for meeting or not meeting performance standards *and* Contracts align with the performance standards of its AAA	Level 2 *and* Authorizer executes contracts that align with nationally recognized quality performance standards and designed to promote high-quality charter school	Level 3 *and* School representatives verify authorizer response to guiding question

B.4 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • Authorizing framework for school academic, financial and operational performance standards ***if different than AAA**** • Documentation of authorizing performance standards that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards and designed to promote and/or resulted in high quality charter schools **Weight** 10%	See above indicators *and* Authorizer's performance standards are inconsistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months *or* One or two Level 1 indicators	For at least the last 12 months: Level 2 indicators were met *and* Performance standards are consistent across the portfolio of charter schools	a) Level 2 specifications have been met for at least the last two years *and* b) For at least the last 12 months authorizer's execution of contracts reflects	Level 2 specifications have been met for at least the last three years *and* Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years

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	*and* 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
Authorizer's Processes for Ongoing Oversight of the Portfolio of Charter Schools	To what degree does the authorizer monitor and oversee the charter schools in the areas of academics, operations, and finances according to the processes outlined in the contract and approved authorizer application?	• MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 4(5) • MN Statutes §124E.10, Subd. 1(a)(7) • Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #4	1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 2. Authorizer Annual Report 3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire 4. State Portfolio Performance Data	Oversight processes in the AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated *and* Authorizer's oversight and monitoring activities misalign with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA	AAA does not include clear processes for oversight and monitoring *and/or* Authorizer's oversight activities misalign with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA	AAA includes clear processes for oversight and monitoring *and* 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 *and* Authorizer's oversight activities align with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA	Level 2 *and* Authorizer's oversight processes align with nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high-quality charter schools	Level 3 *and* School representatives verify authorizer response to guiding question and oversight has resulted in the promotion of high quality charter schools

B.5 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • Authorizer oversight plans, including required academic, financial and legal/organizational reporting by schools to the authorizer ***if different than AAA**** • An example of one school's ongoing oversight including oversight/monitoring report(s) (from beginning to end of a contract term)* • Documentation of authorizing oversight processes that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards and designed to promote and/or resulted in high quality charter schools **Weight** 10%	See above indicator *and* Authorizer's oversight and monitoring practices are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months *or* One Level 1 indicator *or* Authorizer's oversight and monitoring practices are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools	For at least the last 12 months: Level 2 indicators were met *and* Authorizer's oversight and monitoring practices are consistent across the portfolio of charter schools	a) Level 2 specifications have been met for at least the last two years *and* 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	a) Level 2 specifications have been met for at least the last three years *and* Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years *and* Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals

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
Authorizer's Standards and Processes for Interventions, Corrective Action and Response to Complaints	To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action?	• NACSA Standard #4 • MN Authorizer Application Standards • Continuous Improvement Measure	1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 2. Authorizer Annual Report 3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire 4. State Portfolio Performance Data	Authorizer's standards and processes are incompletely or insufficiently stated in its AAA *and* Authorizer's standards and processes for complaints, intervention and corrective action misalign with its stated standards and processes in its AAA	AAA does not include clear standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action *and/or* Authorizer's standards and processes for complaints, intervention and corrective action misalign with its stated standards and processes in its AAA	AAA includes clear standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action *and* Authorizer consistently implements clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action *and* Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio and align with its stated standards and processes in its AAA	Level 2 *and* Authorizer's standards and processes align with nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing	Level 3 *and* School representatives verify authorizer response to guiding question

B.6 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • Authorizer's standards and processes for interventions, corrective action and response to complaints ***if different than AAA**** • Documentation of data collected and decision made regarding complaints, intervention and corrective actions for at least the last 12 months* • Documentation of one complete example of a charter school's school improvement plan or notices of interventions put in place by authorizer* • Documentation of authorizing standards and processes for interventions, corrective action and response to complaints that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards **Weight** 10%	See above indicator *and* Authorizer inconsistently implements standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months *or* One Level 1 indicator *or* Authorizer inconsistently implements standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action	Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months *and* Decisions made regarding complaints, intervention and corrective action is aligned with data generated under oversight and monitoring practices	a) Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years *and* 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	Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years *and* Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years *and* Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals

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
Charter School Support, Development and Technical Assistance	To what degree does the authorizer support its portfolio of charter schools through intentional assistance and development offerings?	• Continuous Improvement Measure	1. Authorizer Annual Report 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	Support and technical assistance is not available	Support and technical assistance is provided inconsistently *and/or* Only in response to problems	Support and technical assistance is proactive *and* Provided in a variety of areas and in a manner to preserve school autonomy	Level 2 *and* Support and technical assistance is regularly offered, based on demonstrated need and designed to prevent problems	Level 3 *and* 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
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence ***if different than authorizer annual report submissions**** • Documentation showing extent to which authorizer provided support and technical assistance, how the assistance addressed a need and/or helped prevent future problems • Documentation of how the support, development and technical assistance is designed to promote excellence **Weight** 5%	See above indicator	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months *or* One Level 1 indicator	Level 2 indicators were met within the last 12 months	a) Level 2 specification *and* b) Level 3 indicator within the last 12 months	Level 3 specifications *and* 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
High Quality Charter School Replication and Dissemination of Best School Practices	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?	• Continuous Improvement Measure	1. Authorizer Annual Report 2. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire	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 *and* Identified models/practices are moving toward replication/ dissemination	Level 3 *and* 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
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence ***if different than authorizer annual report submissions**** • Plan for promoting the model replication and dissemination of best practices of high performing charter schools • Documentation of models being replicated and practices being disseminated **Weight** 5%	See above indicator	See above indicator	Level 2 indicator was met within the last 12 months	Level 2 specification *and* One or more models/practices are moving toward replication/dissemination	Level 3 specifications *and* 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
Charter School Renewal or Termination Decisions	To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to make high stakes renewal and termination decisions? 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?	• MN Statutes §124E.05, Subd. 3(a)(5) • MN Statutes §§124E.10, Subd. 1(a)(13) and Subd. 1(a)(14) • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #5	1.Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 2. MDE Analysis of Renewal Contracts 3. MDE review of requests 4. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire 5. State Portfolio Performance Data 6. Authorizer Annual Report	Renewal standards and processes in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated *and* Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio *and* Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA	AAA does not have transparent and rigorous standards and processes designed to use comprehensive academic, financial, operational and student performance data to make merit-based renewal decisions and terminate charters when necessary to protect student and public interests *and/or* Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio *and/or* Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA	AAA has transparent and rigorous standards and processes designed to use comprehensive academic, financial, operational and student performance data to make merit-based renewal decisions and terminate charters when necessary to protect student and public interests *and* Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across its portfolio of charter schools *and* Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA	Level 2 *and* Authorizer's renewal standards and processes align with nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high-quality charter schools	Level 3 *and* School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question and renewals have resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools

B.9 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources • Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* • Documentation of authorizer's renewal standards and processes ***if different than AAA**** • An example of contract renewal review process and determination (from beginning to end)* • An example of contract termination decision, if applicable, including intervention processes (from beginning to end)* • Documentation of authorizing renewal and termination standards and processes that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards • Documentation of how the authorizer is promoting high quality charter schools **Weight** 20%	See above indicators	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months *or* One or two Level 1 indicators	Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months	a) Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last two years *and* b) For at least the last 12 months authorizer's renewal standards and processes reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools	Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years *and* Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years *and* Decisions resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools *and* Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals

Minnesota Department of Education

Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System (MAPES)

Review Process Summary

Cohort Two

July 2015

Contents

AUTHORIZER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM PROCESS 2
PURPOSE OF EVALUATION 2
COHORT TWO EVALUATION TIMELINE 3
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 3
MAPES OVERVIEW 3
PHASE ONE – WELCOME AND DATA COLLECTION 3
PHASE TWO – DATA REVIEW 4
PHASE THREE – FIELD WORK 4
PHASE FOUR – PERFORMANCE REPORTS 5
DATA PRACTICES ACT 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) was established to implement 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 charters 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 Statues, 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 TWO EVALUATION TIMELINE

Key Dates for Cohort Two Authorizers	*Dates
Welcome Meeting at MDE	July 15, 2015
MDE Distributes Charter School Leadership Surveys	August 3 , 2015
Authorizer Document Submissions Due to MDE	August 17, 2015
Charter School Leadership Surveys Due to MDE	August 24, 2015
Authorizer and School Meetings and Interviews	September 14 – October 9, 2015
Authorizer Review and Comment on Draft Performance Reports	November 18 – December 4, 2015
Final Performance Reports Issued to Authorizers	December 18, 2015
Final Performance Reports Disseminated and Published	January 2016

***MDE may adjust dates if necessary**

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 draft and finalize the performance report while working to ensure the evaluation timeline is followed.

Authorizer: The authorizer actively participates in the evaluation process which includes ensuring all requested documents are provided to MDE in a timely manner and working 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. The authorizer will have an opportunity to review and comment on the draft performance report before it is finalized. Please note, the interview serves as a verification/validation process of the indicators and specifications of an authorizer's MAPES document submission and is not stand-alone evidence.

School: Key school leadership personnel will assist in the authorizer performance evaluation by completing the charter school leadership survey and will be asked to participate in a focus group.

MAPES OVERVIEW

PHASE ONE – WELCOME AND DATA COLLECTION

Welcome Meeting

The Welcome Meeting on **July 15, 2015** 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 MAPES performance measures, (**Important: do not submit non-public data**). Authorizers may submit other documentation not included on the list if they feel it specifically 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. Please ensure narrative references to AAA and authorizer annual report are specific to include page numbers. MDE must receive the USB drive by **August 17, 2015**; carefully read the Addendum for detailed guidance. Any corrections to documents submitted for MAPES must be received no later than one week following the authorizer interview.

Charter School Leadership Surveys

Surveys are completed by key school leadership personnel for each LEA in an authorizer's portfolio of charter schools. Surveys are disseminated directly to charter school leaders on **August 3, 2015**. All surveys must be submitted to MDE by **August 24, 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; MDE review data; 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 **September 14 – October 9, 2015** but may be scheduled at other times during the evaluation process if needed. During this time, MDE/evaluator will conduct interviews with authorizer representatives and focus group meetings (in person and/or via conference call) with school stakeholders to clarify authorizer performance and review data submitted to MDE. Please note the interview serves as a verification/validation process of the indicators and specifications of an authorizer's MAPES document submission and is not stand-alone evidence.

PHASE FOUR – PERFORMANCE REPORTS

MDE Draft Performance Reports

MDE expects to disseminate draft performance reports to authorizers by **November 18, 2015**.

Authorizer Review and Comment on Draft Performance Reports

In the interest of producing as accurate a report as possible, MDE offers authorizers an opportunity to review the draft and submit any errors of a factual nature that may be found. While it is not possible for authorizers to submit *additional* documentation during the review and comment, authorizers are encouraged to review draft report ratings, findings and key evidence and submit a response identifying and explaining any errors. This might include information you believe is not accurately reflected in the report, information you believe you submitted that addresses a measure, or information you believe misaligns with performance measures or with one or more data sources used in the evaluation. Authorizers will have two weeks after they receive the draft report to review and comment on the draft performance report.

MDE Finalize Reports for Publication and Dissemination

Final performance reports will be issued to authorizers by the end of December 2015. MDE will disseminate the performance report to the authorizer's portfolio of charter schools and publish the finalized performance reports under each authorizer's performance profile page on MDE's website in January 2016.

DATA PRACTICES ACT

Please note all information utilized and produced for MAPES will be maintained at MDE and by the external evaluator and will be subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13. **Please do not submit non-public data.**

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 their *Commissioner Approved Authorizing Plans* (CAAP) to MDE.

Authorizers receiving an overall rating of "*Unsatisfactory"* or *"Approaching Unsatisfactory"* are ineligible to submit their CAAP and will be placed in corrective action status. Authorizers 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. Authorizers will have up to one year to satisfactorily address all performance measures in order to be eligible to submit their CAAP.

An authorizer's corrective action status will be assessed on a case by case basis, depending on the nature and scope of deficiencies. An 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 Statues, 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. **Important: do not submit non-public data.** Authorizers may submit additional documentation not included on the list if they feel it specifically addresses a performance measure. The documents are to be submitted to MDE via a USB drive provided at the Welcome Meeting. Please note, this information will be maintained at MDE and provided in response to public data requests.

The documents with an * are required to receive at least a "*Satisfactory"* rating. The other documents address "*Commendable"* and "*Exemplary"* ratings for 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.

- MAPES document request is an opportunity for authorizers to explain and provide evidence on how their organization at least satisfactorily addresses each measure. Authorizer narratives should be comprehensive, concise and specific to each performance measure. The documents submitted for MAPES should minimally exemplify achievement of level 2 indicators and specifications. Please note that submitting evidence for level 3 and level 4 indicators and specifications does not mean the authorizer has met level 2 indicators and specifications. The narrative should clearly reference and explain how the submitted documents address each performance measure level rating. Be sure to include documents to support both establishment and implementation when appropriate.

- 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 multiple 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. However, please reference specific page number(s)/sections in the narrative when referencing your AAA on file at MDE.

- 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. However, please indicate specific page number(s)/part in the narrative when referencing your authorizer annual report.

Submission Instructions:

MDE must receive all USB drives on **August 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 **August 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 within the last 12 months, date of professional development, who attended, how the professional development addressed a needed skill base for authorizing leadership and staff and how the professional development aligns with operations, vision and goals for the portfolio of schools*
- ☐ If not included in the resume submitted for A.4: conference or workshop certificates of completion or participation; etc. for authorizing staff

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 within the last 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 within the 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 aligns 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 corrective actions for at least the last 12 months*
- ☐ Documentation of one complete example of a charter school's school improvement plan or notices of interventions put in place by authorizer*
- ☐ Documentation of authorizing standards and processes for interventions, corrective action and response to complaints that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards

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 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 model replication and dissemination of best practices of high performing charter schools
- ☐ Documentation of models being replicated and practices being 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 Department of Education

Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System
Ratings and Outcomes

Exemplary **Overall Rating 3.8-4.0**	• *"Exemplary"* authorizer performance recognition • Expedited authorizing plans for the next five years • Expedited review and approval of affidavits and other requests from MDE • Eligible to be identified for authorizer best practice • Must receive at least *Level 3 – "Commendable"* on all performance measures in order to receive this rating
Commendable **Overall Rating 3.0-3.79**	• *"Commendable"* authorizer performance recognition • Eligible to submit authorizing plans for the next five years • Eligible to be identified for authorizer best practice • Must receive at least *Level 2 – "Satisfactory"* on all performance measures in order to receive this rating
Satisfactory **Overall Rating 2.0-2.99**	• Eligible to submit authorizing plans for the next five years • Thoroughly addresses identified deficiencies in authorizing plans for the next five years • Must receive an overall performance rating of at least 2.0 in order to receive this rating
Approaching Satisfactory **Overall Rating 1.0-1.99** **or** **Unsatisfactory/Incomplete** **Overall Rating 0-0.99**	• Ineligible to submit authorizing plans for the next five years • May be subject to corrective action status* • Does not have authority to charter new schools, accept transfers or initiate expansion requests until an overall performance rating of *"Satisfactory"* is attained

***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 Statues, section 124E.05 Subdivision 6

Minnesota Department of Education

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. 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.

Please contact the Charter Center if you have any questions regarding your participation in this survey. Email mde.charterschools@state.mn.us or by phone 651.582.8297.

Surveys are due to MDE by 11:59 p.m. Central Standard Time on Tuesday, August 25, 2015.

---

1. Name of Individual(s) Completing this Survey
2. Title of Individual(s) Completing this Survey
3. Name of Charter School
4. Number of Years in Position
5. Email Address
6. Phone Number
7. Our school's authorizer is:
    - Audubon Center of the North Woods
    - Chisago Lakes School District
    - Innovative Quality Schools
    - Northfield Public School District
    - Ordway Center for Performing Arts
    - Pillsbury United Communities
    - University of St. Thomas

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

8. I am aware of and knowledgeable about the authorizer's mission. (A.1)
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree
9. Give examples of how the authorizer's mission was made known to you (A.1)

MAPES Measure	A.3 Authorizer Structure of Operations
Guiding Question	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?

10. The structure of duties and responsibilities of the authorizer is clear and at a level adequate to meet the needs of the school (A.3)
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree
11. Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).
12. The staffing level of the authorizer is clearly sufficient to meet the needs of the school.
    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree
13. Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).

MAPES Measure	A.7 Authorizer Operational Conflicts of Interest
Guiding Question	To what degree does the authorizer implement a clear policy to address conflicts of interest in all decision making processes concerning the portfolio of charter schools?

14. Explain how the authorizer implements a clear policy to address conflicts of interest in all decision making processes concerning the school (limit one paragraph).
15. Have you experienced any conflict of interest with the authorizer?

- o Yes
- o No

16. If yes, please explain the conflict and how it was resolved (limit one paragraph).

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

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

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

    - o Yes
    - o No

19. If yes, please explain the situation and how it was resolved (limit one paragraph).

20. Are you a representative of a new school approved by the authorizer within the last three years?

    - o Yes
    - o No
    - o Yes, but I was not involved in the new school application process

MAPES Measure	B.1 New Charter School Decisions
Guiding Questions	To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals? To what degree did the authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align to its stated approval and process standards and promote the growth of high quality charter schools?

MAPES Measure	B.2 Interim Accountability Decisions (*e.g. site/grade level expansions, ready to open and change in authorizer)*
Guiding Questions:	To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate proposals of existing charter school expansion requests and other interim changes? To what degree 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?

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

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

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

    - Yes
    - No
    - Unknown

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

25. Has your school applied for a grade and/or site expansion in the last three years?

    - Yes
    - No
    - Unknown

MAPES Measure	B.1 New Charter School Decisions
Guiding Questions	To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals? To what degree did the authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align to its stated approval and process standards and promote the growth of high quality charter schools?

MAPES Measure	B.2 Interim Accountability Decisions (*e.g. site/grade level expansions, ready to open and change in authorizer)*
Guiding Question	To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate proposals of existing charter school expansion requests and other interim changes? To what degree 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?

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

    - Site Expansion
    - Grade Level Expansion
    - Both a Site Expansion and Grade Level Expansion
    - Unknown

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

    - Yes

- o No
- o Unknown

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

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

MAPES Measure	B.2 Interim Accountability Decisions (*e.g. site/grade level expansions, ready to open and change in authorizer)*
Guiding Questions	To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate proposals of existing charter school expansion requests and other interim changes? To what degree 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?

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

- o Yes
- o No
- o Unknown

31. If yes, what was the reason for the change in authorizer?

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

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

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

- o Strongly Agree
- o Agree
- o Disagree
- o Strongly Disagree

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

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

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

- o Yes

- No
- I was not a part of the contracting process

37. If yes, which terms of the contract were negotiated (limit one paragraph).

38. Why were those terms negotiated (limit one paragraph)

39. Were you satisfied with the results of the negotiation?

    - Yes
    - No
    - I was not a part of the contracting process

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

40. The contract has clear, measurable and attainable performance standards.

    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

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

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

MAPES Measure	B.5 Authorizer's Processes for Ongoing Oversight of the Portfolio of Charter Schools
Guiding Question	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?

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

    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

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

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

- o Strongly Agree
- o Agree
- o Disagree
- o Strongly Disagree

46. Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).
47. The authorizer monitors and oversees the school's financial performance as outlined in the charter contract.
    - o Strongly Agree
    - o Agree
    - o Disagree
    - o Strongly Disagree
48. Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).
49. 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.
    - o Strongly Agree
    - o Agree
    - o Disagree
    - o Strongly Disagree
50. Please provide a brief description explaining your rating (limit one paragraph).

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

51. Has the authorizer placed the school on any of the following:
    - o Intervention
    - o Corrective Action
    - o Both Intervention and Corrective Action
    - o None of the above
    - o Unknown

52. 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).

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

    - Yes
    - No
    - Unknown

MAPES Measure	B.9 Charter School Renewal or Termination Decisions
Guiding Questions	To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to make high stakes renewal and termination decisions? To what degree 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?

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

    - Yes
    - No

55. If yes, explain the authorizer's process to determine contract renewal and contract term (limit one paragraph).

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

    - Strongly Agree
    - Agree
    - Disagree
    - Strongly Disagree

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