

Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System (MAPES)

Measures, Indicators and Specifications

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

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

SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZER PERFORMANCE MEASURES

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

Authorizer Mission and Vision

A.1: Authorizer Mission (5%)

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

Authorizer Capacity and Infrastructure

A.3: Authorizer Structure of Operations (15%)

A.4: Authorizer Staff Expertise (10%)*

A.5: Authorizer Capacity and Skill Development of Leadership and Authorizing Staff (5%)*

A.6: Authorizer Operational Budget for Authorizing the Portfolio of Charter Schools (10%)

A.7: Authorizer Operational Conflicts of Interest (10%)

A.8: Ensuring Autonomy of the Schools in the Portfolio (15%)

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

A.10: Authorizer High Quality Authorizing Dissemination (5%)*

A.11: Authorizer Compliance to Responsibilities Stated in Statute (10%)

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

Authorizer Process and Decision-making

B.1: New Charter School Decisions (20% / 5%)**

B.2: Interim Accountability Decisions (10% / 5%)**

Authorizer Performance Contracting

B.3: Contract Term, Negotiation, and Execution (10%)

B.4: Performance Standards (10%)

Authorizer Ongoing Oversight and Evaluation

B.5: Authorizer's Processes for Ongoing Oversight of the Portfolio of Charter Schools (10%)

B.6: Authorizer's Standards and Processes for Interventions, Corrective Action and Response to Complaints (10%)*

B.7: Charter School Support, Development and Technical Assistance (5%)*

B.8: High Quality Charter School Replication and Dissemination of Best School Practices (5%)*

Authorizer Renewal and Decision-Making

B.9: Charter School Renewal or Termination Decision (20%)

*Continuous Improvement Measure

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

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

Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System Measures, Indicators and Specifications Overview

The Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System (MAPES) was established to review authorizers' performance per Minnesota Statutes, section 124D.10, Subdivision 3(h), 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 124D.10 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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MN Statute §124D.10, Subd. 3 (d)(1) MN Authorizer Application Standards NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 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 <i>and</i> Mission is verified internally in practice and documentation at authorizing organization	Level 3 <i>and</i> Mission is verified by external references (such as school board validation)

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

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

A.2 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MN Statute §124D.10, Subd. 1(a) MN Authorizer Application Standards NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 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 <i>and</i> Vision has clear organizational goals, criteria and timeframes for achievement <i>and</i> Authorizer is actively measuring and achieving most goals	Level 3 <i>and</i> Authorizer is actively engaged in measuring and is achieving or exceeding goals established

A.2 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <i>and/or</i> Organizational goals are not clearly related to charter school authorizing	Authorizer implements vision from AAA <i>and</i> Authorizer organizational goals aligns with chartering vision and statutory purpose(s)	Level 2 specifications <i>and</i> See above indicator	Level 3 specifications <i>and</i> Authorizer evaluates its work regularly against its chartering vision and organizational goals, and implemented plans for improvement when falling short of its mission and strategic plan

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

A.3 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MN Statute §124D.10, Subd. 3 (d)(2) MN Authorizer Application Standards NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 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 <i>and</i> Structure of duties and, and responsibilities is verified internally at authorizing organization <i>and</i> Staffing level is clearly sufficient to meet the needs of the portfolio	Level 3 <i>and</i> Clear structure of duties and responsibilities are updated when necessary <i>and</i> Authorizer practices are verified externally (such as school board validation)

A.3 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p>Specific Data Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.) <i>if different than AAA*</i> 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* <p>Weight 15%</p>	See above indicator	Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months <i>or</i> One or more specifications described in Level 2 are only partially met	The following specifications were met for at least the last 12 months: Sufficient resources to meet the needs of the portfolio of schools <i>and</i> If applicable, changes were made to the organizational structure when necessary <i>and</i> Authorizer appropriately manages and safeguards school, student information, and records relating to authorizing	a) Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years <i>and</i> b) Structure of duties, responsibilities and staffing levels are consistently verified internally at authorizing organization for interviewed individuals	Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years <i>and</i> Level 3 specification b) <i>and</i> Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals

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

A.4 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MN Statute §124D.10, Subd. 3 (d)(2) MN Authorizer Application Standards NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards Continuous Improvement Measure 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 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
<p>Definitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>Specific Data Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>Weight 10%</p>	See above indicator	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>See above indicator</p>	Level 2 indicator was met for at least the last 12 months	<p>a) Level 2 indicator was met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>b) For at least the last 12 months authorizing staff has diverse experience, expertise and/or skills: diverse is defined as a team of authorizing staff having experience, expertise, and/or specialists with advanced skills and expertise in one or multiple areas above</p>	<p>Level 2 indicator was met for at least the last three years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 specification b)</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>For at least the last 12 months authorizing staff are credentialed</p>

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

A.5 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NACSA Standard #1 – Advanced Standards Continuous Improvement Measure 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Authorizer Annual Report 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 <i>and</i> Aligns with its operations, vision and goals for the portfolio of schools	Level 2 <i>and</i> Professional development is offered regularly to authorizing leadership and staff	Professional development is offered regularly to authorizing leadership and staff, is differentiated, and aligns with operations, vision and goals for the portfolio of schools <i>and</i> Outcomes of professional development are measured and evaluated

A.5 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p>Specific Data Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence <i>if different from FY 2014 authorizer annual report submission*</i> 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 <p>Weight 5%</p>	See above indicator	Professional development is only incident specific <i>and/or</i> Professional Development misaligns with authorizer mission and vision	Within the last 12 months professional development was intentional and planned to build the skill base of the authorizing leadership and staff	Level 2 specification <i>and</i> Professional development is regular, ongoing, and more than once a year	Level 3 specifications <i>and</i> Within the last 12 months professional development is measured, evaluated and customized to meet the needs of the authorizing leadership and staff

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

A.6 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MN Statute §124D.10, Subd. 3(c)(1) and (d)(2) MN Authorizer Application Standards NACSA Standard #1 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) Income and Expenditures Report Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire 	<p>Resource allocations for authorizing fall short of resources committed in its AAA</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Resource allocations are insufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities</p>	<p>Resource allocations for authorizing fall short of resources committed in its AAA</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Resource allocations are insufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Resource allocations are devoted to achieve nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Resource allocations have resulted in attainment of nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing</p>

A.6 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p>Definitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Income: Examples include fees collected annually from charter schools and additional funds from outside sources Expenditures: Examples include staff, travel, consultants and office costs <p>Specific Data Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>Weight 10%</p>	See above indicator	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>One Level 1 indicator</p>	<p>For at least the last 12 months the following were met:</p> <p>Level 2 indicator</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>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)</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Resource allocation aligns with or exceeds its AAA</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer staff changes occurred in relation to portfolio growth</p>	<p>a) Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>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</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications were met for at least three years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 specification b)</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Resource allocations have resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards</p>

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

A.7 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MN Authorizer Application Standards NACSA Principle III 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 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 <i>and</i> Implementation of policy has successfully prevented or resolved conflicts of interest in a timely, fair and appropriate manner	Level 3 <i>and</i> School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question

A.7 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p>Specific Data Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence* Current authorizer conflict of interest policy <i>if different from AAA*</i> 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* <p>Weight 10%</p>	<p>Numerous conflicts exist between the authorizer and its charter schools (e.g. staff and board may overlap, authorizer may require school to purchase services from authorizer, funds may be comingled, etc.)</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Schools are offered incentives by the authorizer (e.g. may only contract with an authorized for various services)</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions are improperly influenced by a management company or the school board</p>	<p>Authorizer does not follow its conflict of interest policy as outlined in its AAA</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Decision making is not transparent and/or it is unclear what criteria are used by the authorizer to make decisions</p>	<p>Authorizer avoids conflicts of interest that might affect its capacity to make objective, merit-based application and renewal decisions (e.g. involvement in school's performance)</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer is able to provide at least one fully documented example of how they have successfully implemented their conflict of interest policy</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Ensures that the application-review and decision making processes are free of conflicts of interest, and requires full disclosure of any potential or perceived conflicts of interest between reviewers or decision makers and applicants</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>If MDE inquires about a specific example, authorizer is able to provide evidence concerning the situation that demonstrates satisfactory resolution</p>	<p>Level 3 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>The implementation and effectiveness of the authorizer's conflict of interest policy is verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals</p>

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

A.8 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MN Statute §124D.10, Subd. 7 MN Authorizer Application Standards NACSA Principle II NACSA Standard #4 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire 	<p>Authorizer policy for ensuring autonomy is missing or vague</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>In practice there is confusion regarding appropriate levels of autonomy with the schools in the portfolio</p>	<p>Authorizer policy for ensuring autonomy exists but is vague</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>In practice there is confusion regarding appropriate levels of autonomy with the schools in the portfolio</p>	<p>Authorizer has a clear policy to ensure school autonomy</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's practices align with its stated policy to uphold school autonomy</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's policy aligns with nationally recognized principles and standards for quality authorizing</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question</p>

A.8 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p>Specific Data Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>Weight 15%</p>	<p>Authorizer policy is missing or does not clearly relate to charter school authorizing or misaligns with Minnesota charter school law</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer is overly involved in the processes and operations of the school's authority over academic, operational and financial needs</p>	<p>Authorizer policy does not clearly relate to charter school authorizing or misaligns with Minnesota charter school law</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Authorizer is overly involved in the processes and operations of the school's authority over academic, operational and financial needs</p>	<p>Authorizer's autonomy policy aligns with state statute</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's policy on school autonomy establishes and recognizes the school's authority over academic, operational and financial needs and respects the school's authority over the schools day-to-day operations</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Practice aligns with policy; authorizer holds charter schools accountable for outcomes rather than on processes and operations</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>See above indicator</p>	<p>Level 3 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's policy and practices to ensure school's autonomy is verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals</p>

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

A.9 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NACSA Standard #1 Continuous Improvement Measure 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Authorizer Annual Report 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 <i>and</i> Authorizer reviews its internal practices against its chartering mission, vision and organizational goals <i>and</i> Authorizer develops continuous improvement plans to address findings of self-evaluation	Level 3 <i>and</i> Implementation of continuous improvement plans have resulted in more effective authorizing practices, one or more of which may be externally recognized such as by MDE, NACSA, and/or another organization

A.9 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence <i>if different from FY 2014 authorizer annual report submission*</i> 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 <i>and</i> Within the last 12 months the following were met: a) Authorizer addresses any needs for improvement when not meeting its mission, organizational goals or strategic plan <i>and</i> b) Authorizer implements continuous improvement plans and documents its internal reviews	Level 3 specifications <i>and</i> Within the last 12 months authorizer evaluates its work regularly against national standards for quality authorizing and recognized effective practices, and develops and implements timely plans for improvement when needed

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

A.10 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Authorizer High Quality Authorizing Dissemination	To what degree does the authorizer disseminate best authorizing practices and/or assist other authorizers in high quality authorizing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <i>and</i> Authorizer reaches out to other authorizers to offer support and guidance
A.10 SPECIFICATIONS				LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Specific Data Sources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <i>if different from FY 2014 authorizer annual report submission*</i> 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 <i>and</i> b) Level 3 indicator was met within the last 12 months	Level 3 specifications <i>and</i> Within the last 12 months best practices are sought out by other authorizers

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

A.11 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Authorizer Compliance to Responsibilities Stated in Statute	To what degree does the authorizer comply with reporting, submissions, and deadlines set forth in Minnesota Statute?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MN Statute §124D.10 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<p>New Charter School Decisions</p>	<p>To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals?</p> <p>To what degree did the authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align to its stated approval and process standards and promote the growth of high quality charter schools?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MN Statute §124D.10, Subd. 3(d)(3) • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #2 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) 2. MDE records and/or review of requests 3. Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire 	<p>Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</p>	<p>Authorizer's application process is not comprehensive; does not include clear application questions and guidance; or does not include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</p>	<p>Authorizer's application process is comprehensive; includes clear application questions and guidance; and includes fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's application process has resulted in attainment of nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question and approvals have resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</p>

B.1 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p>Authorizers actively reviewing new charter school applications</p> <p>Specific Data Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) <i>if different than AAA*</i> 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 <p>Weight 20%</p>	<p>See above indicator</p> <p>and</p> <p>Decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent with its criteria as stated in its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p>or</p> <p>One or two Level 1 indicators</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months</p>	<p>a) Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last two years</p> <p>and</p> <p>b) Authorizer's new charter school application process has resulted in recognition of national quality authorizing standards</p> <p>and</p> <p>c) For at least the last 12 months the application process reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years</p> <p>and</p> <p>Level 3 specification b)</p> <p>and</p> <p>Level 3 specification c) have been met for at least the last two years</p> <p>and</p> <p>Authorizer's new charter school application standards and processes are verified externally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals</p> <p>and</p> <p>Decisions resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</p>
<p>Authorizers not reviewing new charter school applications</p> <p>Specific Data Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) <i>if different than AAA*</i> <p>Weight 5%</p>	<p>Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated</p> <p>and</p> <p>Authorizer's AAA indicated they would run a process for seeking new charter schools and they have not followed their AAA</p>	<p>Authorizer's application process is not comprehensive; does not include clear application questions and guidance; or does not include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria</p> <p>or</p> <p>Authorizer's AAA indicated they would run a process for seeking new charter schools and they have not followed their AAA</p>	<p>Authorizer's application process is comprehensive; includes clear application questions and guidance; and includes fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria</p> <p>and</p> <p>Authorizer's actions are aligned with plans presented in the AAA</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>

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

B.2 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p>Interim Accountability Decisions (e.g. site/grade level expansions, ready to open and change in authorizer)</p>	<p>To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate proposals of existing charter school expansion requests and other interim changes?</p> <p>To what degree do the authorizer's decisions and resulting actions regarding charter school expansion and other interim changes align to its stated approval and process standards and promote the growth of high-quality charter schools?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MN Statute §124D.10, Subd. 3 (d) (6), Subd. 4(j), Subd. 17a, and Subd. 23(c) • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #2 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>Approval criteria and process standards in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</p>	<p>The authorizer's application processes are not comprehensive; do not include clear application questions and guidance; or do not include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</p>	<p>Authorizer's application processes are comprehensive; include clear application questions and guidance; and include fair, transparent procedures and rigorous criteria</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's application processes have resulted in attainment of nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question and approvals have resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</p>

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

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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MN Statute §124D.10 Subdivision 6 MN Authorizer Application Standards NACSA Standard #3 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> MDE Analysis of New and Renewal Contracts Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire 	<p>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory requirements</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Contracts in its portfolio do not clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's contracting practices are inconsistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools</p>	<p>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory requirements</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Contracts do not clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's contracting practices are inconsistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools</p>	<p>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools meet current statutory requirements</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Contracts clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's contracting practices are consistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer clearly defines the role of the school and the authorizer, and executes contract amendments for material changes to current school plans when applicable</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question</p>

B.3 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p>Specific Data Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) <p>Weight 10%</p>	See above indicator	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>One or two Level 1 indicators</p>	<p>The following were met for at least the last twelve months:</p> <p>Level 2 indicators</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Contracts were executed no later than the first day of the renewal period</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Contracts were submitted to MDE within 10 business days of the first day of the renewal period</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 indicator</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 indicator</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals</p>

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

B.4 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
Performance Standards	To what degree does the authorizer execute contracts with clear, measurable and attainable performance standards?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MN Statute §124D.10 Subdivision 6 and 10 MN Authorizer Application Standards NACSA Standard #3 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> MDE Analysis of New and Renewal Contracts beginning in 2014 Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire 	<p>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory performance standards</p> <p>and</p> <p>Contracts misalign with the performance standards of its AAA</p>	<p>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools do not meet current statutory performance standards</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Authorizer's performance standards are inconsistent across authorizer's portfolio of charter schools</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Contracts misalign with the performance standards of its AAA</p>	<p>Contracts in authorizer's portfolio of charter schools meet current statutory performance standards</p> <p>and</p> <p>Contracts define clear, measurable and attainable academic, financial and organizational performance standards, and consequences for meeting or not meeting performance standards</p> <p>and</p> <p>Contracts align with the performance standards of its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p>and</p> <p>Authorizer executes contracts that align with nationally recognized quality performance standards and designed to promote high-quality charter school</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p>and</p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer response to guiding question</p>

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

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

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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MN Statute §124D.10, Subd. 3(d)(5) and Subd. 6(7) MN Authorizer Application Standards NACSA Standard #4 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) Authorizer Annual Report Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire State Portfolio Performance Data 	<p>Oversight processes in the AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated</p> <p>and</p> <p>Authorizer's oversight and monitoring activities misalign with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA</p>	<p>AAA does not include clear processes for oversight and monitoring</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Authorizer's oversight activities misalign with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA</p>	<p>AAA includes clear processes for oversight and monitoring</p> <p>and</p> <p>Authorizer conducts contract oversight that competently evaluates performance and monitors compliance; ensures charter schools' legally entitled autonomy; protects student rights; and informs intervention, termination, and renewal decisions</p> <p>and</p> <p>Authorizer's oversight activities align with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p>and</p> <p>Authorizer's oversight processes align with nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high-quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p>and</p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer response to guiding question and oversight has resulted in the promotion of high quality charter schools</p>

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

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

B.6 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NACSA Standard #4 MN Authorizer Application Standards Continuous Improvement Measure 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Most Recently Approved Authorizer Application (AAA) Authorizer Annual Report Interview, Site Visits, Questionnaire State Portfolio Performance Data 	<p>Authorizer's standards and processes are incompletely or insufficiently stated in its AAA</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's standards and processes for complaints, intervention and corrective action misalign with its stated standards and processes in its AAA</p>	<p>AAA does not include clear standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's standards and processes for complaints, intervention and corrective action misalign with its stated standards and processes in its AAA</p>	<p>AAA includes clear standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer consistently implements clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio and align with its stated standards and processes in its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's standards and processes align with nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer response to guiding question</p>

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

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

B.7 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuous Improvement Measure 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Authorizer Annual Report 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
<p>Specific Data Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence <i>if different from FY 2014 authorizer annual report submission</i> 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 <p>Weight 5%</p>	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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuous Improvement Measure 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Authorizer Annual Report 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 <i>and</i> Identified models/practices are moving toward replication/dissemination	Level 3 <i>and</i> Identified models/practices have been replicated/disseminated

B.8 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p>Specific Data Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence <i>if different from FY 2014 authorizer annual report submission*</i> 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 <p>Weight 5%</p>	See above indicator	See above indicator	Level 2 indicator was met within the last 12 months	Level 2 specification <i>and</i> One or more models/practices are moving toward replication/dissemination	Level 3 specifications <i>and</i> One or more models/practices have been realized

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

B.9 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	EVALUATION DATA SOURCE	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p>Charter School Renewal or Termination Decisions</p>	<p>To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to make high stakes renewal and termination decisions?</p> <p>To what degree do the authorizer's renewal and termination decisions align to its stated renewal standards and processes and promote the growth of high-quality charter schools?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MN Statute §124D.10, Subd. 3(c)(5), Subd. 3(d)(7), Subd. 6(13), and Subd. 6(14) • MN Authorizer Application Standards • NACSA Standard #5 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>Renewal standards and processes in its AAA are incompletely or insufficiently stated</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</p>	<p>AAA does not have transparent and rigorous standards and processes designed to use comprehensive academic, financial, operational and student performance data to make merit-based renewal decisions and terminate charters when necessary to protect student and public interests</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio</p> <p><i>and/or</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions misalign with its AAA</p>	<p>AAA has transparent and rigorous standards and processes designed to use comprehensive academic, financial, operational and student performance data to make merit-based renewal decisions and terminate charters when necessary to protect student and public interests</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across its portfolio of charter schools</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align with its AAA</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer's renewal standards and processes align with nationally recognized quality standards for authorizing and designed to promote high-quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 3</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School representatives verify authorizer's response to guiding question and renewals have resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</p>

B.9 SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Approaching Satisfactory	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Commendable	LEVEL 4 Exemplary
<p>Specific Data Sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>Weight 20%</p>	See above indicators	<p>Level 2 indicators were met, but have only been established and/or implemented within the last 12 months</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>One or two Level 1 indicators</p>	Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last 12 months	<p>a) Level 2 indicators were met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>b) For at least the last 12 months authorizer’s renewal standards and processes reflects a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools</p>	<p>Level 2 indicators were met for at least three years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 specification b) have been met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Decisions resulted in the promotion of high-quality charter schools</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally from interviewed individuals</p>