

# Hawaii Authorizer Performance Evaluation System

## Overview

The Board of Education (“Board”) established the Hawaii Authorizer Performance Evaluation System (“HAPES”) to review the performance of charter school authorizers pursuant to Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”) Section 302D-11 and Hawaii Administrative Rules (“HAR”) Section 8-515-10.

The objectives of HAPES are to:

- Set clear performance expectations between authorizers and the Board;
- Ensure authorizer accountability through an assessment of authorizer effectiveness in carrying out their duties in a manner consistent with Board Policy [redacted] and the spirit and intent of HRS Chapter 302D; and
- Promote high-quality charter schools and authorizing excellence.

HAPES evaluates authorizers against:

- The National Association of Charter School Authorizers’ (“NACSA”) *Principles & Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing, 2018 Edition*, as applicable to local conditions;
- Their compliance with state laws, Board policies, their authorizing contracts, and existing charter contracts, as applicable; and
- How they applied their established standards and processes with fidelity across their portfolios of charter schools.

## PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS

A general timeline of the main process activities is below. Exact dates and deadlines are subject to Board Chairperson approval. The timeline below is based on a regular performance evaluation that is conducted periodically for authorizing contract renewal purposes. The timeline and process for a special review, pursuant to HRS Section 302D-11(c) and HAR Section 8-515-12, could be significantly different and is subject to Board approval.

Approximate Date	Activity
Mid-May	Board notifies authorizer that performance evaluation will be conducted
Mid-August	Authorizer submits Performance Evaluation Response Form and attachments
Mid to Late August	Window for Evaluation Team’s initial review
Early September	Evaluation Team interviews authorizer representatives
Early to Mid-September	Evaluation Team surveys and/or interviews representatives from charter schools within authorizer’s portfolio
Mid-September	Evaluation Team holds a public forum to allow public input on authorizer
Early October	Evaluation Team provides authorizer with draft performance evaluation report
Mid-October	Authorizer submits written comments on draft performance evaluation report
Late October	Final draft of performance evaluation report posted
Early November	Student Achievement Committee meeting on performance evaluation
Early November	Board General Business Meeting on performance evaluation

Early November	Board issues performance evaluation report
Early December	Authorizer submits renewal application
Early February	Board decides on authorizing contract renewal
Mid-February	Board issues its decision in writing

Key components of the performance evaluation process are described below:

Performance Evaluation Response Form: The Performance Evaluation Response Form is the form the authorizer uses to address the guiding questions for each performance measure and provide the necessary documentation and evidence demonstrating its level of performance. The Board Chairperson has the authority to establish and amend the form, as necessary, to implement HAPES. The authorizer is required to submit a completed Performance Evaluation Response Form and appropriate attached documentation to the Board by the date and time set by the Board Chairperson in the notification letter. Any missing or incomplete information will result in negative findings for the respective performance measures.

Authorizer interview(s): The Evaluation Team will interview representatives from the authorizer, either in groups or as individuals, as determined by the Evaluation Team. The interview(s) may clarify information provided in the Performance Evaluation Response Form, gather additional information, and/or internally verify the authorizer’s representations of its performance.

Charter school survey(s) and/or interview(s): The Evaluation Team may survey and/or interview representatives from the authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools, typically for external verification of the authorizer’s representations of its performance. The need for and scope of such surveys and/or interviews are determined by the Evaluation Team.

Public forum: The Evaluation Team will hold a public forum to afford members of the public an opportunity to comment on the performance of the authorizer.

Performance evaluation report: The performance evaluation report is the final report that details the findings, scores, and ratings of the performance evaluation. The performance evaluation report can serve as the performance report for renewal purposes, in accordance with HAR Sections 8-515-11(d) and 8-515-16. In this event, the final rating from the performance evaluation report determines the contract term length for the renewed authorizing contract and other possible outcomes, such as corrective actions for deficiencies or nonrenewal of the authorizing contract.

If the Board uses HAPES for a special review outside of the regular performance evaluation, the performance evaluation report can serve as the notice of noncompliance pursuant to HAR Sections 8-515-11(d) and 8-515-13.

Student Achievement Committee meeting: The Board’s Student Achievement Committee will consider the final draft of the performance evaluation report presented by the Evaluation Team. The Committee will make a recommendation to the full Board to adopt the performance evaluation report as presented or with amendments.

Board General Business Meeting: The Board will decide whether to adopt, amend, or remand the performance evaluation report recommended by the Student Achievement Committee.

## **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

Board: In adopting HAPES, the Board authorizes an Evaluation Team, as selected by the Board Chairperson, to conduct each regular authorizer performance evaluation. The Board Chairperson is responsible for setting the performance evaluation timeline and selecting an Evaluation Team in accordance with HAPES and in consultation with the Student Achievement Committee Chairperson. The Board has final authority to adopt, amend, or remand the performance evaluation report, and the Board issues the final report to the authorizer.

Student Achievement Committee: The Student Achievement Committee reviews the performance evaluation report drafted by the Evaluation Team and recommends adoption, either with or without amendments, to the Board.

Evaluation Team: The Evaluation Team conducts the performance evaluation of the authorizer in accordance with HAPES, including reviewing the Performance Evaluation Response Form, interviewing authorizer representatives, surveying and/or interviewing charter school representatives, and holding a public forum. After carefully reviewing all available information about the authorizer in conjunction with the HAPES performance measures, indicators, and specifications (described later in this document), the Evaluation Team is responsible for writing an initial draft performance evaluation report, providing the draft report to the authorizer for review and comment, and presenting the final draft of the report to the Student Achievement Committee.

The Evaluation Team is selected by the Board Chairperson, in consultation with the Student Achievement Committee Chairperson, and must have at least three members, but no more than five, that meet the following specifications:

- At least one evaluator, but no more than two, must be a Board Member;
- At least one evaluator must be a non-Board Member expert;
- At least one evaluator must have charter school authorizing expertise;
- At least one evaluator must have expertise in finance, accounting, or a related field; and
- While not required, it is desirable for at least one evaluator to have human resources, legal, and/or public administration expertise.

Authorizer: The authorizer is responsible for fully cooperating with the Board and Evaluation Team throughout the performance evaluation process, including submitting a completed Performance Evaluation Response Form and relevant attachments by the deadline, participating in interviews, and providing any supplemental information as requested by the Evaluation Team. The authorizer also provides contact information for identified school representatives that the Evaluation Team may be interested in contacting. The authorizer will have an opportunity to review and comment on the draft performance evaluation report before it is finalized.

Charter Schools: Key school leadership representatives assist the Evaluation Team by completing surveys, providing information, and/or participating in interviews as requested. School representatives may be asked to participate in school site visits and/or other key meetings during the performance evaluation process.

## **MEASURES, INDICATORS, AND SPECIFICATIONS**

There are two elements to each measure: *Performance Measure* and *Specifications*. These elements set clear expectations of performance levels for measures and 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 the source or authority from which the measure originates. These sources are used as reference documents in the evaluation.
- Indicator Level Ratings: Refers to criteria listed in *Performance Measure* levels. An authorizer will receive one of four performance ratings for each measure:
  - Level 3: Exemplary
  - Level 2: Satisfactory
  - Level 1: Improvements Necessary
  - 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 measure. Authorizers may submit additional documentation not included on the list.
- Points Possible: Each measure has a maximum point value, and points are assigned for each measure based on the performance rating achieved for the respective measure. All assigned points are added up to determine an authorizer's score and overall performance rating.
- Indicator Level Specifications: Describes specific evidence or components necessary to achieve the respective indicator level rating. Indicator level specifications may include:
  - Time (duration): Timeframes are applied to certain measures to clearly delineate among the performance indicator levels.
  - 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 and/or governing board chair. If responses from external interviews are inconsistent, the Board may seek responses from additional charter school representatives in the authorizer's portfolio.

The guiding question, evaluation and specific data sources, and additional evidence are used as the primary evaluation data sources. However, review documents are not limited to those stated. Review documents are any type of documentation that is available and exists to verify the measure rating.

## **SCORES, RATINGS, AND OUTCOMES**

An authorizer's score is determined by adding together all of the points earned on each performance measure. Scores can range from 0 to 162. The score, as well as other factors, determine an authorizer's overall rating. The table below illustrates the score range, other requirements, and outcomes for each performance rating.

<b>RATING</b>	<b>REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>OUTCOMES</b>
Exemplary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score of at least 130</li> <li>• Received at least “Satisfactory” rating on all performance measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Exemplary” authorizer performance recognition*</li> <li>• Authorizing contract renewed for five years</li> </ul>
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score between 98 and 129</li> <li>• No performance measure received a rating of “Unsatisfactory”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authorizing contract renewed for five years</li> <li>• Required to include in annual report corrective actions taken on performance measures not receiving at least “Satisfactory” rating until Board determines sufficient progress</li> </ul>
Improvements Necessary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score between 57 and 97</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authorizing contract renewed for a one-year probationary period**</li> <li>• Authority to approve new charter schools, replicate or expand existing charter schools, or accept charter transfers is suspended</li> </ul>
Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score less than 57</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authorizing contract is terminated and authorizer’s chartering authority is revoked</li> </ul>

\*Exemplary recognition may have certain privileges, as determined by the Board, such as expedited charter transfers.

\*\*A one-year probationary authorizing contract requires the authorizer to address all deficient performance measures (any measure not receiving at least a “Satisfactory” rating) in order to receive another authorizing contract. Only the deficient performance measures will be evaluated during the probationary period and will be assessed on a case-by-case basis, depending on the nature and scope of the deficiencies. If the authorizer does not sufficiently address the deficiencies prior to the end of the probationary contract, the authorizing contract is terminated and the authorizer’s chartering authority is revoked.

## **Summary of Authorizer Performance Measures**

### **PERFORMANCE MEASURES A: ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

- A.1: Authorizer Mission
- A.2: Strategic Vision and Organizational Goals
- A.3: Operational Conflicts of Interest
- A.4: Self-Evaluation of Capacity, Infrastructure, and Practices
- A.5: Structure of Operations
- A.6: Authorizer Leadership and Staff Expertise
- A.7: Capacity and Skill Development of Leadership and Staff
- A.8: Authorizing Operational Budget
- A.9: Compliance to Statutory Responsibilities

### **PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: APPLICATION PROCESS AND DECISION-MAKING**

- B.1: Application Process, Timeline, and Request for Proposals
- B.2: Approval Criteria for Charter School Applications
- B.3: Evaluation and Decision-Making Process
- B.4: Pre-Opening Charter School Process

### **PERFORMANCE MEASURES C: PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING**

- C.1: Charter Contract Terms, Negotiation, and Execution
- C.2: Charter School Performance Standards

### **PERFORMANCE MEASURES D: ONGOING OVERSIGHT AND EVALUATION**

- D.1: Process for Ongoing Oversight of Charter Schools
- D.2: Protecting School Autonomy
- D.3: Standards and Processes for Interventions, Corrective Action, and Response to Complaints

### **PERFORMANCE MEASURES E: REVOCATION AND RENEWAL DECISION-MAKING**

- E.1: Charter Contract Renewal Process and Performance Reports
- E.2: Charter Contract Renewal or Revocation Decisions
- E.3: School Closure Protocol

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

A.1 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Authorizer Mission</b>	Does the authorizer have a clear and compelling mission for charter school authorizing that aligns with, supports, and advances the intent of law and purpose of charter schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRS §302D-6(1)</li> <li>• Authorizing Contract</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #1 – Planning and Commitment to Excellence</li> </ul>	Mission inadequately aligns with, supports, or advances the intent of Hawaii’s charter school law or the purpose of charter schools as determined by the Board	Mission is not verified internally	Mission adequately aligns with, supports, and advances the intent of Hawaii’s charter school law and the purpose of charter schools as determined by the Board  <i>and</i> Mission is verified internally	Level 2  <i>and</i> Mission is verified by external references
A.1 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Evaluation Response Form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Terms of the authorizer’s Authorizing Contract</li> <li>• Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of mission practiced and documented at the authorizing organization</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Points Possible</b> 3 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 1 points, Level 2 = 2 points, Level 3 = 3 points</p>			Mission in authorizing contract or as described in Performance Evaluation Response Form does not clearly align with, support, or advance the intent of Hawaii’s charter school law or the purpose of charter schools as determined by the Board	Practice or documentation of authorizer’s mission is not verified internally with consistent responses from individuals or independent observations of authorizing organization	Mission in authorizing contract and as described in Performance Evaluation Response Form clearly aligns with, supports, and advances the intent of Hawaii’s charter school law and the purpose of charter schools as determined by the Board  <i>and</i> Practice and documentation of authorizer’s mission is verified internally with consistent responses from individuals or independent observations of authorizing organization	Level 2 specifications  <i>and</i> Practice of authorizer’s mission is verified externally with consistent responses from individuals or independent observations of external individuals or organizations

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

A.2 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Strategic Vision and Organizational Goals</b>	Does the authorizer have and evaluate its work against its comprehensive long-term strategic vision for charter school authorizing with clear organizational goals and timeframes for achievement that align with, support, and advance the intent of law and the purpose of charter schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRS §302D-6(1)</li> <li>• HRS §302D-3(d) (Commission only)</li> <li>• Authorizing Contract</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #1 – Planning and Commitment to Excellence, Advanced Standards</li> </ul>	<p>Vision is missing, vague, inconsistent, or does not clearly state organizational goals or timeframes for achievement</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Vision does not align with state law or the purpose of charter schools</p>	Organizational goals and timeframes for achievement do not align with vision or are not measurable.	<p>(a) Vision aligns with state law and the purpose of charter schools and includes appropriate and measurable organizational goals with timeframes for achievement</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(b) Authorizer evaluates its work against its vision and implements plans for improvement when falling short of its organizational goals</p>	<p>(a) Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(b) Authorizer has ambitious organizational goals</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(c) Authorizer is actively measuring and achieving most goals within the stated timeframes</p>
A.2 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Evaluation Response Form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>○ Evidence of measurable organizational goals and timeframes for achievement</li> <li>○ Evidence of authorizer engaged in self-evaluation of work against chartering vision and progress towards organizational goals (<i>e.g.</i>, strategic plan and/or continuous improvement plans)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Terms of the authorizer’s Authorizing Contract</li> <li>• Authorizer Annual Report</li> <li>• Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <p><b>Points Possible</b> 12 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 4 points, Level 2 = 8 points, Level 3 = 12 points</p>			One Level 0 indicator	See indicator above	<p>Vision in authorizing contract, annual report(s), and as described in Performance Evaluation Response Form clearly aligns with, supports, and advances the intent of Hawaii’s charter school law and the purpose of charter schools as determined by the Board</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Organizational goals and timeframes for achievement align with vision and are measurable</p> <p><i>and</i></p>	<p>Level 2 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>See indicator (b) above</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer includes its progress and performance in meeting its goals in its annual reports</p>



			Vision provides appropriate long-term strategies for charter school authorizing <i>and</i> See indicator (b) above	
--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT

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

A.3 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Operational Conflicts of Interest</b>	To what degree does the authorizer implement a clear policy to address conflicts of interest in all decision-making processes concerning the portfolio of charter schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRS §§302D-6(1), 302D-8</li> <li>• Authorizing Contract</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #1 – Planning and Commitment to Excellence</li> </ul>	(a) Conflict of interest policy for authorizing does not exist or is not consistent with state law  or  (b) Conflict of interest policy does not effectively address conflicts of interest or is not implemented	Clear conflict of interest policy exists but implementation is inconsistent or inadequate	Clear conflict of interest policy exists and is intentionally implemented in all decision-making processes  and  Consistent implementation verified internally at authorizing organization	Level 2  and  Consistent implementation verified by external references (such as school representative validation)
A.3 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<b>Specific Data Sources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Evaluation Response Form:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>○ Authorizer conflict of interest policy</li> <li>○ Authorizer conflict of interest processes and procedures for implementation and execution (could include forms, checklists, etc.)</li> <li>○ A fully documented examples of how the authorizer successfully implemented its conflict of interest policy</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <b>Points Possible</b> 6 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 2 points, Level 2 = 4 points, Level 3 = 6 points			See indicator (a) above  or  Numerous conflicts exist between the authorizer and its charter schools or charter school applicants ( <i>e.g.</i> , staff and board may overlap, authorizer may require school to purchase services from authorizer, funds may be comingled, etc.)  or  Schools are offered incentives by the authorizer ( <i>e.g.</i> , may only contract with an authorizer in exchange for services from authorizer)  or	Authorizer does not consistently follow its conflict of interest policy  or  Process and procedures for implementation of the conflict of interest policy are unclear or not consistently followed	Authorizer avoids conflicts of interest that might affect its capacity to make objective, merit-based application and renewal decisions and avoids decisions and interventions that hold the authorizer accountable for a school’s performance  and  Authorizer is able to provide at least two fully documented examples of how it has successfully implemented its conflict of interest policy  and  Implementation of conflict of interest policy is verified internally with consistent	Level 2 specifications  and  Consistent implementation and effectiveness of the authorizer’s conflict of interest policy is verified externally with responses from external individuals

	Authorizer's decisions are improperly influenced by a service provider or the school board		responses from decision makers or independent observations of authorizing organization	
--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT

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

A.4 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC															
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary												
<b>Self-Evaluation of Capacity, Infrastructure, and Practices</b>	To what degree does the authorizer regularly self-evaluate its internal ability (capacity, infrastructure, and practices) to oversee the portfolio of charter schools and develops continuous improvement plans to address findings of self-evaluation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRS §302D-6(1)</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #1 – Planning and Commitment to Excellence</li> </ul>	Authorizer does not evaluate its internal ability to oversee the portfolio of charter schools	<p>Authorizer occasionally conducts an evaluation, against national standards, of its internal ability to oversee the portfolio of charter schools</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Authorizer does not develop or implement continuous improvement plans to address findings of self-evaluation</p>	<p>Authorizer regularly conducts an evaluation, against national standards and its organizational goals, of its internal ability to oversee the portfolio of charter schools</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer develops and implements continuous improvement plans to address findings of self-evaluation</p>	<p>Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Implementation of continuous improvement plans have resulted in more effective authorizing practices, one or more of which may be externally recognized, such as by the Board, NACSA, and/or another organization</p>												
A.4 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS															
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Evaluation Response Form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence if different from most recent authorizer annual report</li> <li>○ Authorizer self-evaluation tool(s), schedule, tracking, and progress development</li> <li>○ An example of authorizer strategic plan(s), continuous improvement plan(s), and/or staff development based on self-evaluations</li> <li>○ Documentation of authorizing practices that were recognized externally (e.g., Board, NACSA, and/or other organizations)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Authorizer annual report</li> <li>• Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <p><b>Points Possible</b> 12 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 4 points, Level 2 = 8 points, Level 3 = 12 points</p>			<p>Evidence of a self-evaluation does not exist</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Self-evaluation does not effectively assess internal ability</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Self-evaluation does not use national standards and authorizer’s organizational goals</p>				<p>Authorizer conducts self-evaluations, but they are not regularly scheduled or executed</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Continuous improvement plans are either non-existent, not designed to address the findings resulting from the self-evaluation, or not implemented</p>				<p>Authorizer has a schedule of self-evaluations (both planned and executed) demonstrating regular reviews</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Continuous improvement plans are clearly designed to address findings resulting from the self-evaluation</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer provides evidence of the implementation of continuous improvement plans</p>				<p>Level 2 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Evidence that authorizer received external recognition for authorizing practices as a result of its continuous improvement plans</p>			

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

A.5 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Structure of Operations</b>	To what degree does the authorizer operate with a clear structure of duties and responsibilities, including appropriate lines of authority and delegation of duties between decision-makers and staff, and sufficient resources to effectively oversee its portfolio of charter schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRS §302D-6(1)</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #1 – Human Resources</li> </ul>	Structure of duties and responsibilities is unclear, inconsistent, inappropriate or illegal for an authorizer, or at a level inadequate to meet the authorizing needs of the portfolio	Clear structure of duties and responsibilities exists, but staffing or resources are at a level that is not specifically tailored to meet the current authorizing needs of the portfolio	Clear structure of duties and responsibilities is defined and charted, and authorizer’s staffing and resources are specifically tailored to meet the current authorizing needs of the portfolio	Level 2 <i>and</i> Understanding of the structure of duties and responsibilities is verified internally at authorizing organization <i>and</i> Understanding of the structure of duties and responsibilities are verified externally (such as school governing board validation)
A.5 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<b>Specific Data Sources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Evaluation Response Form:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>○ Job descriptions of authorizer’s personnel (e.g., employees, contractors, volunteers; both paid and unpaid positions, etc.)</li> <li>○ Most recent organizational chart that shows clear lines of reporting and authority/decision-making</li> <li>○ If applicable, authorizer staffing changes since last annual report, including staffing size (in FTEs) compared to portfolio size</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Authorizer annual report</li> <li>• Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <b>Points Possible</b> 9 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 3 points, Level 2 = 6 points, Level 3 = 9 points			See indicator above	See indicator above	See indicator above <i>and</i> Evidence that resources were specifically tailored to meet current authorizing needs <i>and</i> If applicable, changes were made to the organizational structure when necessary	Structure of duties, responsibilities, and staffing levels are verified internally with consistent responses from individuals or independent observations of authorizing organization <i>and</i> Authorizer practices are consistently verified externally with consistent responses from individuals or independent observations of external individuals or organizations

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

A.6 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Authorizer Leadership and Staff Expertise</b>	To what degree does the authorizing staff have or have access to appropriate experience, expertise, and skills to sufficiently oversee the portfolio of charter schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRS §302D-6(1)</li> <li>NACSA Standard #1 – Human Resources</li> </ul>	Authorizing staff does not have appropriate experience, expertise, and skills in most essential authorizing areas	Authorizing staff has experience, expertise, and skills in most, but not all, essential authorizing areas	Authorizing staff has experience, expertise, and skills in all essential authorizing areas	<p>Authorizing staff has strong experience, expertise, and skills in all essential authorizing areas to effectively oversee the portfolio of charter schools</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Experience, expertise, and skills are specifically tailored to needs of the portfolio of charter schools</p>
A.6 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<p><b>Definitions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Authorizing staff” refers to both paid and unpaid individuals, including board members and contractors</li> <li>“Essential authorizing areas” includes, but is not limited to, education leadership; curriculum, instruction, and assessment; special education, English Language Learners, and other diverse learning needs; performance management and accountability; law; finance; facilities; and nonprofit governance and management</li> <li>“Expertise” is defined as having knowledge, education, training, etc. in essential authorizing areas</li> <li>“Experience” is defined as length of time working in essential authorizing areas</li> <li>“Skills” is defined as effective application of experience and expertise in essential authorizing areas</li> </ul> <p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Evaluation Response Form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>Current resumes of existing personnel, including contracted individuals with employment/contract terms</li> <li>If not included in the resume, conference or workshop certificates of completion or participation, licenses, certifications, degrees, etc. documenting staff expertise</li> </ul> </li> <li>Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul>			See indicator above	See indicator above	See indicator above	See indicator above

<b>Points Possible</b> 9 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 3 points, Level 2 = 6 points, Level 3 = 9 points				
---	--	--	--	--

DRAFT

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

A.7 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Capacity and Skill Development of Leadership and Staff</b>	To what degree does the authorizer ensure a commitment to quality authorizing and enable continual agency improvement through regular professional development of its authorizing leadership and staff that is aligned with its mission, vision, and organizational goals?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRS §302D-6(1)</li> <li>NACSA Standard #1 – Planning and Commitment to Excellence; Human Resources</li> </ul>	Professional development is rarely offered or not offered to authorizing leadership and staff	Professional development offered to authorizing leadership and staff is not clearly aligned to the authorizer’s mission, vision, and organizational goals  or  Professional development for authorizing leadership and staff is offered irregularly	Professional development regularly offered to authorizing leadership and staff that is aligned to the authorizer’s mission, vision, and organizational goals	Level 2  and  Professional development is differentiated  and  Outcomes of professional development are measured and evaluated
A.7 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<b>Specific Data Sources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Evaluation Response Form:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>Documentation of training offered to new members to the authorizing board, leadership, and staff within the last 12 months</li> <li>Documentation of professional development offered to authorizing staff within the last 12 months; how the professional development addressed a needed skill base for the authorizer, authorizing leadership and staff; and how the professional development aligns with operations, vision, and goals for authorizer oversight of its portfolio of schools</li> </ul> </li> <li>Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <b>Points Possible</b> 12 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 4 points, Level 2 = 8 points, Level 3 = 12 points			See indicator above  or  Training on the core principles of authorizing is not offered to new members of the authorizing leadership and staff	Professional development does not clearly build the skill base of the authorizing leadership and staff to accomplish the authorizer’s mission, vision, and organizational goals  or  Professional development is not planned or is primarily issue or incident specific	Professional development is regular and ongoing  and  Professional development is intentional and planned to build the skill base of the authorizing leadership and staff to accomplish the authorizer’s mission, vision, and organizational goals	Level 2 specifications  and  Professional development is measured, evaluated, and customized to meet the needs of the authorizer, authorizing leadership, and staff



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

A.8 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Authorizing Operational Budget</b>	To what degree is the authorizer’s actual resource allocation commensurate with its stated budget and responsibilities of authorizing the portfolio of charter schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRS §302D-6(1)</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #1 – Financial Resources</li> </ul>	Resource allocations for authorizing fall short of resources committed in its budget  and  Resource allocations are insufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities	Resource allocations for authorizing fall short of resources committed in its budget  or  Resource allocations are insufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities	Resource allocations for authorizing are sufficient to fulfill authorizing responsibilities for the scale of the portfolio and commensurate with its stated budget	Level 2  and  Resource allocations are sufficient to advance the authorizer’s organizational goals
A.8 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Evaluation Response Form:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>○ Explanation of any significant variances between budgeted and actual expenditures</li> <li>○ If applicable, explanation of how resource allocations advanced authorizer’s organizational goals</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Annual budget and audited expenditures</li> <li>• Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <p><b>Points Possible</b> 9 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 3 points, Level 2 = 6 points, Level 3 = 9 points</p>			See indicators above		For at least the last completed fiscal year:  Authorizer demonstrates resource allocations are adequate to fulfill authorizing responsibilities and the needs and scale of its portfolio ( <i>e.g.</i> , income, expenditures, number and size of the charter schools in the portfolio)  and  Resource allocation aligns with authorizer’s budget, or significant variances in resource reallocation is adequately justified	Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two completed fiscal years  and  Authorizer demonstrates resource allocations advance authorizer’s organizational goals

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

A.9 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Compliance to Statutory Responsibilities</b>	To what degree does the authorizer comply with its statutory responsibilities, including authorizer reporting and the appropriate distribution of funds to its charter schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRS §§302D-5(b), 302D-7</li> <li>• Authorizing Contract</li> </ul>	Authorizer is consistently noncompliant with its statutory responsibilities	Authorizer is occasionally noncompliant with its statutory responsibilities	Authorizer consistently complies with its statutory responsibilities	Level 2 <i>and</i> Annual reports contain longitudinal data and analyses explaining performance trends of the portfolio of schools <i>and</i> Appropriateness of funds distribution is verified by external references (such as school directors)
A.9 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<b>Specific Data Sources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Evaluation Response Form:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>○ Evidence and justification demonstrating that funds were appropriately distributed to the charter schools within the authorizer’s portfolio each year since last authorizer evaluation or approval of authorizer application, whatever is most recent</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Authorizer annual reports</li> <li>• Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <b>Points Possible</b> 9 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 3 points, Level 2 = 6 points, Level 3 = 9 points			Over the last two or more years the authorizer was consistently noncompliant in one or more areas listed under HRS §302D-5(b) <i>or</i> Authorizer is unable to provide evidence and justification that demonstrates that funds were appropriately distributed <i>or</i> Since the last authorizer evaluation, at least one authorizer annual report was not submitted	Over the last two or more years the authorizer was occasionally noncompliant in one or more areas listed under HRS §302D-5(b) <i>or</i> Since the last authorizer evaluation, at least one authorizer annual report was not submitted by the deadlines set by law and the Board <i>or</i> Since the last authorizer evaluation, at least one authorizer annual report did	Over the last two years the authorizer was consistently compliant in all areas listed under HRS §302D-5(b) <i>and</i> Since the last authorizer evaluation, all authorizer annual reports were submitted to the Board and Legislature on time and with complete information <i>and</i> Since the last authorizer evaluation, all authorizer annual reports clearly	Level 2 specifications <i>and</i> Two most recent annual reports contain longitudinal data and analyses explaining performance trends of the portfolio of schools <i>and</i> Appropriateness of fund distribution is externally verified with consistent responses from interviewed individuals

		not contain all information required by law and the Board	described the authorizer's progress in achieving its organizational goals <i>and</i> Authorizer is able to provide evidence and justification that demonstrate that funds were appropriately distributed	
--	--	---	--	--

DRAFT

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: APPLICATION PROCESS AND DECISION-MAKING**

B.1 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<p><b>Application Process, Timeline, and Request for Proposals</b></p>	<p>To what degree does the authorizer have a comprehensive and well-publicized application process that includes realistic timelines, fair and transparent procedures, and guidance that clearly describes each stage of the process?</p> <p>To what degree is the authorizer’s request for proposals clear, comprehensive, and aligned to its mission, vision, and organizational goals?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRS §§302D-5(a)(1), 302D-6(2), 302D-13</li> <li>• Authorizing Contract</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #2 – Fair, Transparent, Quality-Focused Procedures; Proposal Information, Questions, and Guidance</li> </ul>	<p>Process or request for proposal lacks many required elements</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Request for proposal does not align to the authorizer’s mission, vision, and organizational goals</p>	<p>Process or request for proposal lacks some required elements</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Request for proposal reflects some alignment to the authorizer’s mission, vision, and organizational goals</p>	<p>Process is comprehensive and well-publicized to a wide audience</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Request for proposal is clear, comprehensive, and aligned to the authorizer’s mission, vision, and organizational goals</p>	<p>(a) Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(b) Publication of process and request for proposal are targeted to audiences that may be able to assist with achieving authorizer’s vision and organizational goals</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(c) Request for proposal is clearly designed to assist in the achievement of the authorizer’s vision and organizational goals</p>
B.1 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Evaluation Response Form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>○ Charter school application, request for proposals, policies, procedures, timelines, and processes used in the last 12 months</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <p><b>Points Possible</b></p> <p>9</p> <p>Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 3 points, Level 2 = 6 points, Level 3 = 9 points</p>			<p>Process and request for proposals are missing two or more elements required by law</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Three or more elements under Level 2 (b) specification are not met</p>	<p>Process and request for proposals are missing one element required by law</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>One or two elements under Level 2 (b) specification are not met</p>	<p>(a) Process and request for proposals contains all of the elements required by law</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(b) Process and request for proposals contains the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process broadly invites and solicits charter applications while publicizing the authorizer’s vision and chartering priorities;</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 indicators (b) and (c)</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process allows sufficient time for each stage of the application process to be carried out with quality and integrity;</li> <li>• Process has fair and transparent procedures, including informing applicants of their rights and responsibilities and promptly notifying applicants of approval or denial, while explaining the factors that determined the decision;</li> <li>• Process clearly explains how each stage of the application process is conducted and evaluated;</li> <li>• Request for proposals articulates comprehensive application questions to elicit the information needed for rigorous evaluation of applicants' plans and capacities; and</li> <li>• Request for proposals states the authorizer's chartering priorities that align to its organizational goals</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	---	--

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: APPLICATION PROCESS AND DECISION-MAKING**

B.2 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Approval Criteria for Charter School Applications</b>	To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria that align with law and allow it to rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRS §§302D-5(a)(1), 302D-6(2), 302D-13</li> <li>Authorizing Contract</li> <li>NACSA Standard #2 – Rigorous Approval Criteria</li> </ul>	Approval criteria are missing, incomplete, not comprehensive, or vague	(a) Approval criteria are stated but do not clearly align with law or (b) Criteria do not clearly allow for rigorous evaluation of new charter school proposals	(a) Approval criteria clearly align with law and (b) Criteria are clear, comprehensive, and allow for rigorous evaluation of new charter school proposals	Consistent application of Level 2
B.2 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Evaluation Response Form:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>Charter application approval criteria used in the last 12 months (or, if authorizer has not recently accepted or reviewed charter applications, the most recently adopted charter application approval criteria)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <p><b>Points Possible</b> 3 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 1 points, Level 2 = 2 points, Level 3 = 3 points</p>			See indicator above	Level 1 (a) indicator and Criteria requires applicants to present only some of the following information: a clear and compelling mission; strong academic, financial, organizational, and operational plans; and clear evidence of the applicant’s capacity to execute such plans or Distinct criteria are provided for two or less of the following: applicants who are existing school operators; proposing to contract with education service or management providers; or proposing to operate virtual charter schools	Level 2 (a) indicator and Criteria requires all applicants to present a clear and compelling mission; strong academic, financial, organizational, and operational plans; and clear evidence of the applicant’s capacity to execute such plans and Distinct criteria are provided for applicants who are existing school operators, proposing to contract with education service or management providers, and proposing to operate virtual charter schools	Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: APPLICATION PROCESS AND DECISION-MAKING**

B.3 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC															
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary												
<b>Evaluation and Decision-Making Process</b>	<p>To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive evaluation process standards to ensure qualified internal and external evaluators rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals?</p> <p>To what degree did the authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions align to its stated approval criteria and evaluation process standards?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRS §§302D-5(a)(1), 302D-5(a)(2), 302D-5(a)(3), 302D-6(2), 302D-13</li> <li>Authorizing Contract</li> <li>NACSA Standard #2 – Rigorous Decision Making</li> </ul>	<p>Authorizer’s evaluation process standards lack many required elements</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Evaluation team does not include both internal and external evaluators</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions does not align with its approval criteria and process standards</p>	<p>Authorizer’s evaluation process standards lack some required elements</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Evaluation team has internal and external evaluators, but not all evaluators are qualified in essential areas</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions reflects some alignment with its approval criteria and evaluation process standards</p>	<p>Authorizer’s evaluation process standards are clear and comprehensive</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Evaluation team has internal and external evaluators who are qualified in essential areas</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions align with its approval criteria and evaluation process standards</p>	<p>(a) Consistent application of Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(b) If applicable, if an application includes an area of specialization (<i>e.g.</i>, language immersion dropout recovery), at least one evaluator has expertise in that area</p>												
B.3 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS															
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Evaluation Response Form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>Summary of applications, qualifications of individuals who reviewed the application and those who served on the evaluation team, and authorizer decisions since last authorizer evaluation or approval of authorizer application, whatever is most recent</li> <li>A recent example of a charter application evaluation process (from beginning to end)</li> </ul> </li> <li>If applicable, appeals of authorizer decisions on new charter school proposals</li> <li>Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <p><b>Points Possible</b> 6 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 3 points, Level 2 = 6 points, Level 3 = 9 points</p>			<p>Four or more elements under Level 2 (a) specification are not met</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>If authorizer completed an application process within the last 12 months:</p> <p>Evaluation team did not have internal and external evaluators</p>				<p>One to three elements under Level 2 (a) specification are not met</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>If authorizer completed an application process within the last 12 months:</p> <p>Evaluation team had internal and external evaluators, but not all evaluators had relevant expertise or experience in the</p>				<p>(a) Evaluation process standards contain the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thorough review of a written proposal;</li> <li>A substantive in-person interview with each qualified applicant;</li> <li>Other due diligence to examine the applicant’s experience and capacity;</li> </ul>				<p>Level 2 specification (a) was met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 2 specification (b) was applied for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 indicator (b)</p>			

	<p><i>or</i></p> <p>Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are frequently inconsistent with the stated approval criteria and evaluation process standards</p>	<p>essential areas of educational planning, governance, financial management, and school accountability</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Authorizer’s decisions and resulting actions are occasionally inconsistent with the stated approval criteria and evaluation process standards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation conducted by knowledgeable and competent evaluators;</li> <li>• Evaluators document evidence to support whether the applicant meets the each of the approval criteria;</li> <li>• Authorizer provides training to evaluators to ensure consistent evaluation standards and practices, observance of essential protocols, and fair treatment of applicants;</li> <li>• The resulting evaluation and authorizer decision clearly communicates to applicants specific reasons approval or denial; and</li> <li>• Authorizer ensures that the application evaluation process and decision making are free of conflicts of interest and requires full disclosure of any potential or perceived conflicts of interest between evaluators or decision makers and applicants</li> </ul> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(b) If authorizer completed an application process within the last 12 months:</p> <p>Evaluation team had internal and external evaluators with relevant expertise or experience in the essential areas of educational planning, governance, financial</p>	
--	---	---	--	--



			management, and school accountability <i>and</i> Authorizer granted charters only to applicants that have demonstrated competence and capacity to succeed in all aspects of the school, consistent with the stated approval criteria and evaluation process standards	
--	--	--	---	--

DRAFT

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES B: APPLICATION PROCESS AND DECISION-MAKING**

B.4 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC									
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary						
<b>Pre-Opening Charter School Process</b>	To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive pre-opening processes and criteria to determine the readiness of a pre-opening charter school to commence operations on a reasonable timeline?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRS §§302D-5(a), 302D-6(4), 302D-14.5</li> <li>Authorizing Contract</li> <li>NACSA Standard #3 – Contract Term, Negotiation, and Execution</li> </ul>	<p>There is no documented evidence of a formal pre-opening process</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Pre-opening criteria lack many required elements</p>	<p>Pre-opening process is vague or on a unreasonable timeline</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Pre-opening criteria lack some required elements</p>	<p>Pre-opening process is clear and on a reasonable timeline</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Pre-opening criteria are clear and comprehensive</p>	<p>(a) Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(b) Demonstration of a smooth opening of a charter school because of the pre-opening process and criteria</p>						
B.4 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS									
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Evaluation Response Form:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>Pre-opening process and criteria</li> <li>A recent example of a pre-opening process (from beginning to end)</li> <li>If applicable, evidence of a smooth charter school opening</li> </ul> </li> <li>If applicable, appeals of authorizer decisions on new charter school proposals</li> <li>Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <p><b>Points Possible</b> 3 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 1 points, Level 2 = 2 points, Level 3 = 3 points</p>			<p>Level 2 (a) specification is not met</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Both elements under Level 2 (b) specification are not met</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Two or more elements under Level 2 (c) specification are not met</p>				<p>One of element under Level 2 (b) specification is not met</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>One of element under Level 2 (c) specification is not met</p>		<p>(a) Pre-opening process and criteria ensure that the charter school will not be significantly different upon opening from what was described in the authorizer approved application</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(b) Pre-opening process includes the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allows sufficient time for pre-opening charter school to meet pre-opening criteria with quality and integrity; and</li> <li>Authorizer approves commencement of operations only for charter schools that have demonstrated readiness</li> </ul>		<p>Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Since the last evaluation of the authorizer, Level 3 (b) indicator met</p>	

			<p>consistent with the stated pre-opening criteria</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(c) Pre-opening criteria requires each of the following prior to opening:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All health, safety, and other legal requirements are met;</li><li>• Sufficient staffing and governance;</li><li>• Demonstration of adequate operating funds; and</li><li>• Evidence of a facility that supports the school's needs</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES C: PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING**

C.1 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Charter Contract Terms, Negotiation, and Execution</b>	To what degree does the authorizer negotiate and execute charter contracts that clearly define material terms and rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRS §§302D-5(a)(4), 302D-6(3)</li> <li>Authorizing Contract</li> <li>NACSA Standard #3 – Contract Term, Negotiation, and Execution</li> </ul>	<p>Charter contracts contain only some defined material terms or rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Charter contracts do not comply with statute</p>	<p>Charter contracts do not clearly define all material terms and all rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Charter contracts do not align with national standards</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>School and authorizer do not mutually understand or accept the material terms of the charter contract</p>	<p>Charter contracts clearly define all material terms and all rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer that align with statute and national standards</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>School and authorizer mutually understand and accept the material terms of the charter contract</p>	Consistent application of Level 2
C.1 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Evaluation Response Form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>Current charter contract template</li> </ul> </li> <li>Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <p><b>Points Possible</b> 6 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 2 points, Level 2 = 4 points, Level 3 = 6 points</p>			<p>One Level 0 indicator</p>	<p>Charter contract does not clearly align with all of NACSA Standard 3 (Contract Term, Negotiation, and Execution)</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Mutual understanding and acceptance of the material terms of the charter contract is not verified</p>	<p>Charter contract aligns with NACSA Standard 3 (Contract Term, Negotiation, and Execution) and state law</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Mutual understanding and acceptance of charter contract is verified internally with consistent responses from individuals of authorizing organization and verified externally with consistent responses from school representatives</p>	Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last three years

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES C: PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING**

C.2 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Charter School Performance Standards</b>	To what degree does the authorizer execute charter contracts with clear, measurable, and attainable performance standards?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRS §§302D-5(a)(4), 302D-6(3), 302D-16</li> <li>Authorizing Contract</li> <li>NACSA Standard #3 – Performance Standards</li> </ul>	Standards in performance frameworks do not meet current statutory requirements	Standards in performance frameworks are unclear, not clearly measurable, or not clearly attainable  <i>or</i> Charter contract does not identify data sources that serve as the evidence base for performance evaluation	Charter contracts include clear, measurable, and attainable standards in performance frameworks that meet current statutory requirements  <i>and</i> Charter contract identifies data sources that serve as the evidence base for performance evaluation	Consistent application of Level 2
C.2 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Evaluation Response Form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>Performance framework for school academic, financial, organizational, and operational performance standards as contained in the current charter contract template</li> </ul> </li> <li>Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <p><b>Points Possible</b> 6 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 3 points, Level 2 = 6 points, Level 3 = 9 points</p>			See indicator above	One Level 1 indicator	See indicators above	Level 2 indicators have been met for at least the last three years

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES D: Ongoing Oversight and Evaluation**

D.1 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Process for Ongoing Oversight of Charter Schools</b>	To what degree does the authorizer have and implement a comprehensive oversight and monitoring system as defined by the charter contract?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRS §§302D-5(a)(5), 302D-6(4), 302D-17</li> <li>Authorizing Contract</li> <li>NACSA Standard #4 – Performance Evaluation and Compliance Monitoring; Protecting Student Rights</li> </ul>	(a) Authorizer’s system for oversight and monitoring of charter schools in the areas of academics, finances, and operations lacks many required elements  or  (b) Authorizer does not implement its oversight and monitoring system  or  (c) Authorizer does not communicate regarding oversight and monitoring system	Authorizer’s system for oversight and monitoring of charter schools in the areas of academics, finances, and operations lacks some required elements  or  Authorizer inconsistently implements its oversight and monitoring system  or  Authorizer’s communication regarding oversight and monitoring is unclear, irregular, or not timely	Authorizer has a comprehensive system for oversight and monitoring of charter schools in the areas of academics, finances, and operations  and  Authorizer consistently implements its oversight and monitoring system  and  Authorizer’s communication regarding oversight and monitoring is clear, regular, and timely	Level 2  and  Oversight and monitoring system implementation verified by external references (such as school representative validation)
D.1 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<b>Specific Data Sources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Evaluation Response Form:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>Description of the authorizer’s oversight and monitoring system, including any supporting documentation and processes and procedures for implementation and execution (could include forms, checklists, etc.)</li> <li>Fully documented examples of ongoing oversight and monitoring</li> </ul> </li> <li>Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <b>Points Possible</b> 9 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 3 points, Level 2 = 6 points, Level 3 = 9 points			Two or more elements under Level 2 (a) specification are not met  or  Level 0 indicator (b) or (c)	One element under Level 2 (a) specification is not met  or  Level 2 (b), (c), or (d) specifications not met	(a) Oversight and monitoring system includes the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear guidance to ensure timely compliance;</li> <li>Protection of student rights;</li> <li>Provides information necessary to make intervention, revocation, and renewal decisions; and</li> </ul>	Level 2 specifications  and  Implementation of the authorizer’s oversight and monitoring processes, consistent with its stated processes, is verified externally with responses from external individuals

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforces stated consequences for failing to meet requirements</li> </ul> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(b) Authorizer is able to provide at least two fully documented examples of how it has implemented its oversight and monitoring system consistent with its stated processes</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(c) Implementation of oversight and monitoring system is verified internally with consistent responses from individuals or independent observations of authorizing organization</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(d) Demonstration that the authorizer regularly communicates the oversight and monitoring system to schools</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES D: Ongoing Oversight and Evaluation**

D.2 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Protecting School Autonomy</b>	To what degree does the authorizer respect, preserve, and support the essential autonomies of the portfolio of charter schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRS §§302D-5(a)(5), 302D-6(4)</li> <li>• Authorizing Contract</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #4 – Respecting School Autonomy</li> </ul>	Provisions within the charter contract that ensure school autonomy do not exist  <i>or</i> Authorizer is overly involved in the processes and operations of the school’s authority over day-to-day operations and decisions that are clearly within the school’s purview	Provisions within the charter contract related to school autonomy exist but do not clearly ensure school autonomy  <i>or</i> Authorizer’s practices are inconsistent with the stated charter contract provisions to uphold school autonomy	Authorizer respects, preserves, and supports the essential autonomies of the portfolio of charter schools through its charter contract  <i>and</i> Authorizer’s practices align with the stated charter contract provisions to uphold school autonomy	Level 2  <i>and</i> Monitoring and oversight is performed in a manner that minimizes administrative burden on the portfolio of charter schools without compromising the protection of public interests  <i>and</i> Authorizer’s practices regarding school autonomy verified by external references (such as school representative validation)
D.2 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<b>Specific Data Sources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Evaluation Response Form:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>○ Description of the authorizer’s practices regarding school autonomy, including any supporting documentation</li> <li>○ Fully documented examples of authorizer’s practices regarding school autonomy</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Terms of the authorizer’s Authorizing Contract</li> <li>• Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <b>Points Possible</b> 6 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 2 points, Level 2 = 4 points, Level 3 = 6 points			One Level 0 indicator	One Level 1 indicator	Charter contract provisions establish and recognize the school’s authority over the schools day-to-day operations and decisions that are clearly within the school’s purview  <i>and</i> Authorizer is able to provide at least two fully documented examples of how its practices align with school autonomy	Level 2 specifications  <i>and</i> Demonstration of how authorizer minimized administrative burden on the portfolio or charter schools without compromising public interest  <i>and</i> Implementation of the authorizer’s oversight and



			provisions in the charter contract <i>and</i> Practices aligned with school autonomy provisions in the charter contract are verified internally with consistent responses from individuals or independent observations of authorizing organization	monitoring , consistent with its stated processes, is verified externally with responses from external individuals
--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES D: Ongoing Oversight and Evaluation**

D.3 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Standards and Processes for Intervention and Corrective Action</b>	To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address intervention and corrective action?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRS §§302D-5(a)(5), 302D-6(4), 302D-17</li> <li>Authorizing Contract</li> <li>NACSA Standard #4 – Intervention</li> </ul>	(a) Authorizer’s intervention policy is not documented in the charter contract  or  (b) Authorizer’s intervention process lacks many elements	(a) Authorizer has documented in its charter contract an intervention policy, but it is unclear  or  (b) Authorizer’s intervention process lacks some elements	Authorizer has documented in its charter contract an intervention policy that is clear and comprehensive  and  Authorizer’s intervention process is clear and comprehensive	Level 2  and  Authorizer’s implementation of intervention process verified by external references (such as school representative validation)
D.3 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<b>Specific Data Sources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Evaluation Response Form:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>Authorizer’s intervention policy and standards as contained in the charter contract</li> <li>Authorizer’s processes for intervention and corrective action</li> </ul> </li> <li>Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <b>Points Possible</b> 6 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 2 points, Level 2 = 4 points, Level 3 = 6 points			Level 0 indicator (a)  or  Two or more elements under Level 2 (b) specification are not met	Level 1 indicator (a)  or  One element under Level 2 (b) specification is not met	(a) Intervention policy in the charter contract includes conditions that may trigger intervention and types of possible actions and consequences  and  (b) Intervention process includes the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When intervention is needed, the authorizer identifies what the school must remedy without prescribing solutions;</li> <li>Authorizer gives schools clear, adequate, evidence-based, and timely notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies;</li> </ul>	Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years  and  Consistent implementation of the authorizer’s intervention process is verified externally with responses from external individuals

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Authorizer allows schools reasonable time and opportunity for remediation in non-emergency situations</li><li>• Allows authorizer to apply professional discretion and consider context and a range of solutions</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES E: Revocation and Renewal Decision-Making**

E.1 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Charter Contract Renewal Process and Performance Reports</b>	To what degree does the authorizer have a clear, comprehensive, fair, and transparent process for charter contract renewal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRS §§302D-5(a)(6), 302D-6(5), 302D-18</li> <li>Authorizing Contract</li> <li>NACSA Standard #5 – Cumulative Report and Renewal Application; Fair, Transparent Process</li> </ul>	Process for contract renewal lacks many required elements	Process for contract renewal lacks some required elements	Process for contract renewal is clear, comprehensive, fair, and transparent	Level 2 <i>and</i> Authorizer has consistently implemented its contract renewal process <i>and</i> Consistent implementation verified by external references (such as school representative validation)
E.1 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<b>Specific Data Sources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Evaluation Response Form:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>Authorizer’s charter renewal application, policies, procedures, timelines, and processes</li> <li>An example of a charter school’s performance report</li> </ul> </li> <li>Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <b>Points Possible</b> 6 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 2 points, Level 2 = 4 points, Level 3 = 6 points			The contract renewal process and application guidance does not comply with law <i>or</i> Four or more elements under Level 2 (b) specification are not met	One to three elements under Level 2 (b) specification are not met	(a) The contract renewal process and application guidance comply with law <i>and</i> (b) Process for contract renewal includes the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria for charter revocation, renewal, and nonrenewal decisions that are consistent with the charter contract;</li> <li>An explanation of available appeal rights through which a school may challenge the authorizer’s decision;</li> </ul>	Level 2 specifications <i>and</i> Authorizer’s renewal practices are consistent with its state process and are verified externally with consistent responses from individuals or independent observations of external individuals or organizations

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular updates and publication of the process for renewal decision making;</li> <li>• Provides the school a meaningful opportunity and reasonable time to respond to the performance report; to correct the record, if needed; and to present additional evidence regarding its performance;</li> <li>• Sends the performance report in advance of a renewal decision;</li> <li>• Performance report summarizes the school's performance and states the authorizer's summative findings concerning the school's performance and its prospects for renewal;</li> <li>• Notification of each school of its decision, including written explanation of the reasons for the decision; and</li> <li>• Prompt communication of renewal or revocation decisions to the school community and public that allows parents and students to exercise choices for the coming school year</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES E: Revocation and Renewal Decision-Making**

E.2 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
<b>Charter Contract Renewal or Revocation Decisions</b>	To what degree do the authorizer’s renewal and revocation decisions align to its stated performance standards?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HRS §§302D-5(a)(6), 302D-6(5), 302D-18</li> <li>• Authorizing Contract</li> <li>• NACSA Standard #5 – Revocation; Renewal Decisions Based on Merit and Inclusive Evidence; Fair, Transparent Process</li> </ul>	<p>(a) Authorizer does not base its renewal decisions on the objective evidence defined by the performance frameworks in the charter contract</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>(b) Authorizer does not base its revocation decisions on clear evidence of extreme underperformance or violation of law to protect student and public interests</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>(c) Authorizer does not revoke a charter when there is clear evidence of extreme underperformance or violation of law to protect student and public interests</p>	<p>(a) It is unclear whether authorizer bases its renewal decisions on the objective evidence defined by the performance frameworks in the charter contract</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>(b) It is unclear whether authorizer bases its revocation decisions on clear evidence of extreme underperformance or violation of law to protect student and public interests</p>	<p>(a) Authorizer bases its renewal decisions on the objective evidence defined by the performance frameworks in the charter contract</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(b) Authorizer bases its revocation decisions on clear evidence of extreme underperformance or violation of law to protect student and public interests</p>	<p>(a) Level 2</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>(b) Demonstration of how authorizer’s renewal and revocation decisions have resulted in a higher performing charter school portfolio</p>
E.2 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Evaluation Response Form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>○ Documentation of authorizer’s renewal and revocation decisions since the last authorizer evaluation</li> <li>○ If applicable, appeals of authorizer decisions on new charter school proposals</li> <li>○ If applicable, evidence of how authorizer’s renewal and revocation decisions have resulted in a higher performing charter school portfolio</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul>			<p>Renewals are granted to schools that have not met the performance standards or have not been faithful to the terms of the contract</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>Renewal decisions (including granting probationary or short-</p>	<p>Renewals are granted to schools that have not clearly met the performance standards or have not clearly been faithful to the terms of the contract</p> <p><i>or</i></p>	<p>Renewals are only granted to schools that have met the performance standards and have been faithful to the terms of the contract</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Renewal decisions (including granting probationary or short-</p>	<p>Level 2 specifications</p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>Level 3 indicator (b)</p>

<p><b>Points Possible</b> 9 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 3 points, Level 2 = 6 points, Level 3 = 9 points</p>	<p>term renewals) are made on the basis of political or community pressure or solely on promises of future improvement <i>or</i> Level 0 indicator (b) or (c)</p>	<p>Renewal decisions (including granting probationary or short-term renewals) may have been made on the basis of political or community pressure or solely on promises of future improvement <i>or</i> Level 1 indicator (b)</p>	<p>term renewals) are not made on the basis of political or community pressure or solely on promises of future improvement <i>and</i> Level 2 indicator (b)</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

DRAFT

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES E: Revocation and Renewal Decision-Making**

E.3 MEASURE	GUIDING QUESTION	MEASURE ORIGIN	INDICATOR LEVEL RATINGS AND RUBRIC			
			LEVEL 0 Unsatisfactory or Incomplete	LEVEL 1 Improvements Necessary	LEVEL 2 Satisfactory	LEVEL 3 Exemplary
School Closure Protocol	To what degree does the authorizer have a closure protocol that is clear and comprehensive?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HRS §§302D-5(a)(6), 302D-6(5), 302D-19</li> <li>Authorizing Contract</li> <li>NACSA Standard #5 – Closure</li> </ul>	Closure protocol lacks many required elements	Closure protocol lacks some required elements	Closure protocol is clear and comprehensive with reasonable timelines	Level 2 <i>and</i> In the event a school was closed within the five years preceding the evaluation, authorizer worked with the school governing board and leadership in carrying out the closure protocol
E.3 SPECIFICATIONS			INDICATOR LEVEL SPECIFICATIONS			
<p><b>Specific Data Sources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance Evaluation Response Form:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brief narrative response addressing guiding question and evidence</li> <li>Authorizer’s school closure protocol and processes</li> <li>If applicable, evidence of efforts the authorizer made to coordinate an orderly school closure with school governing board and leadership</li> </ul> </li> <li>Interviews, surveys, site visits, and independent observations</li> </ul> <p><b>Points Possible</b> 6 Level 0 = 0 points, Level 1 = 2 points, Level 2 = 4 points, Level 3 = 6 points</p>			Three or more elements under Level 2 specification are not met	One or two elements under Level 2 specification are not met	Closure protocol includes the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedures that require the authorizer to not only oversee, but also to work with the school’s governing board and leadership;</li> <li>Details to cover all of major situations that would arise in a closure process;</li> <li>Timely notification to parents;</li> <li>Orderly transition of students and student records to new schools;</li> <li>Disposition of school funds, property, and assets in accordance with law; and</li> <li>Sufficient time for school to comply with authorizer’s</li> </ul>	Level 2 specifications were met for at least the last two years <i>and</i> Evidence authorizer made every effort to coordinate an orderly school closure with the school governing board and leadership



			closure protocol without compromising public interest	
--	--	--	---	--

DRAFT