

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

### Authorizer Information

**Authorizer:** Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools

**Authorizer Type:** Single-Purpose

**Evaluation Period:** January 2017 – December 2021

**Report Issue Date:** December 8, 2021

### Characteristics of the Authorizer

- The Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools (the Guild) is a single-purpose authorizer whose mission is to improve the educational achievement of Minnesota students by advocating a systemic approach to charter school formation and operation that promotes stakeholder accountability, autonomy, and competence. The Guild has a variety of schools in its portfolio and has a specific interest in schools that serve students most affected by the achievement gap and low graduation rates.
- The Guild is committed to growing a portfolio of charter schools that promote, establish and expand teacher-powered models and autonomies. The Guild does not limit its schools' models or programs, and instead, promotes teacher-powered schools through professional development opportunities. It also emphasizes this priority to new school applicants.
- The Guild's portfolio includes 15 operational schools and two preoperational schools which are located across the state.
- The Guild implements a small staffing model, with one full-time staff member (the executive director [ED]) and a part-time staff member (administrative assistant) with a lead educational consultant as a core part of the team. Additionally, it uses consultants to fill gaps in staff capacity.

## Overall Performance Rating

**MAPES Overall Performance Rating for Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools is 1.63: Approaching Satisfactory**

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

A.1: Authorizing Mission (2.5 percent)*	2
A.2: Authorizer Organizational Goals (1.25 percent)**	1
A.3: Authorizer Structure of Operations (2.5 percent)	2
A.4: Authorizing Staff Expertise (2.5 percent)	2
A.5: Authorizer Knowledge and Skill Development of Authorizing Leadership and Staff (2.5 percent)**	3
A.6: Authorizer Operational Budget for Authorizing the Portfolio of Charter Schools (2.5 percent)	0
A.7: Authorizer Operational Conflicts of Interest (2.5 percent)	1
A.8: Ensuring Autonomy of the Charter Schools in the Portfolio (2.5 percent)	4
A.9: Authorizer Self-Evaluation of Capacity, Infrastructure and Practices (1.25 percent)**	3
A.10: Authorizer High-Quality Authorizing Dissemination (1.25 percent)**	2
A.11: Authorizer Compliance to Responsibilities Stated in Statute (3.75 percent)	4
<b>Total Performance Measures A Rating:</b>	<b>2.30</b>

### Performance Measures B: Authorizer Processes and Decision-Making – 75 Percent Weight of Overall Rating

B.1: New Charter School Decisions (11.25 percent)*	1
B.2: Interim Accountability Decisions (11.25 percent: 3.75 percent for expansion requests; 3.75 percent for ready to open standards; 3.75 percent for change in authorizers)	
Expansion Requests (3.75 percent)	2
Ready to Open Standards (3.75 percent)	2
Change in Authorizers (3.75 percent)	2
B.3: Contract Term, Negotiation and Execution (7.5 percent)	2
B.4: Performance Outcomes and Standards (11.25 percent)	1
B.5: Authorizer's Processes for Ongoing Oversight of the Portfolio of Charter Schools (7.5 percent)	1
B.6: Authorizer's Standards and Processes for Interventions, Corrective Action and Response to Complaints (3.75 percent)**	3
B.7: Charter School Support, Development and Technical Assistance (3.75 percent overall weight)**	3
B.8: High-Quality Charter School Replication and Dissemination of Best School Practices (3.75 percent)**	0
B.9: Charter School Renewal and Termination Decisions (15 percent)	1
<b>Total Performance Measures B Rating:</b>	<b>1.40</b>

*\*All percentages are presented in terms of overall weight*

*\*\*Continuous Improvement Measure*

## Performance Measures A: Authorizer Capacity and Infrastructure

### A.1 Measure: Authorizing Mission

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

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 2-Satisfactory

**Finding:** The authorizer has a clear and compelling mission for charter school authorizing.

- The mission is stated and fully aligns with Minnesota charter school statute. The Guild’s website, New Charter School Application and Operating Guide state that it is a single-purpose authorizer whose mission is to “improve the educational achievement of Minnesota students by advocating a systemic approach to charter school formation and operation that promotes stakeholder accountability, autonomy, and competence.” This aligns with Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.01, subdivision 1. As outlined in the Operating Guide and confirmed during the authorizer interview, the secondary focus of the Guild’s mission is its vision, which is to promote and authorize teacher-powered schools whose focus is to “create new professional opportunities for teachers, including the opportunity to be responsible for the learning program at the school site.” The vision statement is also included on the Guild’s website, in its Operating Guide and in its New Charter School Application.
- The narrative states that the Guild is carrying out its mission by promoting stakeholder accountability, autonomy and competence. The narrative explains that promoting teacher-powered schools is an effective way to promote autonomy. The Contract Template upholds school autonomy, and the contracted performance indicators and monitoring processes ensure competence and accountability of the authorizer’s schools. Evidence provided indicates that authorizing staff have attended Teacher-Powered Schools conferences and encouraged their schools to attend as well. For example, Board meeting minutes indicate that a group of 13 Guild representatives attended the Teacher-Powered Schools conference in Los Angeles in January 2017. Additionally, survey data indicates that 75 percent (n = 12) of the Guild’s schools noted that the Guild’s priority of teacher empowerment through professional voice, choice and leadership was either extremely clear or very clear. The New School Application also asks schools to explain how their mission and vision “intends to support the Guild’s priority to promote teacher-powered schools (encouraged, but not required.)” During the school leader interviews, participants confirmed that the Guild encourages, but does not require, teacher-powered schools.
- The authorizer implements its mission from the commissioner-approved authorizer application (AAA). A review of board meeting minutes shows that the Guild revised its mission on February 27, 2017, to align with the AAA. The mission as stated within the authorizer’s Operating Guide, New Charter School Application and on its website is the same as that articulated in its AAA; however, the vision statement is not part of the AAA. The narrative states, and a review of board minutes confirms, that the Guild’s mission and vision statements are stated on Guild board meeting agendas and minutes.
- The Guild’s mission was not verified internally with consistent responses from interviewed individuals. For example, during the authorizer interview, while all interviewed members of the team could discuss one element of the vision (teacher-powered schools), not all Guild interviewees spoke to the formal stated mission of the Guild.

**Key Evidence:**

- A.1 Narrative
- AAA
- 20.07-30 New Charter School Application MN Guild

- 02.27.17 Guild Board Minutes
- 21.5-11 Updated MN Guild Operating Guide
- Guild Contract Template updated Spring 2021
- Winter FY21 Guild Schools Survey Response Summary
- Authorizer Review and Comment Submission Form – The Guild
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021
- Charter school leader interviews, September 17, 2021

## A.2 Measure: Authorizer Organizational Goals

**Guiding Question:** *Does the authorizer have clear organizational goals and timeframes for achievement that are aligned with its authorizing mission and Minnesota charter school statute?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 1-Approaching Satisfactory

**Finding:** The authorizer has organizational goals aligned with its authorizing mission and Minnesota charter school statute; however, goals do not have criteria or timeframes for achievement.

- The Guild has clear organizational goals that are related to charter authorizing and aligned with state statute. As stated in the narrative and as confirmed in the authorizer interview, the Guild’s organizational goals include: (1) Continue to advance a portfolio of teacher-powered schools in which teachers are leaders of the school; (2) Maintain high standards for schools’ academic, operational and financial performance; and (3) Uphold school autonomy through clear contract terms, oversight, monitoring and support.
- The Guild’s organizational goals are not consistent with the Guild’s corrective action documentation for A.2 as part of its AAA. For instance, while the Guild’s corrective action documentation includes organizational goals focused on the number of schools to open per year, these goals are not aligned with the organizational goals stated in the narrative or during the authorizer interview. For example, the goals stated in the CAP documentation “Goal Timeframes,” states that in 2016-17 the Guild will have 17 schools open, in 2017-18 they will have 16 schools open, in 2018-19 they will have 19 schools open, in 2019-20 and in 2020-21 they will have 23 schools open. None of the CAP goals are aligned to the goals stated in the narrative or authorizer interview.
- The Guild’s organizational goals, as seen in the narrative and confirmed in the interview, do not include specific criteria or timeframes for achievement. The Guild did provide evidence of formative goal reviews with the board and three-month planning activities, demonstrating that the Guild uses a three-month planning cycle to manage its workflow and prioritize work; however, it is unclear how the Guild tracks its progress toward its organizational goals. Additionally, documentation did not demonstrate evidence of specific criteria or timeframes for achievement of the organizational goals.

### Key Evidence:

- A.2 Narrative
- AAA
- AAA CAP Document 17.03-23 A2 Organizational Goal Timeframes
- Updates on Guild Board Goals for 2017-2018
- Minnesota Guild Formative Goals for 2020-2021
- MN Guild 2020 Summer Activities
- Three-month Planning March 2021 and Three-month Plan of Action March 2020
- Authorizer Review and Comment Submission Form – The Guild
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021

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

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree does the authorizer operate with a clear structure of duties and responsibilities and sufficient resources to effectively oversee its portfolio of charter schools?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 2-Satisfactory

**Finding:** The authorizer operates with a clear structure of duties and responsibilities and sufficient resources to effectively oversee its portfolio of charter schools.

- The Guild has a clear and defined structure of duties and responsibilities that sufficiently meets the needs of the portfolio of charter schools. The narrative and organizational chart provide a clear organizational structure comprised of the Guild Board led by its board chair, an ED (1.0 Full Time Employee [FTE]), a lead educational consultant (0.7 FTE), an administrative assistant (0.8 FTE), and additional consultants as needed. The Guild provided an overview of its leadership transition in 2018 and its adjustments over the years to its structure, duties and responsibilities. For example, as part of the transition to a new ED, the Guild moved away from a full-time director of programs to a lead educational consultant and eventually hired an administrative assistant in early 2020. The job descriptions for each position are clear and define responsibilities that were verified during the authorizer interview.
- The Guild's structure of duties and responsibilities is updated when necessary, as noted in the narrative and transition documents. During the interview, the authorizer consistently described the 2018 leadership transition and stated that it now uses external consultants largely to fill gaps on a per-project basis. The narrative states, and board minutes demonstrate, that the Guild has increased the hours to almost full time for both the lead educational consultant and the administrative assistant to meet the demands of schools going through the renewal and new school affidavit processes, and support monthly and ad-hoc meetings and calls throughout the pandemic.
- The Guild appropriately manages, retains and safeguards school and student information and records relating to authorizing. There is an agreement between the Guild and the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) signed in 2017, outlining data sharing protocols between these two organizations. The narrative states and the annual reports indicate that school documents and records are secured in Epicenter and Google Drive, and the authorizer shared a policy for data retention that includes general guidance to securely retain all documents. Evidence in the corrective action plan (CAP) documents from March 2017 show that Epicenter has been in use since March 2017.
- Level 2 indicators were met for at least three, but not four years. While the authorizer verified the structure of duties, responsibilities and staffing levels during the interview, and verified that they have been in place for three years (since July 2018), documentation does not confirm that sufficient staffing levels have been in place for more than three years.

**Key Evidence:**

- A.3 Narrative
- AAA
- FY 2017 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2018 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2019 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2020 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- Basic Guild Org Chart

- 17.03-14 Guild CAP Deliverables
- 2018 Minnesota Guild Leadership Transition
- Guild Executive Director Job Description
- Position Description- Lead Educational Consultant
- MN Guild Admin Asst Posting January 2020
- MN Guild Data Retention Policy
- 17.11-13 Fully Executed Guild-MDE Authorizer Data Sharing Agreement
- 20.10-29 Guild Board Meeting Minutes
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021

#### **A.4 Measure: Authorizing Staff Expertise**

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree does the authorizer have appropriate experience, expertise and skills to sufficiently oversee the portfolio of charter schools?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 2-Satisfactory

**Finding:** Authorizing staff has sufficient experience, expertise and skills to oversee the portfolio of charter schools.

- Guild staff have appropriate experience, expertise and skills in charter school academics, finance, operations and law. A review of resumes shows that the Guild's former ED has 20 years of charter school and authorizing experience including leading the initial development and implementation of MAPES. The Guild's lead consultant has over 20 years of experience in charter schools, specifically in supporting the development and review of academic programs, and in providing oversight in the areas of academic, fiscal and operational performance. The resume of the Guild's founder and current board chair shows 17 years of teaching experience as well as a background in facilitating professional development. The other board members each bring their own relevant experience including American Federation of Teachers (AFT) members and leaders and those who have served on school boards. Additionally, they provide expertise in areas such as technology and communications; law and education policy; teaching and school development; talent and teacher preparation, and budgeting and finance. All board members have been on the Guild's board for several years, with the most recent member joining in 2017.
- Guild staff sufficiently oversee the portfolio of charter schools. As noted in the narrative, the authorizer's staff, board members, and board advisors have experience, expertise and skills in charter school authorizing, academic program development, teacher training and development, English language learning, finance and operations and law as evidenced by resumes. During the authorizer interview and in the narrative, the participants explained that the Guild hires external consultants to provide additional expertise as needed. For example, the authorizer recognized a need to hire an expert to conduct the review of the schools' financial reports and they have taken steps to hire an external consultant for the project.
- The Guild did not demonstrate how its staff experience, expertise and skills align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards. When asked in the interview how the skills and expertise of their staff align with national standards, the authorizer could not explain alignment with national standards, nor was it explicitly articulated in the narrative or provided documents.

**Key Evidence:**

- A.4 Narrative
- AAA
- Guild Board Member Resumes, Bios, Professional Development Info and Impact Statements
- Guild Staff Resumes
- HBAmaya Resume
- Rachel Ngendakuriyo General Resume
- Skills Matrix
- Org Training Attendance 18.07-19 Authorizer Conference Agenda
- Authorizer Review and Comment Submission Form – The Guild
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021

## **A.5 Measure: Authorizer Knowledge and Skill Development of Authorizing Leadership and Staff**

**Guiding Questions:** *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 the authorizer's operations, mission and goals for overseeing its portfolio of charter schools?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 3-Commendable

**Finding:** The authorizer builds the knowledge and skill base of its authorizing leadership and staff through regular professional development that is aligned to its operations, mission and goals.

- Professional development is intentional and planned to build the knowledge and skill base of authorizing leadership and staff. Each annual report since 2017 describes an extensive list of professional development sessions attended by Guild staff. Particularly, Guild staff consistently participate in Minnesota Association of Charter School Authorizer (MACSA) monthly meetings and activities; attend the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) Leadership Conference; attend the Teacher-Powered Schools conference; and engage in MDE meetings to learn about compliance, sharing practice, support strategies and responsive practices to the pandemic. Board members have also regularly participated in a range of relevant professional development, as evidenced by the Board Member Bios. In a letter to Novation Education Opportunities (NEO) in January 2020, the Guild demonstrates an intentional effort to strengthen the Guild's expertise in finance and operations, data storage (Epicenter) and new charter school application. Additionally, a letter to Osprey Wilds Environmental Learning Center (OWELC) also shows collaboration between this authorizer and the Guild on the charter school application process through a New Charter School Application Work Group as well as through support with data storage (Epicenter).
- Professional development aligns with the authorizer's operations, mission and organizational goals for overseeing its portfolio of charter schools. Board minutes show an annual board retreat in which reflection and areas of improvement and need for professional development are identified and aligned with the goals of the organization for the year. Additionally, Guild staff and board members have attended Teacher-Powered Schools conferences and many other professional development offerings on the topic of teacher-powered schools, aligning directly with the Guild's mission and vision, particularly the aspects dealing with stakeholder and teacher autonomy. Those opportunities also align with the Guild's organizational goal, "continue to advance a portfolio of teacher-powered schools in which teachers are leaders of the school." Guild staff and board members have attended a wide variety of professional development offerings on general topics regarding charter schools and the authorizer role (NACSA conferences and trainings, MDE boot camps, etc.), in alignment with the Guild's operations and its organizational goal to "maintain high standards for schools' academic, operational, and financial performance."
- Professional development attended is sufficient to fulfill professional development commitments in the authorizer's AAA. Participants in the authorizer interview affirmed the Guild's commitment to and membership in both NACSA and MACSA. Annual reports from 2017 to 2020 show that the authorizer's leadership staff attended professional development sessions, including those offered by MDE, MACSA and NACSA.
- As noted above, professional development is attended regularly by leadership and staff. Professional development is also ongoing and occurs more than once a year as shown by the consistent participation in MACSA meetings and activities, the NACSA leadership conference, Teacher-Powered School conference and MDE hosted opportunities – including MDE bootcamp for the Guild's administrative assistant.
- Professional development is not measured or evaluated. The narrative did not explain nor was there evidence provided of professional development activities being measured or evaluated by the Guild.

**Key Evidence:**

- A.5 Narrative
- AAA
- FY 2017 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2018 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2019 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2020 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- Guild Board Member Bios, Professional Development info and Impact Statements
- Guild Staff Resumes
- 19.08-16 Board Retreat Minutes
- 20.01-22 Letter of Thanks to NEO
- 20.08-11 Letter of Thanks to OWELC
- Authorizer Review and Comment Submission Form – The Guild
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021

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

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree is the authorizer's actual resource allocation commensurate with its stated budget, and the needs and responsibilities of authorizing the portfolio of charter schools?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 0-Unsatisfactory or Incomplete

**Finding:** The authorizer's resource allocations for authorizing have not been sufficient to meet the needs and responsibilities of authorizing the portfolio of charter schools.

- The Guild's resource allocations are not consistent with the commitments in its AAA. In the Guild's CAP A.6 document submission 17.03-23 5-Year projections, the revenue projected (for example \$359,652.05 for SY2019-20) is higher than what is described in the narrative (\$267,320 for FY2020) for the last five years. The actual difference in the number of schools projected to open, when the CAP was written in 2017, compared to the actual number of schools opened, is unclear and the reasons for those differences are unclear. During the authorizer interview, the authorizer was unable to speak to the alignment of its resource allocations with its AAA commitments. The Guild subsequently clarified with additional documentation that they planned on increasing to 23 schools over the course of this term, but mitigating circumstances prevented them from opening the number of schools projected in their 2017 CAP, and therefore budget and revenue projections were adjusted. However, these adjustments are not consistent with its AAA.
- The Guild's resource allocations have not been sufficient to fulfill its authorizing responsibilities for at least three years. The authorizer has added key staff, such as the administrative assistant in the last two years and as noted in B.1, the authorizer determined that it did not have the capacity as an organization to run a new school application process, and that decision was made after the process began with letters of intent submitted. During the authorizer interview, the authorizer explained that it has scaled back on the number of schools it opened based on its capacity as an organization and has updated its new school projections in its FY2022 Budget with FY2023-26 Revenue Projections. Additionally, during the authorizer interview, the authorizer explained that the Guild now has a system for estimating its consulting needs using the Final FY2021 Consultant Categories for Budgeting spreadsheet, with this practice being new in the last one to two years.

### **Key Evidence:**

- A.6 Narrative
- AAA
- FY 16-17 Guild Budget vs. Actuals
- FY 17-18 Guild Budget vs. Actuals
- FY 18-19 Guild Budget vs. Actuals
- FY 19-20 Guild Budget vs. Actuals
- FY 20-21 Guild Budget vs. Actuals
- CAP: 17.03-23 A6. Guild Schools - 5-Year Projections (03.22.2017) - Schools.pdf
- MN Guild FY22 Budget with FY2023-26 Revenue Projections
- Final FY21 Consultant Categories for Budgeting
- Contract Schedule
- 20.12-08 Important Update – MN Guild's FY21 Application Process (Letter On File with MDE)

- 5-Year FY18-22
- 2019 Projections
- A.6 2018 Review of Guild Schools
- A.6 Guild School and Leaders (05.15.2018) - Schools
- New School Prospects-ExecComm
- Authorizer Review and Comment Submission Form – The Guild
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021

## A.7 Measure: Authorizer Operational Conflicts of Interest

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree does the authorizer implement a clear policy to address conflicts of interest in all decision-making processes concerning the portfolio of charter schools?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 1-Approaching Satisfactory

**Finding:** The authorizer does not consistently implement a clear policy to address conflicts of interest in all decision-making processes concerning the portfolio of charter schools.

- The Guild’s Conflict of Interest (COI) Policy in the Operating Guide is clear and intentionally implemented. The COI policy states that the Guild will not enter into the following contracts with the schools it authorizes: administration, financial management, accounting or auditing services and real estate leasing. In addition, the Operating Guide describes the Guild’s COI policy as it applies to Guild staff and Board members. Conflict of Interest is also addressed in Article III, sections 6 and 7 of the Guild Bylaws.
- The Guild avoids conflicts of interest that might affect its capacity to make objective, merit-based application and renewal decisions. Guild board minutes include a screen for conflicts at the start of each meeting (a practice that began in 2020). Documentation of the COI policy on the Guild website as well as interviews with the authorizer and charter school leaders confirmed that the conflict of interest policy is implemented by the Guild.
- The authorizer does not follow its conflict of interest policy as outlined in its AAA. The Guild’s policy is part of the Guild’s Operating Guide and states, in part, that *“Persons with any actual or perceived conflict of interest shall disclose the situation to the Guild Director and/or the Board President. Those with a conflict of interest are excluded from Guild deliberations and voting to ensure they have no influence over the organization regarding the compensation for or business transactions of themselves or of related persons.”* Review of emails finds that the Guild contacted MDE in June 2018 after discovering a COI in 2018 with the actions and business involvements of its ED at the time. During the authorizer interview (and verified by a 2018 email between MDE and the Guild), the authorizer explained that it learned about the COI through conversations with school leaders at Guild schools. However, the ED did not disclose this COI as was required by the COI policy outlined in the AAA.
- The Guild’s COI policy ensures that 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. The narrative states that the Guild ensures that all application reviewers complete and sign a disclosure form that defines actual, potential and perceived COIs and a completed example from 2020 was provided. This practice and others mentioned above were cited during the authorizer interview.

### Key Evidence:

- A.7 Narrative
- AAA
- MN Guild of Public Charter Schools – Operating Guide
- Guild Bylaws 10.18.17
- Rachel Ngendakuriyo COI form 2020
- 20.11-19 MN Guild Board Meeting Minutes
- Guild website
- 19.07-29 Exploration High School Board Minutes

- 18.04-02 Federal CSP Grant Inquiry
- 18.06-08 MDE Letter to Guild
- 18.06-08 Email Letter Re Guild Concerns
- 18.07-05 Email Complaints against former Guild ED
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021
- Charter school leader interviews, September 17, 2021

## A.8 Measure: Ensuring Autonomy of the Charter Schools in the Portfolio

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree does the authorizer preserve and support the essential autonomies of the portfolio of charter schools?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 4-Exemplary

**Finding:** The authorizer consistently preserves and supports the essential autonomies of its portfolio of charter schools.

- The Guild’s autonomy policy, as included in the Contract Template, states in Article II, “The Guild shall have no authority or control over operational, administrative, or financial responsibility for the School” and further outlines the responsibility of each school’s board in the management of operations, academics and finances (Article VI).
- The Guild’s autonomy policy establishes and recognizes the schools’ authority over academics, financials and operations and respects the school’s authority over the schools’ day-to-day operations. In addition to the policy included in the contract template, the Guild has adopted an autonomy statement that is published on its website, which states that “the Guild recognizes its purpose in charter school authorizing is to improve all pupil learning and all student achievement. To do so, the Guild will engage in responsible oversight of charter schools by ensuring that authorized schools have the autonomy and independence to which they are entitled while being held accountable to statutory and contractual expectations.” The statement further identifies specific guidelines and actions, including language that the Guild will not operate or manage any of its schools, that the Guild will only offer voluntary technical assistance, and that the Guild will only require actions of schools in response to contract or statute. The authorizer’s autonomy statement explicitly states that the authorizer does not manage or operate any charter school nor require schools to engage in technical assistance; rather, the policy states that the authorizer is responsible for holding authorized schools accountable for their performance.
- The Guild’s autonomy policy aligns with its practice for preserving school autonomy. During the interview, the authorizer repeatedly referenced its commitment to its schools’ autonomy. For example, the authorizer described an instance where it received a complaint about one of its schools concerning graduation requirements. The Guild worked with the school and the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) to ensure that the school was correctly transferring credits and meeting the state’s required credits for graduation. The provided correspondence (dated from September 2019 through March 2020) between the Guild, the school and MDE demonstrates that the Guild worked with the school to address the complaint and liaised with MDE to ensure that the school was meeting requirements. School leaders also confirmed during the interview that the Guild supports a variety of education models and that the Guild was very clear that the technical assistance it offered is optional.
- As stated in the narrative and in the interview, the Guild’s policy is in accordance with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards which state that a quality authorizer upholds school autonomy in the following areas: governing board independence from the authorizer; personnel; school vision and culture; instructional programming, design and use of time; and budgeting. The authorizer requests and reviews monthly reports on financials and it conducts board meeting observations and site visits.
- As stated above, during the school leader interviews, participants consistently verified that the authorizer has preserved and supported the essential autonomies of the portfolio of charter schools. Furthermore, 71 percent of respondents to the Charter School Leadership Survey agreed or strongly agreed that the authorizer preserves the school board’s autonomy over policy matters related to operating the school. Four respondents (24 percent) neither agreed nor disagreed. 82 percent of participants agreed with the statement that, in the five past years, they have felt that the Guild has supported their school’s autonomy.

**Key Evidence:**

- A.8 Narrative
- AAA
- FY 2017 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2018 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2019 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2020 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- MN Guild Statement of School Autonomy
- Guild’s Contract Template
- NACSA Principles and Standards, 2018 Edition
- Guild website
- Email Correspondence re- CPath March 2020 Complaint wrap-up
- 19.09-24 MDE Letter to Guild re Career Pathways
- 19.10-11 MN Guild Response to CPATH Complaint
- 20.02-25 MDE Letter to Guild re Career Pathways
- 20.03-13 MDE Letter to Guild re Career Pathways -Complaint Closed
- Charter School Leadership Survey
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021
- Charter school leader interviews, September 17, 2021

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

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree does the authorizer self-evaluate its internal ability (capacity, infrastructure and practices) to oversee the portfolio of charter schools?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 3-Commendable

**Finding:** The authorizer regularly self-evaluates its internal ability (capacity, infrastructure and practices) to oversee its portfolio of charter schools.

- The Guild regularly evaluates its internal ability to oversee the portfolio of charter schools. As stated in the narrative and as shown in annual reports, the Guild's board has made changes to the organization's leadership to provide better oversight to its portfolio of schools. This included appointing a new ED, adding board members and consultants with increased expertise especially in law and adding an administrative assistant to support their increased needs.
- The Guild's self-evaluations are intentional and planned to build its capacity, infrastructure and practices to oversee its portfolio of charter schools. In the Guild's CAP, it explains that the Guild conducts self-evaluation in the following areas: 1) annual staff performance evaluation; 2) annual review of staff levels to ensure alignment with oversight protocols and staff; 3) school portfolio ratio; and 4) regular procedure and process reviews, including annual school leader surveys. The Guild board meets regularly (usually monthly) to review schools, staff, finances and goals. In addition, the board has an executive committee and a finance committee responsible for the review of the authorizer's finances, priorities, and strategic planning. Board minutes show and the authorizer interview confirmed that the board participates in an annual board retreat to evaluate the past year's performance and set goals. Additionally, as the narrative states, the Guild conducted a survey of its schools in 2021 to get feedback on their efforts and performance as an authorizer. During the interview, the authorizer explained that as a result of the survey, the Guild entered into an agreement to provide schools with the Hope Survey, training on its use and support in developing ongoing practices based on its results. School participation in this offering is voluntary and is paid for by the Guild.
- The narrative explained a process by which the Guild conducts a three-month planning cycle for continuous improvement of their practices. During the interview, the authorizer explained that beginning in 2020, every three months board officers and staff go through the priorities for the quarter, and review performance from the past three months to determine how they can improve the organization and support for their schools. It is a way they hold staff and board members accountable for continuous improvement. For example, the authorizer provided three month plans of action notes from March-May 2020 and March-May 2021, mapping out tactical items and key projects to accomplish during that time.
- While the Guild engages in regular self-evaluation and a cycle of implementing continuous improvement efforts, how it aligns its evaluations with nationally recognized standards is unclear.

### **Key Evidence:**

- A.9 Narrative
- AAA
- Guild Self-Evaluation
- Guild and Talent Enthusiasts HOPE Survey Agreement 2021-2022
- Winter FY21 Guild Schools Survey Response Summary
- FY 2017 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2018 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools

- FY 2019 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2020 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- 19.08-16 Board Retreat Meeting Minutes
- MN Guild 2020 Summer Activities
- Three-month Plan of Action March 2020
- Three-month Planning March 2021
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021

## **A.10 Measure: Authorizer High-Quality Authorizing Dissemination**

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree does the authorizer disseminate best authorizing practices and/or assist other authorizers in high-quality authorizing?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 2-Satisfactory

**Finding:** The authorizer engages with other authorizers to improve the authorizing community of practice.

- The Guild engages with other authorizers to improve the authorizing community of practice. The narrative and the Guild's annual reports state that the Guild joined both MACSA and NACSA in FY2019. In SY2019-20, Guild staff participated regularly in MACSA monthly meetings and activities. Additionally, the Guild's former ED attended the NACSA 2019 Leadership Conference in St. Louis, MO. The former ED and the Guild's lead educational consultant also attended meetings and events for charter school authorizers hosted by MDE through SY2019-20, including the authorizer conference hosted by MDE in December 2019. Guild staff members participated in ongoing MDE calls to learn about how to prepare for and operate during the COVID-19 pandemic. At the SY2019-20 MACSA annual conference, the Guild's lead consultant chaired a MACSA committee that was focused on effective practices in charter authorizing. As a panel monitor, the consultant also participated in a US Department of Education review of state entity grant proposals in the Spring of 2020.
- The Guild does not regularly share best practices with and/or provide technical assistance to other authorizers. The March 2017 CAP documentation shows that the Guild intended to share practices through a blog on their website; however, the authorizer interview confirmed this action is not taking place. The authorizer stated in the narrative that one of their goals in the upcoming years is to have more of a voice in disseminating high-quality practices.

### **Key Evidence:**

- A.10 Narrative
- AAA
- FY 2017 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2018 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2019 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2020 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- Guild Website
- Guild's Dissemination-Authorizing Practices
- CAP Part A Deliverables Rubric Response
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021

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

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree does the authorizer comply with reporting, submissions and deadlines set forth in Minnesota Statutes?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 4-Exemplary

**Finding:** The authorizer regularly complies with reporting, submissions and deadlines set forth in Minnesota Statutes.

- According to the MAPES Compliance Data Spreadsheet, since the start of the current term, the Guild was 100 percent compliant in all areas including: attendance at MDE trainings; statement of income and expenditures; renewed charter contracts, and authorizer annual reports.

**Key Evidence:**

- A.11 Narrative
- MAPES Compliance Data Spreadsheet – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools

## Performance Measures A: Rating (25 Percent Weight of Overall Rating)

**MAPES Performance Measures A Rating for Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools is 2.30.**

### Performance Measures A: Rating Drivers

- While the Guild has organizational goals aligned with its mission and vision, charter authorizing and state statute, it is unclear how the Guild tracks its progress toward its organizational goals including specific criteria to measure progress and timeframes to achieve the goals of its work.
- The Guild's organizational and staffing structure was changed following the change in ED in 2018. The Guild's current structure is clear with duties divided among the board chair, ED, administrative assistant and lead educational consultant. The staff, board, and board advisors have sufficient experience, expertise and skills in charter school authorizing, academic program development, teacher training and development, English language learning, finance and operations and law, as evidenced by resumes. During the authorizer interview, the participants explained that the Guild hires external consultants to provide additional expertise as needed and fill gaps on a per-project basis.
- While the Guild has worked to shift its resource allocations and project its consulting needs in a more strategic way, the Guild's resource allocations have not been demonstrated to fulfill its authorizing responsibilities for at least three years. The authorizer has added key staff, such as the administrative assistant in the last two years, but for FY2021 the authorizer determined that it did not have the capacity as an organization to run a new school application process, and that decision was made after the process began with letters of intent submitted.
- The Guild is committed to preserving and supporting the essential autonomies of its portfolio of charter schools. Its autonomy statement is published on its website and the Guild's follow-through on implementing its autonomy policy was evident throughout documentation and it was confirmed by the authorizer and school leader interviews.

### Performance Measures A: Recommendations

- Update the AAA to a commissioner-approved authorizing plan (AAP) to ensure alignment to each performance measure.
- Create criteria by which the organizational goals can be measured, and ensure that these criteria are clear and include timeframes for achievement with annual milestones. Consider revising the broad organizational goals to SMART goals (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound).
- Document the full timeline and process for projecting projects and workstreams each year and make decisions about priorities prior to a new fiscal year beginning, to ensure that staffing levels can meet the needs of the existing portfolio of schools and potential new schools.

## Performance Measures B: Authorizer Processes and Decision-Making

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

**Guiding Questions:** *To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals? To what degree did the authorizer's decisions and resulting actions align to its stated approval and process standards and promote the growth of high-quality charter schools?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 1-Approaching Satisfactory

**Finding:** The authorizer has clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate new charter school proposals. However, the authorizer's decisions and resulting actions do not consistently align with its stated approval and process standards and promote the growth of high-quality charter schools.

- The Guild's application process (updated in February 2020) is comprehensive and includes clear application questions covering mission and vision, educational program, and governance, management and administration, as well as an additional section for early learning programs, and guidance on how to align with statute. It also includes fair, transparent procedures, and criteria for evaluation; however, prior to the 2020 application cycle, the application process did not include clear timelines and procedures. The Guild's criteria for application approval are listed in the New School Application Instructions as well. Each section of the application is rated on a three-point scale. In 2020, the Guild made efforts to improve its review process and updated the three-point scale from "Inadequate-Satisfactory-Excellent," to a scale of "Beginning-Approaches-Meets." During the interview, the authorizer described its new school application process encompassing the following steps: a meeting to share the Guild's priorities and determine fit with potential applicants; a letter of intent; a technical assistance meeting to review the application and Charter Schools Program (CSP) grant; a review of the application by reviewers hired as consultants; a capacity interview, and a round of feedback/asking applicants for clarifications before the Guild determines if they are going to move forward. The authorizer stated that it uses the review rubric, the interview and a team meeting to make this determination.
- The Guild's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools, as evidenced by the FY2021 application review cycle. December 2020 board minutes show and the authorizer interview confirmed that despite beginning the application process for 2021, after the letter of intent stage the Guild decided to stop the process citing capacity concerns at the Guild, which is inconsistent with its stated process. The Guild's board chair issued a letter to applicants regarding this decision a week prior to the Board meeting in which the Guild approved a stop to the new school application process.
- The Guild's decisions and resulting actions do not consistently align with its AAA. The process described in the narrative and in the authorizer interview and documented in the Operating Guide and in communications around the new charter school application and decision-making process, review, and feedback align with the process outlined in the 2017 New School Decisions CAP document. However, as previously mentioned, the Guild's decisions and resulting actions have not always been consistent with the stated process (as evidenced by the FY2021 application review cycle).

#### Key Evidence:

- B.1 Narrative
- AAA
- FY 2017 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2018 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools

- FY 2019 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2020 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- MN Guild New Charter School Application Instructions
- Guild-New School Application Instructions (2018)
- Updated MN Guild Operating Guide
- Charter School Application Review Rubric
- Guild website
- FY20 New Charter School Application Overview Technical Assistance
- Capacity Interview Questions-Rollingstone
- Capacity Interview Summary Rubric – Rollingstone
- New School Decision Sheet
- 20.12-17 Guild Board Mtg Minutes
- 20.12-08 Important Update – MN Guild’s FY21 Application Process (Letter On File with MDE)
- 2017 CAP Document New School Decision Sheet 1
- Future Academy-Review
- Future Academy-Review
- NewCSApplication
- Aspire LOI
- New School Listening Sessions2017
- Guild School Leaders 05.15.2018
- School to CAP targets
- Authorizer Review and Comment Submission Form – The Guild
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021

## **B.2 Measure: Interim Accountability Decisions (i.e., site/grade level/early learning expansions, ready to open, and change in authorizer)**

**Guiding Questions:** *To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive approval criteria and process standards to rigorously evaluate proposals of existing charter school expansion requests and other interim changes? To what degree did 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?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 2-Satisfactory

**Finding:** The authorizer has clear and comprehensive approval criteria and processes to rigorously evaluate proposals of existing charter school expansions requests and other interim changes. The authorizer's decisions and resulting actions regarding charter school expansion and other interim changes align with its stated approval and process standards but have not yet promoted the growth of high-quality charter schools.

- The Guild's application processes are comprehensive; include clear application questions and guidance and include fair, transparent procedures, timelines and rigorous criteria. The narrative explained that the Guild has a different application for grade-level, site and/or early childhood program expansion and replication and change of authorizer. The authorizer corrected its processes as shown in the March 2017 CAP documents Criteria for New and Existing School Reviews and the Interim Decisions Process, and then updated its policy for program expansion in 2019 and again in 2021 to provide more guidance, a timeline and a detailed rubric. The updated application for program expansion includes sections on Need and Demand, current academic performance, financial management, governance and management and early learning programs, if applicable. For a change of authorizer application, the Guild has an application process that includes a series of informal exploratory meetings with interested parties and provides an opportunity for the schools to learn more about the Guild. If the schools were still interested, the application process would proceed as described in the Operating Guide. This process was verified during the authorizer interview and shown in evidence of two potential schools expressing interest in changing authorizer in 2020: Bluffview and Ridgeway. The authorizer interview explained that after the first meeting stage, neither opted to continue with the process. Also as detailed in the narrative, for ready-to-open accountability, the Guild has two primary documents outlining projects and tasks that a school needs to complete/accomplish prior to receiving the approval to open. The first document is the Ready to Open Process that is included in the Operating Guide, which includes a checklist organized as sets of tasks addressing areas for all parts of school operations. The second document is language within the contract (as seen in the contract templates and contracts on file with MDE), that addresses targets for items like facilities acquisition, enrollment interest and talent hiring.
- The Guild's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio of charter schools. The Guild publishes its program expansion application on its website, and while school leaders were not clear on the process, they were aware that it exists and referenced that the document is on the website. As explained in the narrative, the Guild has only had one expansion application to the authorizer, the Community School of Excellence (CSE) in 2018. According to the narrative and corresponding documents (i.e., emails between the authorizer and applicant and the CSE application), the authorizer shows consistent application of decision-making in alignment with expansion application expectations. According to the narrative and corresponding documents (email correspondence and thank you letters), the Guild has not had any formal change in authorizer requests in the period since 2017. However, as outlined above, in FY2020 the Guild received informal inquiries from two schools, Bluffview and Ridgeway, both in Winona, who informed the Guild that they were also meeting with other authorizers to find the right fit. In the narrative, the Guild explained that schools need to follow the ready to open process included in the Operating Guide and in schools' contracts. Additionally, in the contract, there are specific milestones around enrollment, facilities and hiring that need to be met by specific dates and what the process is if the milestones are not met. For example,

documentation including an updated ready to open checklist for Exploration High School was provided along with a timeline demonstrating how the Guild followed its stated processes.

- The processes documented in the Operating Guide and in communications around the expansion application process, ready to open criteria and change in authorizer process are in alignment with the Guild's AAA and the changes made during the CAP process in 2017. For example, the CAP required the Guild to create a template and process to evaluate and approve a change in authorizer and the process submitted outlined steps to interview and perform due diligence about the school before the school applies. During the interview, the authorizer validated that this would be the process had Bluffview and Ridgeway proceeded with the change in authorizer process.
- While the Guild's interim accountability processes are comprehensive and consistent, documentation does not demonstrate alignment with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards nor of the processes reflecting a clear strategy to promote high-quality charter schools.

**Key Evidence:**

- B.2 Narrative
- AAA
- 2017 CAP documentation for B.2 – Interim Decisions, and Criteria for Reviews
- FY 2017 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2018 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2019 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2020 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- MN Guild Original Operating Guide and Updated Operation Guide
- MN Guild Expansion Application Instructions - July 2019
- 21.04-22 MN Guild Updated Expansion Process
- 18.08-06 CSE Email to Cindy re- Secondary Site Expansion
- CSE Expansion Application\_wExhibits\_09.02.2018
- Exploration High School Ready to Open Timeline
- ExHS Ready to Open Checklist Aug 2021 - ExHS RTO
- Guild Ready to Open Checklist
- 20.04-28 SmartGoals
- MN SmartGoals Charter Renewal
- Board minutes with goal updates
- Communications to Families
- Directors Report Mar FY21
- New Heights Performance Improvement Plan-3
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021
- Charter school leader interviews, September 17, 2021

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

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree does the authorizer execute contracts that clearly define material terms and rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 2- Satisfactory

**Finding:** The authorizer consistently executes contracts that clearly define material terms and rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer.

- According to the MAPES Compliance Data Spreadsheet, all contracts in the Guild’s portfolio of charter schools meet current statutory requirements for at least three years. However, the contract for Augsburg Fairview Academy is not compliant with statute based on MDE’s September 27, 2021 review.
- The Guild’s contracts clearly state the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer for at least three years. As explained in the narrative and seen in the contract template, the Guild embeds clear language about the rights and responsibilities of the school and the Guild into the contract; this information has been included in all MN Guild contracts, and has been clarified for FY2019, FY2020, and FY2021. Specifically, Article II specifies the relationship between the school and the Guild and Article III specifies the role of the Guild.
- The Guild’s contracting practices have been consistent for three years across the portfolio of charter schools. As noted above and explained in the narrative, the Guild employs a contract template to ensure its contracting practices are consistent across schools. For schools that do not achieve an adequate rating in one or more performance categories they receive a three-year contract and must create a performance plan. Once the elements of the performance plan have been met, the school may extend to a five-year contract. During the school leader interviews, it was explained that beginning in 2019, after the Guild’s leadership change, the goal setting process part of the contract became collaborative and supportive and included the use of the contract template. School leaders stated that now, after the change in leadership, the Guild has processes in place and schools know what to expect regarding contracts, goals and performance plans. During the authorizer interview, the Guild explained that it adjusts school goals as contracts come up for renewal.
- According to the MAPES Compliance Data Spreadsheet, all contracts over the course of the term were executed on time.
- Level 2 indicators were met for three years, but not for four years. While contracts were executed on time over the course of the term, contracting practices have been consistent for three years (beginning in 2019), as discussed above.

**Key Evidence:**

- B.3 Narrative
- AAA
- MAPES Compliance Data Spreadsheet – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- MDE Renewal Rubrics – September 2021 MDE Guild – Renewal Contract Compliance Review
- Guild Contract Template updated Spring 2021
- New Heights Performance Improvement Plan with Updates
- Renewal Timeline and Process for FY 2021
- School contracts on file with MDE

## B.4 Measure: Performance Outcomes and Standards

**Guiding Questions:** *To what degree does the authorizer execute contracts with clear, measurable and attainable performance standards? To what degree does the authorizer hold charter schools in its portfolio accountable to its academic, financial and operational performance outcomes and standards?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 1-Approaching Satisfactory

**Finding:** The authorizer executes contracts with clear, measurable and attainable performance standards. However, the authorizer does not consistently hold charter schools in its portfolio accountable to its academic, financial and operational performance outcomes and standards.

- Some contracts in the Guild’s portfolio do not meet current statutory performance standards, according to MDE’s September renewal contract compliance reviews. For example, Augsburg Fairview was not compliant with Minnesota Statutes, section 124E.10, subdivision 1, because the Performance Improvement Plan which includes specific performance outcomes and standards was missing from the contract.
- The Guild’s Contract Template and school contracts define clear, measurable and attainable academic, financial and operational performance outcomes and standards, and consequences for meeting or not meeting performance outcomes and standards. The performance measures used by the Guild are fully disclosed in the contract under Section 6.8 Performance Requirements. As noted in the narrative and illustrated with the example of Rochester Beacon Academy’s (RBA’s) evaluation report and contract, a school’s performance results are presented to the Guild on an annual basis. RBA was held accountable to their performance outcomes and as a result received a three-year contract due to its “inadequate” ratings on financial performance and its “partially adequate” ratings on academic performance. The school’s contract also states that, “If the School fails to achieve academic goals, financial targets, or comply with Applicable Laws or other requirements, the School may at any time prepare and implement an improvement plan to overcome such deficiencies.” As detailed in the narrative, the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) is included on page 25 of RBA’s renewal evaluation report, and the PIP defines additional interventions to ensure that contract performance goals are met in the future. Each school must commit to their performance goals under Section 6.8 Performance Requirements.
- The Guild’s performance standards are inconsistent across the authorizer’s portfolio of charter schools. As stated previously, the authorizer’s contracts include clear, measurable performance outcomes and standards; however, in both school leader interviews, leaders indicated that these standards have been not implemented consistently across the Guild schools over the term. School leaders were able to speak to the development of SMART goals and agree that they need to have SMART goals in all domains – academic, financial and organizational. However, they expressed confusion over how or when the Guild is measuring their attainment toward their annual goals, in contradiction to the narrative’s explanation that school’s performance results are presented on an annual basis. Additionally, they were unsure what actions would be taken if they did not meet their performance outcomes (e.g., goals). Specifically, during this discussion school leaders were asked if they were aware of consequences and next steps if they did not meet their school goals. The majority of school leaders responded they did not know, and some responded they were only somewhat clear on consequences and next steps. Further, documentation was not provided to demonstrate the consistent implementation of performance outcomes and standards over the contract term.
- The Guild’s contracts align with the performance standards of its AAA. Both the original and updated Operating Guide include the Contract Template with the Guild Evaluation Performance Indicators that are executed as part of each school’s contract, which is in alignment with the AAA and the B.4 CAP documentation of the contract updates.
- As previously mentioned, documentation was not provided to demonstrate that the Guild consistently holds charter schools accountable to contractual academic, financial and operational performance outcomes and

standards. Additionally, when asked, school leaders indicated they are uncertain about how or when attainment toward their annual goals is measured.

**Key Evidence:**

- B.4 Narrative
- AAA
- MDE Guild – Renewal Contract Compliance Review Rubric
- MN Guild Original Operating Guide
- 21.5-11 Updated MN Guild Operating Guide
- Guild New School Contract Template 07.12.2017
- Guild Contract Template Updated Spring 2021
- 21.09-27 MN Guild-AFA Renewal Contract Compliance Review Rubric
- 17.03-28 B9 Contract Renewal Review Rubric
- Renewal Evaluation Report Template MN Guild
- MN Guild CMO-EMO Contract Attachment
- 20.11-30 Revised Exhibit A- RBA Renewal Evaluation Report
- Authorizer Review and Comment Submission Form – The Guild
- Charter school leader interviews, September 17, 2021

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

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree does the authorizer monitor and oversee the charter schools in the areas of academics, operations and finances according to the processes outlined in the contract and the AAA?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 1-Approaching Satisfactory

**Finding:** The authorizer does not consistently monitor and oversee the charter schools in the areas of academics, operations and finances according to the processes outlined in the contract and the AAA.

- The Guild has clear processes for oversight and monitoring which are clearly outlined in its Operating Guide, in the Guild Contract Template under Section 3.1. Oversight Responsibilities of The Guild and in Article VI—Operating Requirements. This documentation, in addition to the Guild Oversight Accountability Review, outlines a review process with a focus on governance, academics, operations and financial performance.
- The Guild's oversight and monitoring activities align with its stated oversight and monitoring processes in its AAA. As previously mentioned, oversight and monitoring activities are included in both the Operating Guide and the contract template. The Operating Guide is included as a part of the authorizer's AAA; thus, the activities are in alignment with the stated processes.
- The Guild conducts oversight that competently evaluates academic, financial and operational performance and monitors compliance with applicable law. As stated in the narrative, the authorizer conducts scheduled and unscheduled site visits and an annual site visit, reviews of monthly financial statements, the annual budget and annual financial audit, compliance reviews and performance reviews. An example of the annual site visit report from Career Pathways shows an example of the site visit report as outlined in the Operating Guide. The authorizer's narrative stated it attends at least two meetings of the school's governing board and reviews the annual report for alignment with the Contract Agreement. The authorizer evaluates each school's academic, operational and financial performance against measures identified in the charter contract, and reviews data shared through Epicenter.
- The Guild's oversight and monitoring practices are not consistent across the portfolio of charter schools. While the authorizer provided site visit reports and annual review documentation for Career Pathways and New Heights, as well as three years of overviews of financial audits for all schools, during the school leader interviews, the level of oversight including site visits was stated to be unclear and inconsistent over the term. School leaders agreed that check-ins by the authorizer are unplanned, and it is unclear if the authorizer reviews the information each school submits annually, or if the Guild is checking on the progress of each schools' goals. Some school leaders noted that they did have the authorizer visit frequently and attend board meetings. All school leaders agree that Epicenter is used for monthly document submission, but none were able to speak to what happens after document review, or what would happen if a school were not meeting a goal for the year. Documentation was not provided to demonstrate the consistent implementation of the authorizer's oversight and monitoring practices, including site visits and document submission.

### **Key Evidence:**

- B.5 Narrative
- AAA
- FY 2017 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2018 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2019 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2020 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools

- Guild Contract Template updated Spring 2021
- MN Guild Original Operating Guide
- 21.5-11 Updated MN Guild Operating Guide
- Guild Oversight Accountability Review
- B.5 School Example- Career Pathways
- FY 2016-FY 2020 Career Pathways Contract Renewal Report
- 071218 Career Pathways Board Meeting notes from Guild visit
- Career Pathways Board Meeting notes from Guild visit May 8, 2020
- Website Compliance Audit\_03.22.2018
- Career Pathways Site Visit
- Career Pathways AR Review
- Career Pathways FY20 Annual Report Compliance Dashboard
- 21.08-03 Career Pathways Epicenter Stats
- 20.11-20 Revised Career Pathways Renewal Evaluation Report - signed.pdf
- 21.1-04 FY 20 Notes from Annual Report Review
- 20-9.30 New Heights Performance Improvement Plan
- Guild Site Visits 2018
- SciTech Response
- Scitech Epicenter Compliance
- Scitech Verifying Epicenter
- 21.03-02 Scitech Epicenter Compliance (1)
- 21.03-02 Scitech Epicenter Compliance (2)
- 21.03-02 Scitech Epicenter Compliance (3)
- CPE Renewal Report
- CPE Epicenter Compliance
- MN EO 20-20 FINAL SIGNED
- EO 20-01-CovidEmerge ncy
- EO 20-89 Emergency Extended
- Agenda Aligned with MAPES Metrics
- Authorizer Review and Comment Submission Form – The Guild
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021
- Charter school leader interviews, September 17, 2021

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

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and/or corrective action?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 3-Commendable

**Finding:** The authorizer has clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, interventions and corrective actions aligned to nationally recognized quality authorizing standards.

- The Guild implements clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action. The Guild's standards and process regarding a school reporting a significant "claim" or complaint are included in its contracts with schools, Section 6.20 Notification of a Claim, stating that a school will notify the Guild within five business days of the school's receipt of any significant claim. Both Section 6.9 Performance Requirements of the contract and the Gantt Template for intervention further specify what can occur if remediation or an improvement plan is needed because of a complaint or issue requiring resolution (initiated by either the authorizer or the school). For example, a school can submit an improvement plan to the Guild for review at any time in response to a school's identified need for intervention. If a school fails to meet goals and/or performance measures, the Guild can initiate intervention by notifying the school leader or board chair of area(s) needing correction and a target date for correction. If the situation remains uncorrected, the Guild will then send formal notice to the school board and may ask the school board to adopt a specific improvement plan. A third-party investigator may be retained as needed. If circumstances are not improved, the Guild may then provide notice to the school board of charter revocation/termination. The Guild's Operating Guide also provides information about intervention, stating that the Guild will "monitor the situation, its proposed remedy and key milestones to ensure the issues are addressed," and employ a variety of techniques to review the situation, including interviews, site visits, audits and document review.
- The Guild's decisions and resulting actions are consistent across the portfolio of charter schools and align with its stated standards and processes in its AAA. The practices described above are shown in the examples of the formal notice and termination of TRUTH Preparatory Academy and the school's response in 2017, the 2018 Art and Science Academy's notice of concern, letter to school board, school response and PIP, and in the corrective action example with Lincoln International High school. These practices align with the intervention steps outlined in the Guild's AAA. For example, they align with the CAP B6 Gantt Template Intervention and in the Guild's "Communications" section of the updated Operating Guide.
- Decisions made regarding complaints, intervention and corrective action are aligned with data generated under oversight and monitoring practices. As outlined above, the documented evidence confirms that the Guild's schools have taken steps to address the letters of concern and when appropriate implemented corrective action plans, which were approved by the authorizer. For example, the Guild issued a PIP to the Art and Science Academy, and in the six-month follow up report, the Art and Science Academy summarized its actions as a result of the PIP. These actions included ensuring that professional development supports the school's mission and contract goal benchmarks.
- The Guild's standards and processes align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards. When asked in the interview, the authorizer could not fully explain how the Guild's process for interventions, corrective action and response to complaints aligns with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards. However, the Guild later clarified that their focus on open communication with schools is aligned to NACSA's Principles and Standards related to clear, adequate, evidenced-based and timely notice of violations and deficiencies.

- During the school leader interviews, school leaders did not share experiences aligned to the Guild's processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action. School leaders noted in an example that the Guild was not clear on where its oversight applied to the particular complaint, while another example noted a different process they experienced with the Guild for addressing complaints.

**Key Evidence:**

- B.6 Narrative
- AAA
- FY 2017 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2018 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2019 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2020 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- MN Guild Original Operating Guide
- 21.5-11 Updated MN Guild Operating Guide
- Guild Contract Template Updated Spring 2021
- Gantt Template Intervention Escalation
- 18.06-27 Guild Letter to ASA Board
- 18.08-20 ASA Response to Complaint
- 18.09-21 ASA Notice of Concern
- 19.02-18 Response to Notice of Concern
- 19.03-20 Guild to ASA following 3.15 meeting
- 19.04-11 MN Guild Response to ASA
- 19.07-05 MDE Letter to Guild on ASA Complaint
- 19.09-27 ASA PIP Final
- 10.02-04 ASA PIP Report
- TRUTH Intervention Letter 03.10.2017 (CAP)
- TRUTH Response to Guild 03.17.2017 (CAP)
- 17.03-28 Guild Final CAP Submission
- 20.08-12 Guild Board Meeting Feedback for Lincoln
- 20.08-12 Lincoln Board Minutes
- 20.08-18 Email Following 21.08.12 Board Meeting
- 21.05-06 Guild Fdbk on LHS 4.14-2021 Brd Mtg
- 21.1.07 CPE Status Communication
- Life Prep FY20 Report Compliance Dashboard
- 21.04 Notes for Guild from Rachel

- Authorizer Review and Comment Submission Form – The Guild
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021
- Charter school leader interviews, September 17, 2021

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

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree does the authorizer support its portfolio of charter schools through intentional assistance and development offerings?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 3-Commendable

**Finding:** The authorizer regularly supports its portfolio of charter schools through intentional assistance and development offerings.

- The Guild provides proactive technical assistance (TA), demonstrated by its consistent (optional) monthly meetings for all schools. For example, COVID-specific conference calls provided schools with a place to ask questions and connect with other school leaders as pandemic-related changes evolved. The Guild provided TA presentations focused on contract renewal and setting contract goals for schools that were set to undergo contract renewal in April 2021, ahead of when renewal contracts needed to be executed.
- The Guild demonstrated a variety of TA offered to all schools including an Epicenter training session with representatives from Epicenter; TA on drafting the charter school Annual Report and World's Best Workforce Report on November 11, 2020; TA on the Minnesota Common Course Catalog (MCCC) on December 2, 2020; TA on board training and the statutory requirements concerning board training on March 31, 2021; and regular Zoom calls that all schools are encouraged to attend that began as a response to the COVID-19 pandemic and have expanded in focus area and continued since. The Annual Report also notes a variety of TA including in 2018, focusing on individual school assistance and professional development on specific topics based on best practices for director evaluations, applying for extended time monies and math instruction. In 2019 the TA focus was on project-based learning, Epicenter and director evaluation, as well as a regular e-newsletter to share professional development opportunities and other resources. According to the 2020 Annual Report, the focus was on COVID-19, project-based learning (PBL), Epicenter and director evaluation, as well as regular Zoom meetings.
- The Guild's support and TA are provided in a manner that preserves school autonomy. According to the 2017 Annual Report, while the Guild is always available to its schools, "the Guild does not require its schools to: attend specific trainings, hire certain people, work with certain contractors/companies or run the school or budget a certain way." For example, attendance at all monthly meetings is encouraged, but optional, as are specific offerings such as providing the opportunity for schools to conduct the Hope Survey – a Guild-funded opportunity to work with a consulting group for schools to implement the Hope Survey and get assistance in acting upon its results.
- Support and TA are provided in a manner that is consistent across the portfolio of charter schools. For example, all school leaders are invited (not required) to attend monthly meetings and the school leader interviews confirmed that school leaders feel they have access to support when needed.
- The Guild regularly offers support and TA based on demonstrated need, that is designed to prevent problems. As stated above, the regular TA provided was based on the schools' demonstrated need for assistance in areas like pandemic response, contract renewal and school improvement. These proactive sessions and opportunities were focused on areas that could prevent problems from occurring such as miscommunication over pandemic procedures or misunderstanding of the contract renewal process. Additionally, in a Winter 2021 Guild Schools Survey, 92 percent (n=16) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "the Guild provides adequate resources and opportunities for support."
- Support and technical assistance are not consistently designed to promote high-quality charter schools. While the Guild provides support and technical assistance to its schools aimed at school improvement, and while some evidence spotlights innovation from Skyline Math and Science Academy, documentation does not demonstrate how the Guild designs its technical assistance to promote high-quality charter schools.

Additionally, based on MDE's designation, only two (of the fifteen) schools in the Guild's portfolio have been designated high-quality; thus, it is unclear if support and technical assistance are intentionally designed to promote high-quality charter schools.

**Key Evidence:**

- B.7 Narrative
- AAA
- FY 2017 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2018 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2019 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2020 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- 17.03-23 Rochester Technical Assistance
- 17.03-23 Calendar of Future Events
- 20.04-15 Guild Schools COVID-19 Conference Call notes.doc
- 20.04-22 Guild Schools COVID-19 Conference Call notes.docx
- 20.12-2 Guild Schools Call Slides.pptx
- Email follow-up to 20.21-2 Guild Schools Call (MCCC)
- 21.01-13 Guild Schools Call Slides.pptx
- 20.11-11 Guild Schools Call Slides (contains Annual Report technical assistance)
- 20.12-2 Guild Schools Conference Call - MCCC Presentation by Karen Milette
- 21.3-31 Guild Schools Call PP (contains Board Training technical assistance)
- 21.4-1 Contract Renewal Technical Assistance- Goals examples
- 21.4-15 Contract Renewal Technical Assistance- Other Contract Elements
- 21.04-16 Email to Guild Schools re- HOPE Survey
- MDE High-Quality Charter Schools Lists (2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021)
- 21.4-21 Guild Schools Call- HOPE Survey project intro.mp4
- Talent Enthusiasts HOPE Survey Support
- 21.11-11 Guild MDE Finance Award Recipients
- 20.11-11 Guild Schools Call Slides
- Video Links
- Authorizer Review and Comment Submission Form – The Guild
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021
- Charter school leader interviews, September 17, 2021

## **B.8 Measure: High-Quality Charter School Replication and Dissemination of Best School Practices**

**Guiding Question:** *To what degree does the authorizer plan and promote model replication and dissemination of best practices of high-quality charter schools?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 0-Unsatisfactory or Incomplete

**Finding:** While the authorizer disseminates best practices of high-quality charter schools, it does not plan or promote model replication.

- The authorizer disseminates best practices, but there is not an intentional plan for successful model replication. While the narrative discusses a Guild-sponsored mentor program for new leaders and informal sharing of best practices through Guild-hosted meetings among schools, the authorizer interview confirmed that the Guild does not have an intentional plan for model replication or dissemination of best practices. During the authorizer interview, the Guild stated that it hosts annual gatherings where schools can network and share practices. The Guild added that it also occasionally sends out emails and updates for its schools to learn from one another and its monthly meetings periodically provide an opportunity to share practices. The Guild stated that it does not have a specific replication plan and that it tries to connect schools to learn from one another. Additionally, the Guild stated that given the Guild's mission and its focus on the teacher-powered school model, it is a school-level decision if a school wants to replicate, and that since the Guild is in its fifth year, its schools are just beginning their practices and it is too soon for replication.

### **Key Evidence:**

- B.8 Narrative
- AAA
- FY 2017 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2018 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2019 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2020 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- 20.11-19 MN Guild Board Meeting Minutes
- 21.2-10 Guild Schools Call Notes
- 21.3-31 Guild Schools Call PP
- 20.12-2 Guild Schools Call Slides
- 20.12-2 Guild Schools Conference Call - MCCC Presentation by Karen Milette
- 21.02-10 Charter School Board Training Slides from Beth at Rosa Parks
- MAPES - Guild Response
- 20.11-11 Best Practices PP
- 21.11-11 Guild MDE Finance Award Recipients.xlsx
- 20.11-11 Guild Schools Call Slides
- Video Links
- Authorizer Review and Comment Submission Form – The Guild
- Authorizer interview, September 17, 2021

## **B.9 Measure: Charter School Renewal and Termination Decisions**

**Guiding Questions:** *To what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to make high stakes renewal and termination decisions? To what degree did the authorizer's renewal and termination decisions align to its stated renewal standards and processes and promote the growth of high-quality charter schools?*

**Performance Level Rating:** Level 1-Approaching Satisfactory

**Finding:** The authorizer has clear and comprehensive standards and processes to make high-stakes renewal and termination decisions. However, the authorizer's renewal and termination decisions do not consistently align with its stated renewal standards and processes or promote the growth of high-quality charter schools.

- The Guild has transparent and rigorous standards and processes designed to use comprehensive academic, financial, operational and student performance data to make merit-based renewal decisions. The Guild's contract renewal process is outlined in its Operating Guide, updated in FY2021, and further explained in the presentation "Charter Contract Renewal Evaluation Overview & Instructions FY2021." The renewal process consists of four phases and spans ten months, starting with an introductory communication with the board and school leader(s) and ending with contract negotiations and approvals from the Guild board of directors and the school's board. During the renewal process, three areas are assessed: academic, financial and operational. The authorizer uses a five-point rating scale to evaluate its schools (not met, partially met, met, accomplished, highly accomplished).
- The Guild's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent across the portfolio of charter schools. While the authorizer has made updates to its processes for renewal and termination starting in FY2021, and while it acknowledges that these updates were necessary to ensure a more rigorous and transparent process, it has not met the indicator for at least three years, nor is there sufficient documentation to show that this process is consistent across its schools. During the school leader interviews, it was articulated that the Guild's renewal process and resulting decisions were unclear and no school leader was able to describe how criteria are evaluated as met or unmet. Some school leaders noted consistent, clear communication throughout the process and up through the renewal decision, while others noted that they did not receive consistent communication. Finally, school leaders stated that they felt that renewals were subjective.
- The Guild's decisions and resulting actions do not align with its AAA. For example, according to MDE's November 2021 renewal contract compliance review, the renewal contract between the Guild and College Prep Elementary (CPE) did not follow the processes and timelines established in the Guild's AAA. More specifically, the Guild's AAA states that renewal applications must be submitted at least 180 days prior to the end of the current contract, and applicants will be notified of renewal decisions "no later than 120 days prior to the termination of the existing contract." Per this timeline, a renewal evaluation and a decision should have been completed by January 2021; however, the final performance evaluation report was not issued to the school until September 1, 2021 (after the execution of the renewal contract).

### **Key Evidence:**

- B.9 Narrative
- AAA
- MDE MN Guild – Renewal Contract Compliance Review Rubrics
- FY 2017 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2018 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- FY 2019 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools

- FY 2020 Annual Report – Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools
- MN Guild Original Operating Guide
- 21.5-11 Updated MN Guild Operating Guide
- Renewal Timeline and Process for FY 2021
- Charter Contract Renewal Evaluation Overview & Instructions FY 2021
- 21.05-17 AFA Renewal Evaluation Report
- 21.07-14 Renewal Contract between MNB Guild and CPE – signed
- 21.07-01 Renewal Contract between MN Guild and LIHS – signed
- 21.11-10 MN Guild-CPE Renewal Contract Compliance Review Rubric
- MN EO 20-20 FINAL SIGNED
- EO 20-01-CovidEmergency
- EO 20-89 Emergency Extended
- 18.10-16 Original letter re Renewal
- 101618 email
- ASA Renewal Contract Review
- Contract Renewal Review Rubric
- Authorizer Review and Comment Submission Form – The Guild
- Charter school leader interviews, September 17, 2021

## Performance Measures B: Rating (75 Percent Weight of Overall Rating)

**MAPES Performance Measures B Rating for Minnesota Guild of Public Charter Schools is 1.40.**

### Performance Measures B: Rating Drivers

- The Guild's new school application process is comprehensive and includes clear application questions and guidance as well as fair, transparent procedures, timelines and rigorous criteria. However, the authorizer's decisions and resulting actions are inconsistent given its closure of the FY2021 new school application cycle after letters of intent had been submitted.
- The Guild's Contract Template and its contracts define clear, measurable and attainable academic, financial and operational performance outcomes and standards and consequences for meeting or not meeting performance outcomes and standards. However, per the MAPES Compliance Data Spreadsheet, not all contracts in the Guild's portfolio of charter schools meet current statutory requirements. For example, the contract for Augsburg Fairview Academy is not compliant with statute based on MDE's September 27, 2021 review.
- The Guild has clearly outlined processes for monitoring and oversight in its Operating Guide, including scheduled and unscheduled site visits and an annual site visit, reviews of monthly financial statements, the annual budget, and annual financial audit, compliance reviews and performance reviews. However, the level of oversight implemented is unclear and inconsistent, with school leaders reporting varying experiences with the authorizer's implementation of its oversight activities. While the authorizer has made updates to its processes for renewal and termination starting in FY2021 and acknowledges that these updates were necessary to ensure a more rigorous and transparent process, there is not sufficient documentation to show that this process is consistent across its schools.
- The Guild has standards and processes to address and resolve complaints and the Guild's contract templates outline the process. Documentation shows that the Guild has followed its standards and processes (e.g., sending letters of concern, implementing corrective action plans) to successfully resolve complaints but these processes remain unclear to school leaders.
- The Guild provides all its schools with regular, intentional opportunities which have continued through the COVID-19 pandemic, and are a primary delivery method for TA and support. The Guild also offers all of its schools an opportunity to conduct the Hope Survey – a Guild-funded opportunity to work with a consulting group for schools to implement the Hope Survey and get assistance in acting upon its results. All technical assistance and support opportunities are optional unless required by regulation or law.

### Performance Measures B: Recommendations

- Document the full timeline and process for anticipating projects and workstreams each year and make decisions about priorities prior to a new fiscal year beginning to avoid a cancellation of new school applications mid-cycle.
- Document and publish, to all schools, the full process for providing monitoring and oversight both annually and throughout the year (quarterly or monthly). Ensure that the commitments made to oversight implementation can be accomplished by Guild staff throughout the year and create a process and documentation to ensure that the practices are implemented consistently across schools.
- Create and execute a plan to share best practices and plan for successful school model replication. Develop criteria that would trigger the Guild to speak to a high performing school about their potential (not requirement) to apply for replication or expansion.

- Revise, clarify and publish to school leaders the renewal process and ensure that each element of the renewal process is documented and implemented consistently across schools.
- Update the AAA to an AAP to ensure that all standards and processes for new school applications and interim accountability decisions align with the stated approval and process standards and promote the growth of high-quality charter schools.

## Appendix A: Authorizer Portfolio Information

**Operational Schools:** Art and Science Academy, Augsburg Fairview Academy, Career Pathways, College Prep Elementary, Community School of Excellence, Exploration High School, LIFE Prep, Lincoln International High School, Marine Area Community School, New Heights School, Phoenix Academy Charter School, Rochester Beacon Academy, Rosa Parks Charter High School, SciTech Academy, Skyline Math and Science Academy

**Preoperational Schools:** Rollingstone Community School, School of Leadership for Public Service

**Closed Schools:** Minneapolis School of New Music, TRUTH Preparatory Academy

**Never Opened Schools:** FUSE Charter School, Language Arts Academy, Mercy Community Academy, Rochester Academy Charter School, Sandstone Montessori Charter School

**Schools that have transferred into portfolio:** None

**Schools that have transferred out of portfolio:** None

**Merged schools over the term of the review period:** None

## Appendix B: Evaluation Methodology

SchoolWorks is committed to ensuring inter-rater reliability and consistency across all MAPES reports. In order to achieve this, SchoolWorks adopts the following methodology.

1. SchoolWorks assigned each authorizer a two-person evaluation team that includes a team lead and team writer.
2. All evaluators then engage in a training with the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) during which they norm around ratings, evidence and report language.
3. The lead and writer review all submitted documents and rate the evidence submitted by the authorizer.
4. Teams participate in a pre-interview call. During this call, the team comes to consensus, deciding upon initial ratings. Also during this call, team members identify any standards for which they need additional clarification.
5. Team members lead in-person interviews with authorizing staff and representatives from the authorizer's portfolio of charter schools. Following the interview, evaluators may ask for additional documentation to be submitted by the authorizer.\*\*\*
6. Team members use interview responses and any additional document submissions in alignment with the MAPES standards and, if applicable, revise their initial ratings.
7. Team members participate in a consensus call during which they finalize their ratings.
8. Draft reports are completed and reviewed by a SchoolWorks content editor. The content editor reviews ratings and evidentiary alignment with the MAPES rubric within each individual report, and ensures consistency of ratings across all reports.
9. The SchoolWorks project manager reviews all reports to ensure consistency of ratings and sufficiency of evidence.
10. Draft reports are submitted to MDE for review.
11. MDE shares draft reports with authorizers for factual review. During the factual review, authorizers may submit additional documentation to clarify factual errors.
12. SchoolWorks evaluators review the factual corrections submitted by the authorizer and any accompanying documentation. Based on the authorizer's submissions, they consider whether additional evidence impacts the ratings identified in the final report.
13. Evaluators finalize their MAPES reports and submit to the SchoolWorks project manager.
14. The SchoolWorks project manager reviews all finalized reports.
15. Final reports are submitted to MDE for review.

\*\*\* Due to COVID-19, interviews were conducted via videoconference.