Clayton County Public Schools
Charter Renewal Evaluation Rubric

Aligned to the OCSC Performance Framework and Developed for Renewal Recommendations to the Clayton County Board of Education

Purpose and Use

This rubric is intended to guide Clayton County Public Schools staff in evaluating charter school renewal petitions in a manner that is rigorous, transparent, and aligned to both district policy and the Office of Charter School Compliance performance framework. The document is designed to support consistent internal review, clear communication with schools, and well-supported renewal recommendations to the Clayton County Board of Education. It should be used alongside the renewal application, the district's renewal policy, the charter contract, and verified performance data spanning the full charter term.

How the Rubric Works

The rubric is organized around the three state performance domains (academic, financial, and organizational performance) and then supplemented with Clayton County renewal considerations that appear in the district policy and renewal application. Where the OCSC framework supplies explicit thresholds, point values, or scoring rules, those standards are reproduced here in adapted form. Where the state framework is more compliance-based than numeric, the rubric translates those standards into rating language that can be applied consistently across schools.

Core Decision Rules

- Academic performance is the primary driver of renewal decisions.
- Ratings must be based on evidence from the full charter term, not a single year in isolation.
- Where information is incomplete or unclear, staff should use the district's clarification process before assigning a lower rating based solely on documentation gaps.
- A well-written application does not substitute for strong results, and a weaker narrative should not obscure strong verified performance.

Unified Rating Scale

Rating	Meaning in the Clayton County Renewal Context
4 – Exceeds Standard	Performance clearly exceeds the applicable standard or comparison point and reflects strong, sustained results or strong compliance across the term.
3 – Meets Standard	Performance meets the applicable standard and supports a finding that the school is fulfilling expectations in that area.
2 – Approaches Standard	Performance is close to the standard, mixed across years or measures, or includes remediated issues that warrant caution but not a finding of full noncompliance.
1 – Falls Below Standard	Performance does not meet the applicable standard, reflects persistent weakness, unresolved compliance issues, or significant risk.

DRAFT

SECTION I: ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Framework question: Is the charter school offering students a better educational opportunity than they would otherwise receive at the traditional local school?

Under the OCSC framework, a local charter school may satisfy annual academic accountability standards by outperforming its comparison zone in student achievement or growth. Comparison zones are calculated by weighting the local attendance zones from which charter students are drawn. A school only needs to outperform its comparison zone on one measure within either Indicator 1 or Indicator 2 to receive an annual Meets designation. Because renewal is a multi-year judgment, Clayton County staff should look for consistency, trajectory, and whether results are sustained across the term.

OCSC Academic Designations and Clayton County Rating Conversion

OCSC Designation	Framework Threshold	Typical Clayton Rating	How to Interpret at Renewal
Exceeds Standard	10 or more points above the comparison zone	4 – Exceeds Standard	Strong evidence of a better educational opportunity, especially when sustained across years and grade bands.
Meets Standard	1 to 9 points above the comparison zone	3	School is outperforming the comparison zone on at least one relevant measure.
Approaches Standard	At the comparison zone or no more than 2 points below	2	Performance is close to the comparison zone but not clearly better.
Varied Performance	School earns Meets in one grade band and Does Not Meet in another	2	Results are uneven across grade bands and warrant caution.
Does Not Meet Standard	Below the comparison zone	1	School is not providing a clearly better educational opportunity on the relevant measure.

Indicator 1: Grade Band Measures

All charter schools must demonstrate their ability to positively impact academic performance either through high levels of achievement or growth across all grade bands served. The same comparison-zone thresholds apply to each of the academic measures listed below.

Measure 1a: CCRPI Content Mastery

Rating	Specific Performance Description
4 – Exceeds Standard	The school's score is 10 or more points higher than the comparison zone on this measure across the relevant grade bands, with results that are sustained or repeated across years.
3 – Meets Standard	The school's score is 1 to 9 points higher than the comparison zone on this measure in the relevant grade bands.
2 – Approaches	The school performs as well as, or no more than 2 points below, the comparison zone on this measure, or results are

DRAFT

Standard	mixed enough to suggest near-performance without a clear advantage.
1 – Falls Below Standard	The school performs below the comparison zone on this measure, or results reflect persistent weakness across years or grade bands.

Measure 1b: CCRPI Progress

Rating	Specific Performance Description
4 – Exceeds Standard	The school's score is 10 or more points higher than the comparison zone on this measure across the relevant grade bands, with results that are sustained or repeated across years.
3 – Meets Standard	The school's score is 1 to 9 points higher than the comparison zone on this measure in the relevant grade bands.
2 – Approaches Standard	The school performs as well as, or no more than 2 points below, the comparison zone on this measure, or results are mixed enough to suggest near-performance without a clear advantage.
1 – Falls Below Standard	The school performs below the comparison zone on this measure, or results reflect persistent weakness across years or grade bands.

Measure 1c: CCRPI Grade Band Score

Rating	Specific Performance Description
4 – Exceeds Standard	The school's score is 10 or more points higher than the comparison zone on this measure across the relevant grade bands, with results that are sustained or repeated across years.
3 – Meets Standard	The school's score is 1 to 9 points higher than the comparison zone on this measure in the relevant grade bands.
2 – Approaches Standard	The school performs as well as, or no more than 2 points below, the comparison zone on this measure, or results are mixed enough to suggest near-performance without a clear advantage.
1 – Falls Below Standard	The school performs below the comparison zone on this measure, or results reflect persistent weakness across years or grade bands.

Measure 1d: Value-Added Model Impact Score

Rating	Specific Performance Description
4 – Exceeds Standard	The school's score is 10 or more points higher than the comparison zone on this measure across the relevant grade bands, with results that are sustained or repeated across years.
3 – Meets Standard	The school's score is 1 to 9 points higher than the comparison zone on this measure in the relevant grade bands.
2 – Approaches Standard	The school performs as well as, or no more than 2 points below, the comparison zone on this measure, or results are mixed enough to suggest near-performance without a clear advantage.
1 – Falls Below	The school performs below the comparison zone on this measure, or results reflect persistent weakness across years

DRAFT

Standard	or grade bands.

Multi-Year Renewal Rule for Academic Performance

Clayton County Renewal Interpretation	How Staff Should Apply It
Exceeds (4)	Academic performance meets or exceeds the state standard in most years of the term, with at least one especially strong year or a clearly sustained pattern of outperforming the comparison zone.
Meets (3)	Academic performance meets the state standard in the majority of years, even if one year is mixed or near the threshold.
Approaches (2)	Performance is mixed across years, near the threshold, or varied across grade bands without a sustained pattern of outperforming the comparison zone.
Falls Below (1)	The school does not meet academic standards in multiple years, or the overall trend indicates that students are not receiving a better educational opportunity than they would otherwise receive.

SECTION II: FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

Framework question: Is the charter school fiscally viable and responsible?

The OCSC framework evaluates both fiscal viability and fiscal management/oversight. To receive an overall annual Meets designation in the financial domain, a school must earn at least 80 points on both Indicator 1 and Indicator 2. If the school earns below 70 on both indicators, it does not meet financial standards. Any other combination results in Approaches.

Financial Domain Decision Rules

Overall Financial Result	Framework Threshold	Clayton County Rating Guidance
Exceeds / very strong performance	90–100 points on both indicators, with strong ratios and no major findings	4
Meets Standards	80–100 points on both indicators	3
Approaches Standards	70–79 on one or both indicators, or mixed performance where one indicator meets and the other does not	2
Does Not Meet Standards	0–69 points on both indicators, or major unresolved financial risk	1

Indicator 1: Fiscal Viability

DRAFT

The state framework scores Fiscal Viability using six measures worth a total of 100 points. The framework itself includes point cutoffs for Meets, Approaches, and Does Not Meet. The additional Exceeds thresholds below are included so Clayton County can distinguish truly strong performance from minimum sufficiency at renewal.

Measure	Points Available	4 – Exceeds Standard	3 – Meets Standard	2 – Approaches Standard	1 – Falls Below Standard
Measure 1a: Current Ratio (working capital ratio)	15	≥ 1.50	> 1.0	0.9 to 1.0 or equal to 1.0	≤ 0.9
Measure 1b: Unrestricted Days Cash	20	≥ 90 days	> 60 days	15 to 60 days	< 15 days
Measure 1c: Annual Debt to Income	20	< 3%	Below 5%	5% to 15%	Above 15%
Measure 1d: Default	10	No default, no delinquency, and no outstanding debt obligations creating material risk	School is not in default of loan covenants or delinquent with debt service payments, or has no outstanding debt	Not applicable in the framework; if risk indicators exist but no default is triggered, staff may note concern in narrative only	School is in default of loan covenants, delinquent with debt service, or otherwise fails this measure
Measure 1e: Efficiency Margin (aggregated 3-year)	15	> 3%	Greater than 0%	-0.01 to -10%	Less than -10%
Measure 1f: Debt to Asset Ratio	20	< 70%	Less than 95%	95% to 100%	Greater than 100%

Fiscal Viability Rating Guidance at Renewal

Rating	How to Assign the Indicator 1 Rating
4 – Exceeds Standard	Nearly all fiscal viability measures are in the Exceeds or Meets range, with no major red flags and a clear pattern of long-term sustainability.
3 – Meets Standard	The school earns at least 80 points on Fiscal Viability, meets minimum state thresholds on the core measures, and does not show material short-term or long-term solvency risk.
2 – Approaches Standard	The school earns 70–79 points on Fiscal Viability, or shows a mix of sufficient and near-threshold results that require close monitoring.
1 – Falls Below Standard	The school earns below 70 points on Fiscal Viability, shows multiple below-threshold measures, or presents significant solvency risk.

Indicator 2: Fiscal Management and Oversight

DRAFT

Indicator 2 also totals 100 points. Several measures are binary in the state framework, while others include an Approaches category when findings were remedied and compliance was regained.

Measure	Points Available	4 – Exceeds Standard	3 – Meets Standard	2 – Approaches Standard	1 – Falls Below Standard
Measure 2a: Adherence to GAAP standards	30	Unqualified audit with no findings, no going concern language, and no adverse compliance statements over the review period	Unqualified audit; no significant findings, material weaknesses, significant internal control weaknesses, going concern disclosure, or adverse statements	Not applicable in the framework; if minor issues exist outside the audit findings, note them narratively but do not assign points here	Failure to comply with one or more applicable financial management or oversight expectations as evidenced by the annual independent audit
Measure 2b: Adherence to federal financial requirements	15	Full compliance plus strong documented internal controls and monitoring discipline	School complied with applicable federal requirements relating to internal controls, expenditures, inventory, drawdowns, and cost principles	School failed to comply during monitoring but adequately remedied findings and regained compliance	School failed to comply with applicable federal financial requirements
Measure 2d: Adherence to the school's own financial policies and procedures	20	Consistent adherence over the term with evidence of strong internal implementation	School adhered to governing-board-approved financial policies and procedures	School failed to comply with at least one policy or procedure but adequately remedied findings and regained compliance	School failed to comply with at least one of its financial policies or procedures
Measure 2e: Enrollment variance	10	≤ 1% variance between projected and actual enrollment	Less than 3%	3% to 8%	Greater than 8%
Measure 2f: Timely audit submission	25	On-time submission supported by strong year-to-year reporting discipline	Submitted on or before November 1	Submitted after November 1 but on or before December 1	Submitted after December 1

Fiscal Management and Oversight Rating Guidance

DRAFT

Rating	How to Assign the Indicator 2 Rating
4 – Exceeds Standard	The school demonstrates exceptionally strong management discipline, clean audits, timely submissions, and no material control or compliance concerns.
3 – Meets Standard	The school earns at least 80 points on Fiscal Management and Oversight and demonstrates responsible compliance with reporting and control requirements.
2 – Approaches Standard	The school earns 70–79 points, or has one or more remediated findings that warrant caution but not a finding of material financial noncompliance.
1 – Falls Below Standard	The school earns below 70 points, or presents significant unresolved audit, control, or reporting concerns.

SECTION III: ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Framework question: Is the organization effective, compliant, and well-run?

In the OCSC framework, organizational performance is calculated through six indicators using measure-level points. A school earns a Meets designation for the organizational domain by scoring at least 80 points overall; 70–79 results in Approaches; and below 70 results in Does Not Meet. Clayton County may distinguish especially strong compliance performance as Exceeds where a school is at 90 points or above with no major unresolved violations.

Organizational Domain Thresholds

Clayton County Rating	Point-Based Guide	Interpretation
4 – Exceeds Standard	90–100 points and no major unresolved violations	School is compliant, well-run, and demonstrates strong systems and follow-through.
3 – Meets Standard	80–100 points	School meets the operational performance standard.
2 – Approaches Standard	70–79 points	School is near standard or has remediated issues that warrant monitoring.
1 – Falls Below Standard	0–69 points	School does not meet operational performance standards.

Across the organizational measures, the framework commonly uses the following compliance logic: full compliance earns Meets; a remediated issue usually earns Approaches; and an unresolved or repeated issue earns Does Not Meet. Where the framework does not include an Approaches category, staff should apply the framework as written and then describe any nuance in the narrative justification.

Indicator 1: Educational Program Compliance

This indicator asks whether the school is implementing the educational program it promised and complying with applicable state and federal education requirements and reporting duties.

Measure	Points Available	3 – Meets Standard	2 – Approaches Standard	1 – Falls Below Standard

DRAFT

Measure 1a: Essential or innovative features and mission-specific goals	4	School has fully implemented all essential or innovative features of its educational and operational program in all material respects and has met all mission-specific goals in the charter contract, if applicable.	School has fully implemented at least one essential or innovative feature in all material respects or has met at least one mission-specific goal.	School failed to fully implement any essential or innovative features in all material respects and failed to meet any mission-specific goals, if applicable.
Measure 1b: State education requirements	4	School complied with all applicable state laws, rules, regulations, charter provisions, and school policies relating to state education requirements, including mandated programs, graduation requirements, state standards, and state assessment administration.	School failed to comply with at least one applicable state requirement during monitoring, but adequately remedied the finding and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with at least one applicable state requirement.
Measure 1c: Federal education requirements	4	School complied with all applicable federal laws, rules, regulations, and school policies relating to federal education requirements, including assessment security, accountability reporting, and applicable federal program requirements.	School failed to comply with at least one applicable federal requirement.	School failed to comply with two or more applicable federal requirements.
Measure 1d: Data reporting	5	School complied with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, and charter provisions relating to reporting requirements and deadlines, including student, personnel, CCRPI, special education, financial, and audit submissions.	School failed to comply with one reporting requirement or deadline.	School failed to comply with two or more reporting requirements or deadlines.

Indicator 2: Governance, Ethics, and Transparency

This indicator evaluates the governing board's compliance with governance, transparency, communication, and budget-adoption requirements.

Measure	Points Available	3 – Meets Standard	2 – Approaches Standard	1 – Falls Below Standard
Measure 2a: General governance	4	School complied with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, charter provisions, and policies relating to governance, including bylaws, code of ethics, conflicts of interest, board composition, and compensation	School failed to comply with at least one governance requirement during monitoring, but adequately remedied the finding and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with at least one governance requirement.

DRAFT

		restrictions.		
Measure 2b: Open governance	4	School complied with all applicable open meetings and open records requirements.	School failed to comply during monitoring, but adequately remedied the finding and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with open governance requirements.
Measure 2c: Governance training	4	School took action to ensure all governing board members complied with required training requirements under O.C.G.A. § 20-2-2072.	Not applicable in the framework.	School failed to take action to ensure required board training compliance.
Measure 2d: Transparent governance and communication with stakeholders	4	School complied with applicable transparency and stakeholder communication requirements, including public access to information, timely communication of major changes, and appropriate complaint response.	School failed to comply during monitoring, but adequately remedied the finding and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with transparency or stakeholder communication requirements.
Measure 2e: Budget approved in accordance with state law	4	School approved its budget in accordance with state law, including required public meetings, legal notice, and public posting.	Not applicable in the framework.	School failed to comply with at least one state-law budget approval requirement.

Indicator 3: Obligations to Students

This indicator examines whether the school is protecting student rights and complying with obligations to students generally, as well as to students with disabilities and English Learners.

Measure	Points Available	3 – Meets Standard	2 – Approaches Standard	1 – Falls Below Standard
Measure 3a: Rights of all students	6	School complied with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, charter provisions, and policies relating to admissions, lottery, enrollment, student information, due process, privacy, civil rights, and discipline.	School failed to comply during monitoring, but adequately remedied the finding and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with one or more requirements relating to student rights.
Measure 3b: Rights of students with disabilities	6	School complied with applicable IDEA, Section 504, ADA, charter, and operational requirements relating to identification, service delivery, discipline protections, implementation of IEPs and 504 plans, and access to facilities and	School failed to comply during monitoring but adequately remedied the finding and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with one or more disability-related requirements.

DRAFT

		programs.		
Measure 3c: Rights of English Learners	6	School complied with applicable Title III, state, federal, and charter requirements relating to EL identification, service delivery, accommodations, exit procedures, and monitoring.	School failed to comply during monitoring but adequately remedied the finding and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with one or more English Learner requirements.

Indicator 4: Employer Obligations

This indicator addresses staff qualifications, employment practices, and employee civil rights.

Measure	Points Available	3 – Meets Standard	2 – Approaches Standard	1 – Falls Below Standard
Measure 4a: Employee qualifications, evaluations, and criminal records checks	5	School complied with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and charter provisions relating to employee qualifications, evaluations, criminal background checks, and educator effectiveness systems.	School failed to comply during monitoring but adequately remedied the finding and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with one or more employee qualification, evaluation, or background-check requirements.
Measure 4b: Employee rights	5	School complied with applicable laws, rules, regulations, charter provisions, and governing policies relating to employment, including professional qualifications, nepotism/conflict rules, labor standards, leave, disability protections, and contracts.	School failed to comply during monitoring but adequately remedied the finding and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with one or more employee-rights requirements.
Measure 4c: Employee civil rights	5	School complied with applicable notice, grievance, and substantive nondiscrimination requirements.	School failed to comply, but adequately remedied findings and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with one or more nondiscrimination requirements.

Indicator 5: School Environment

This indicator evaluates facilities, health and safety, and secure handling of information and communication.

Measure	Points Available	3 – Meets Standard	2 – Approaches Standard	1 – Falls Below Standard
Measure 5a: Facility	6	School complied with all applicable facility-related laws, rules, regulations, and charter provisions,	School failed to comply during monitoring, but adequately remedied the finding and	School failed to comply with one or more facility requirements.

DRAFT

		including fire inspections, occupancy, insurance, and required approvals for facilities and changes.	regained compliance.	
Measure 5b: Health and safety	6	School complied with all applicable safety and health requirements, including health services, required trainings, student health obligations, emergency supports, and maintaining a safe and secure environment.	School failed to comply during monitoring, but adequately remedied the finding and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with one or more health or safety requirements.
Measure 5c: Information, data, and communication	6	School complied with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, charter provisions, board policies, and directives regarding federal notices, student records, personnel records, confidentiality, and records transfer.	School failed to comply during monitoring, but adequately remedied the finding and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with one or more information, privacy, or communication requirements.

Indicator 6: Additional and Continuing Obligations

This indicator captures other legal or contractual obligations not otherwise listed and the school's compliance with corrective action or probation requirements.

Measure	Points Available	3 – Meets Standard	2 – Approaches Standard	1 – Falls Below Standard
Measure 6a: Additional obligations	6	School complied with all other legal, statutory, regulatory, or contractual requirements not otherwise explicitly addressed in the operational standards, including obligations tied to nutrition, transportation, intervention requirements, and other accountable entities.	School failed to comply during monitoring, but adequately remedied the finding and regained compliance.	School failed to comply with at least one other legal, statutory, regulatory, or contractual requirement.
Measure 6b: Continuing obligations	6	School fulfilled the terms of a corrective action plan required because of probationary status, and the local district or OCSC determined that the precipitating conditions no longer exist and no new conditions warrant probation.	Not applicable in the framework.	School failed to adhere to probation requirements, failed to implement a corrective action plan timely, failed to produce required interim reports, or failed to remediate the conditions that triggered probation.

DRAFT

DRAFT

SECTION IV: SUPPLEMENTAL RENEWAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR CLAYTON COUNTY

The district's renewal policy directs staff and the Clayton County Board of Education to consider not only the state performance domains, but also broader renewal factors such as mission fidelity, enrollment stability and demand, leadership and board capacity, performance trends, proposed charter changes, and the public interest. These areas do not replace the state framework; they supplement it and help translate annual performance data into a renewal judgment across the entire charter term.

Supplemental Area	4 – Exceeds Standard	3 – Meets Standard	2 – Approaches Standard	1 – Falls Below Standard

Mission and program fidelity	School has fully implemented its approved mission and educational program with strong evidence of alignment in practice and outcomes.	School is generally implementing its approved mission and program with only minor variation.	Implementation is partial, inconsistent, or not yet clearly reflected in outcomes.	Program implementation is materially misaligned with the approved charter or mission.
Enrollment stability and community demand	Enrollment is stable or growing, community demand is clear, and the school fills a meaningful local need.	Enrollment is generally stable and there is reasonable evidence of community demand.	Enrollment fluctuates or demand is mixed, creating some concern about long-term viability or community fit.	Enrollment is declining or demand is weak, undermining confidence in continued need.
Capacity for the next charter term	School presents a strong, strategic, and realistic plan for the next term, clearly informed by past performance.	School presents a reasonable forward-looking plan and appears capable of sustaining operations.	Plan is limited, underdeveloped, or only loosely connected to past performance and identified needs.	Plan is weak, unrealistic, or does not demonstrate sufficient future capacity.
Public interest	Renewal would clearly advance student outcomes and serve the community's educational interests.	Renewal would provide a reasonable public benefit and continued educational option.	Public benefit is mixed or unclear.	Renewal would not be in the public interest.

SECTION V: RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION FRAMEWORK

The final renewal recommendation should synthesize the school's performance across the charter term, with academic performance carrying the greatest weight. The table below is intended as a guide, not a substitute for reasoned judgment. Staff should also consider whether concerns are isolated or systemic, whether they were remediated, and whether renewal is in the public interest.

Academic Rating	Financial Rating	Organizational Rating	Typical Recommendation
3–4	3–4	3–4	Full-term renewal is generally supported.
3	2–3	2–3	Renewal may be supported, potentially with conditions or heightened monitoring.
2 with improvement trend	Varies	Varies	Shortened-term renewal or conditional renewal may be appropriate where the school demonstrates credible capacity to improve.
1	Any	Any	Denial of renewal is likely unless extraordinary circumstances clearly justify a different recommendation.
Any	1 on both indicators or significant financial instability	Varies	Conditional renewal or denial may be appropriate depending on severity and remediability of financial risk.
Any	Any	1 with unresolved major compliance concerns	Conditional renewal or denial may be appropriate depending on severity, remediation history, and risk to students or the public.

Narrative Justification Requirement

DRAFT

For every final recommendation, staff should prepare a concise written rationale that identifies the most important supporting evidence, explains the role that academic performance played in the recommendation, addresses any significant mixed findings across domains, and states whether renewal is in the public interest. If conditions are recommended, the rationale should clearly identify the problem to be addressed, the evidence required to demonstrate improvement, and the timeline for monitoring.

End of Rubric

This rubric is intended to function as the district's working evaluation tool. It may be paired with scorer worksheets, board briefing templates, and communication materials for schools as part of the full Clayton County charter renewal process.

DRAFT