



NATIONAL  
CHARTER SCHOOL  
RESOURCE CENTER

# High-Quality Charter Authorizing Policy Profiles: Minnesota

U.S. Department of Education  
January 2020



NATIONAL  
CHARTER SCHOOL  
RESOURCE CENTER

The National Charter School Resource Center (NCSRC) provides technical assistance to Federal grantees and resources supporting charter sector stakeholders. NCSRC is funded by the U.S. Department of Education and managed by Manhattan Strategy Group in partnership with WestEd.

NCSRC acknowledges the major contributions of Robin Chait and Lauren Outlaw in the development of this profile.

NCSRC would like to thank Charter School Programs State Entity grantee representatives for their reviews and feedback on their respective State's profile.

Suggested citation: National Charter School Resource Center (2020). *High-Quality Charter Authorizing Policy Profiles: Minnesota*. Bethesda, MD: Manhattan Strategy Group.

This publication was produced in whole or in part with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under contract number GS10FO201T. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the Federal government.

# Minnesota: Overview of State Law and Snapshot of Quality Authorizing Practices

## Introduction and Methodology

The National Charter School Resource Center (NCSRC) created the [Policy Framework for High-Quality Charter Authorizing Practices \(Framework\)](#) as a tool for assessing a State policy environment's support for high-quality authorizing practices. The Framework is based on a review of high-quality authorizing practices referenced in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and literature by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) and the National Alliance of Public Charter Schools (Alliance).<sup>i</sup> NCSRC staff used this review to identify common themes or categories of policies that are essential to State support for high-quality authorizing and incorporated them into the Framework.

NCSRC then created High-Quality Charter Authorizing Policy Profiles (State Authorizing Profiles) that describe states' authorizing policy contexts based on the Framework. As of winter 2020, NCSRC staff created 19 profiles for the States that were awarded Charter School Programs (CSP) State Entities grants between FY2017 and FY2019, including:

- Alabama
- Arizona
- Arkansas
- Colorado
- Delaware
- Idaho
- Indiana
- Maryland
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Mississippi
- New Mexico
- New York
- North Carolina
- Oklahoma
- Rhode Island
- Texas
- Washington
- Wisconsin

CSP State Entity (SE) Grants provide funding for State entities to support eligible applicants in planning and preparation for the opening of new charter schools and the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools. Grant funds must also be used by the State entity to provide technical assistance to eligible applicants and to improve the quality of authorizing.

More State Authorizing Profiles may be added in the future. In addition, NCSRC may publish updated versions of State Authorizing Profiles to reflect changes in State policy.

The State Authorizing Profiles are intended to be used by state policymakers and practitioners to learn about their own authorizing policy environments and those of their peers. They may also be useful to charter school support organizations and charter management organizations that are looking to learn about different states' policy contexts.

Each State profile includes a (i) Framework Snapshot, which is an assessment of a State's authorizing practices using the Framework described in the first paragraph above and (ii) a more detailed description of the state context for each practice. The basis for the State Profiles was a review of the charter law and significant State policies for applicable states. Significant

state policies included those issued by the state education agency and/or state board of education. NCSRC used this review to identify whether the authorizing practices specified in the Framework were present in state law or policy. That is, boxes that were checked in the Framework Snapshot indicated that particular aspects of an authorizing practice(s) were included in state law or policy.

The State Authorizing Profiles provide a foundation for understanding authorizing practices in the State. The profiles are not an exhaustive review of the State's authorizing policies and practices; it is intended to describe the key elements of the State's policy context for supporting high-quality authorizing practices. Therefore, it is possible that certain State policies are not reflected in the profiles, and that individual authorizers within a state are implementing other practices as well. In addition, the review does not assess the quality of implementation of the policies; it is possible that state policy or statute articulates a quality practice that authorizers do not implement with fidelity.

Finally, state policy is one strategy for advancing high-quality authorizing practices and is the strategy we are focusing on in these profiles. However, there are other strategies and sources of support, including technical assistance and resources provided by state, regional, and local charter support associations. While this report does not address those other strategies, it provides a narrative of the policy context in which authorizers operate. We articulate this context to support authorizers and authorizer support organizations in understanding how to implement quality authorizing practices in their States.

## Overview of State Law

The Minnesota Legislature passed the State’s charter school law as part of the 1991 Omnibus K-12 Education Finance Bill.<sup>ii</sup> The law was amended in 2009 to provide for additional oversight of charter schools’ administration, operations, and finance.<sup>iii</sup> Several changes to the law were made in 2014, such as including timelines for authorizers to review and respond to applications, requiring contracts to identify performance of all students as the most important factor in determining contract renewal, and allowing nonprofits to incorporate as liability corporations for the sole purpose of chartering schools.<sup>iv</sup>

# State Authorizing Profile: Minnesota

## Framework Snapshot<sup>1</sup>

### **Authorization**

- Does not cap charter school growth
- Provides for more than one authorizing pathway

*Application includes the following:*

- Specific application criteria
- Timelines
- Evaluation review process
- Process for denied applications

*Performance-based contract includes and provides for the following:*

- Separate post-application agreement
- Rights and responsibilities of authorizer and school
- Academic, financial, and operational performance expectations for schools
- Initial term of not more than five years
- Fiscal, legal, and programmatic autonomy for schools
- Independent charter school governing boards

### **Performance Monitoring**

- Provides for annual authorizer evaluation of schools based on the performance goals and expectations set forth in performance-based contract
- Establishes a comprehensive accountability/monitoring system that includes performance expectations and compliance requirements
- Minimizes schools' administrative and reporting burden
- Articulates authorizer action for schools that fail to meet performance expectations (e.g., probation, sanction, or turnaround)

### **Renewal/Revocation**

- Establishes a clear renewal process and decision-making criteria
- Requires that decisions to renew/revoke be based on student academic achievement
- Requires clear school closure procedures (e.g., parent notification, student enrollment, student record transfer, and disposition of assets)

### **Authorizer Accountability**

- Provides for a registration process for eligible authorizing entities
- Requires the State entity to review authorizers' performance
- Requires authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing

### **Authorizer Leadership, Student Access, and Student Services**

- Requires a mission or strategic vision for authorizing
- Promotes quality authorizing by requiring technical assistance or professional development for authorizers and/or charter school applicants
- Ensures equitable access to all students
- Requires appropriate services for educationally disadvantaged students (e.g., students with special needs, English learners, students in foster care, or unaccompanied homeless youth)

### **Authorizer Funding**

- Provides a mechanism for guaranteed access to authorizer funding
- Includes a process for holding authorizers accountable for how funding is used

**Source(s):** Minnesota Statute, Charter 124E. Charter schools.

<sup>1</sup> As noted in the Introduction and Methodology section, boxes checked in the framework snapshot indicate that aspects of an authorizing practice(s) were included in State law or policy. If individual authorizers create and follow a certain policy that is not in State statute or policy, then the box will not be checked for the entire State.

## Authorization

- Does not cap charter school growth
- Provides for more than one authorizing pathway

### Does not cap charter school growth

State law does not limit charter school growth.

### Provides for more than one authorizing pathway

Under Minnesota law, the following entities can be approved to authorize charter schools: a school board, a nonsectarian charitable organization (including “single-purpose authorizers”), a private college, a State college or university governed by the Board of Trustees of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, the University of Minnesota, and a nonprofit corporation under section 317A.905 (e.g., chambers of commerce, boards of trade, exchanges).<sup>v</sup>

*Application includes the following:*

- Specific application criteria
- Timelines
- Evaluation review process
- Process for denied applications

### Specific application criteria

State law requires the application to include elements such as the school developer’s mission statement, school purposes, program design, and financial plan.<sup>vi</sup> In addition, once authorized, an operator is required to incorporate as a nonprofit corporation before entering into the charter contract.<sup>vii</sup>

### Timelines

The law states that “before an operator may establish and operate a school, the authorizer must file an affidavit with the commissioner stating its intent to charter a school ... at least 14 months before July 1 of the year the new charter school plans to serve students.”<sup>viii</sup> In addition, “the commissioner must approve or disapprove the authorizer’s affidavit within 60 business days of receiving the affidavit. If the commissioner disapproves the affidavit, the commissioner shall notify the authorizer of the deficiencies in the affidavit and the authorizer then has 20 business days to address the deficiencies. The commissioner must notify the authorizer of the commissioner’s final approval or final disapproval within 15 business days after receiving the authorizer’s response to the deficiencies in the affidavit.”<sup>ix</sup>

### Evaluation review process

When an entity submits an application to authorize charter schools, the law requires the entity to include the application and review process the authorizer will use to decide whether to grant charters.<sup>x</sup>

### Process for denied applications

Minnesota law states that “to be approved as an authorizer, an applicant must include in its application to the commissioner at least the following ... the application and review process

the authorizer uses to decide whether to grant charters.”<sup>xi</sup> The law further states that “before an operator may establish and operate a school, the authorizer must file an affidavit with the commissioner stating its intent to charter a school.”<sup>xii</sup> An authorizer must file a separate affidavit for each school it intends to charter at least 14 months before July 1 of the year the new charter school plans to serve students.<sup>xiii</sup> The affidavit must state (1) the terms and conditions under which the authorizer would charter a school; and (2) how the authorizer intends to oversee (i) the fiscal and student performance of the charter school; and (ii) compliance with the terms of the written contract between the authorizer and the charter school board of directors.<sup>xiv</sup>

In addition, the commissioner must approve or disapprove the authorizer’s affidavit within 60 business days of receiving the affidavit; if the commissioner disapproves the affidavit, the commissioner shall notify the authorizer of the deficiencies in the affidavit and the authorizer then has 20 business days to address the deficiencies.<sup>xv</sup> The commissioner must notify the authorizer of the commissioner’s final approval or disapproval within 15 business days after receiving the authorizer’s response to the deficiencies in the affidavit.<sup>xvi</sup> If the authorizer does not address deficiencies to the commissioner’s satisfaction, the commissioner’s disapproval is final.<sup>xvii</sup> An authorizer who fails to obtain the commissioner’s approval is precluded from chartering the school that is the subject of this affidavit.<sup>xviii</sup>

*Performance-based contract includes and provides for the following:*

- Separate post-application agreement
- Rights and responsibilities of authorizer and school
- Academic, financial, and operational performance expectations for schools
- Initial term of not more than five years
- Fiscal, legal, and programmatic autonomy for schools
- Independent charter school governing boards

### **Separate post-application agreement**

To authorize a charter school, the authorizer and the charter school board of directors must sign a written contract within 45 business days of the commissioner’s approval of the authorizer’s affidavit.<sup>xix</sup>

### **Rights and responsibilities of authorizer and school**

The law requires the contract to include “the criteria, processes, and procedures the authorizer will use to monitor and evaluate the fiscal, operational, and academic performance.”<sup>xx</sup>

### **Academic, financial, and operational performance expectations for schools**

The law requires the contract to include “a description of the school program and the specific academic and nonacademic outcomes that pupils must achieve.” In addition, “the achievement levels of the outcomes contained in the contract may exceed the achievement levels of any outcomes adopted by the commissioner for public school students.”

### **Initial term of not more than five years**

The law provides that the initial term of the contract term may be up to five years, plus a preoperational planning period.<sup>xxi</sup>

## Fiscal, legal, and programmatic autonomy for schools

Minnesota law exempts charter schools from all statutes and rules applicable to a school, school board, or school district, unless a statute or rule is made specifically applicable to charter schools.<sup>xxii</sup> Charter schools design their own education program (and must include this program in an application), and a school's board is permitted to enter contracts, sue or be sued, and enter leases.<sup>xxiii</sup> Charter schools also receive operational funding in the same manner as school districts. The law requires charter schools to hire licensed teachers.<sup>xxiv</sup>

## Independent charter school governing boards

State law requires operators authorized to organize and operate a school to establish a board of directors composed of at least five members.<sup>xxv</sup> The board of directors is responsible for policy matters related to operating the school, including budgeting, curriculum programming, personnel, and operating procedures.<sup>xxvi</sup>

## Performance Monitoring

- ☒ Provides for annual authorizer evaluation of schools based on the performance goals and expectations set forth in performance-based contract
- ☒ Establishes a comprehensive accountability/monitoring system that includes performance expectations and compliance requirements
- ☒ Minimizes schools' administrative and reporting burden
- ☒ Articulates authorizer action for schools that fail to meet performance expectations (e.g., probation, sanction, or turnaround)

### Provides for annual authorizer evaluation of schools based on performance goals and expectations set forth in performance-based contract

Charter schools are required to publish an annual report approved by the board of directors, and to distribute the report to its authorizer.<sup>xxvii</sup> At a minimum, the annual report must include information on school enrollment, student attrition, governance and management, staffing, finances, academic performance, innovative practices and implementation, and future plans.<sup>xxviii</sup> In addition, charter schools are required to submit an audit report to the commissioner and its authorizer annually by December 31.<sup>xxix</sup>

### Establishes a comprehensive accountability/monitoring system that includes performance expectations and compliance requirements

State law requires authorizers to monitor and evaluate the academic, financial, operational, and student performance of the schools it authorizes.<sup>xxx</sup>

### Minimizes schools' administrative and reporting burden

Minnesota statute requires districts to report on their strategic plans to improve teaching and learning each year in what is called the World's Best Workforce (WBWF) Report. The law permits a charter school to combine its annual report with the required WBWF Report.<sup>xxxi</sup> Additionally, the law requires the commissioner's review of an authorizer's performance to "use existing department data on the authorizer to minimize duplicate reporting to the extent practicable."<sup>xxxii</sup>

## Articulates intervention for schools that fail to meet performance expectations (e.g., probation, sanction, or turnaround)

Minnesota law requires authorizers to articulate ongoing oversight and evaluation processes and renewal criteria and processes in authorizing applications, commissioner-approved authorizing plans, and contracts.<sup>xxxiii</sup> The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) developed the Minnesota Authorizer Performance Evaluation System Rubric (MAPES Rubric) “to review authorizers’ performance per Minnesota Statutes.”<sup>xxxiv</sup> MAPES was developed by MDE to review authorizers’ performance per Minnesota Statutes, §124E.05, subdivision 5. Measure B.6 of this rubric assesses an “authorizer’s standards and processes for interventions, corrective action and response to complaints.”<sup>xxxv</sup> The guiding question for this indicator is “[t]o what degree does the authorizer have clear and comprehensive standards and processes to address complaints, intervention and corrective action?,” and one of the evaluation data sources includes “documentation of authorizing standards and processes for interventions, corrective action and response to complaints that align with nationally recognized quality authorizing standards.”<sup>xxxvi</sup>

## Renewal/Revocation

- ☑ Establishes a clear renewal process and decision-making criteria
- ☑ Requires that decisions to renew/revoke be based on student academic achievement
- ☑ Requires clear school closure procedures (e.g., parent notification, student enrollment, student record transfer, and disposition of assets)

### Establishes a clear renewal and decision-making criteria

Minnesota law states an authorizer “may unilaterally terminate a contract during the term of the contract” for (i) failure to demonstrate satisfactory academic achievement for all students, including the requirements for pupil performance contained in the contract; (ii) failure to meet generally accepted standards of fiscal management; (iii) violations of law; or (iv) other good cause shown.<sup>xxxvii</sup> In addition, the law mandates that “at least 60 business days before not renewing or terminating a contract, the authorizer shall notify the board of directors of the charter school of the proposed action in writing” that states the reasons for the proposed action and describes the informal hearing process before the authorizer takes final action.<sup>xxxviii</sup> The authorizer is also required to take final action no later than 20 business days before the proposed date for terminating the contract or the end date of the contract.<sup>xxxix</sup>

### Requires decisions to renew/revoke be based on student academic achievement

The law states that “to be approved as an authorizer, an applicant must include in its application to the commissioner at least the following ... the process for renewing or terminating the school’s charter based on evidence showing the academic, organizational, and financial competency of the school, including its success in increasing student achievement and meeting the goals of the charter school agreement.”<sup>xl</sup> The law further requires that the charter include “the specific conditions for contract renewal that identify the performance of all students ... as the most important factor in determining whether to renew the contract.”<sup>xli</sup>

## Requires clear school closure procedures (e.g., parent notification, student enrollment, student record transfer, and disposition of assets)

Per State law, charter applications must include a plan for school closure that “establishes the responsibilities of the school board of directors and the authorizer for (i) notifying the commissioner, school district in which the charter school is located, and parents of enrolled students about the closure; (ii) providing parents of enrolled students information and assistance to enable the student to re-enroll in another school; (iii) transferring student records to the student’s resident school district; and (iv) closing financial operations.”<sup>xlii</sup> In addition, the law requires a school to transfer students’ educational records to their district of residence within 10 business days of the school closing.<sup>xliii</sup>

## Authorizer Accountability

- ☒ Provides for a registration process for eligible authorizing entities
- ☒ Requires the State entity to review authorizers’ performance
- ☒ Requires authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing

### Provides for a registration process for eligible authorizing entities

State law requires an eligible entity to apply to the commissioner to authorize charter schools. The application must “show the applicant’s ability to implement the procedures and satisfy the criteria for chartering a school under this chapter.”<sup>xliiv</sup>

### Requires the State entity to review authorizers’ performance

Per State law, the commissioner is required to review authorizers’ performance every five years, and can do so more frequently at the commissioner’s own initiative or at the request of a charter school operator, charter school board member, or other interested party.<sup>xlv</sup> Authorizers are also required to submit an annual public report by January 15 for the previous school year demonstrating “key indicators of school academic, operational, and financial performance” for the schools in its portfolio.<sup>xlvi</sup> Additionally, the commissioner is authorized to take corrective action against an authorizer, including terminating “the contract with the charter school board of directors of a school it chartered.”<sup>xlvii</sup>

### Requires authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing

When evaluating authorizers, the MDE uses its MAPES Rubric “to identify high-quality authorizing practices to promote authorizer excellence in Minnesota.”<sup>xlviii</sup> One goal of the evaluation system is to “promote national principles and standards for quality charter school authorizing.”<sup>xlix</sup>

## Authorizer Leadership, Student Access, and Student Services

- ☒ Requires a mission or strategic vision for authorizing
- ☒ Promotes quality authorizing by requiring technical assistance or professional development for authorizers and/or charter school applicants
- ☒ Ensures equitable access to all students
- ☒ Requires appropriate services for educationally disadvantaged students (e.g., students with special needs, English learners, students in foster care, or unaccompanied homeless youth)

## Requires a mission or strategic vision for authorizing

The law states that applications to authorize charter schools must include “how the organization carries out its mission by chartering schools.”<sup>i</sup>

## Promotes quality authorizing by requiring technical assistance or professional development for authorizers and/or charter school applicants

The MDE’s 2019 application for organizations to become charter authorizers stated that “once the Intent to Apply Notice is received [by authorizer applicants], MDE will contact applicants to schedule a two hour meeting to review the components of the application, answer questions and provide technical assistance.”<sup>ii</sup> The MDE’s MAPES Rubric for authorizers also includes the following measures and elements:

- (i) Measure A.10. Authorizer High-Quality Authorizing Dissemination. Essential elements “describe the applicant’s process to share best practices and/or provide assistance to other authorizers to promote high quality authorizing.”
- (ii) Measure B.7. Charter School Support, Development and Technical Assistance. Essential elements (i) “describe the plan to provide proactive support, development and technical assistance to charter schools,” and, (ii) “describe how the support, development and technical assistance will be provided in a variety of areas and in a manner to preserve school autonomy.”<sup>iii</sup>

In addition, and pursuant to State law, each charter school board member is required to attend annual training throughout the member’s term on the board’s role and responsibilities, employment policies and practices, and financial management.<sup>liii</sup>

## Ensures equitable access to all students

Charter schools are prohibited from limiting “admission to pupils on the basis of intellectual ability, measures of achievement or aptitude, or athletic ability ... [and] establish[ing] any criteria or requirements for admission that are inconsistent” with the law.<sup>liv</sup>

## Requires appropriate services for educationally disadvantaged students (e.g., students with special needs, English learners, students in foster care, or unaccompanied homeless youth)

The law requires charter schools to comply with rules “relating to the education of pupils with a disability.”<sup>lv</sup> In addition, charter school applications must include a description for “how the charter school board of directors or the charter school operators will provide special instruction and services for children with a disability, and a description of the financial parameters within which the charter school will provide the special instruction and services to children with a disability.”<sup>lvi</sup>

## Authorizer Funding

- Provides a mechanism for guaranteed access to authorizer funding
- Includes a process for holding authorizers accountable for how funding is used

## Provides a mechanism for guaranteed access to authorizer funding

Minnesota law permits authorizers to collect an annual fee from charter schools and requires that the agreed-upon fee amount be included in the charter contract.<sup>lvii</sup> The law further provides

that “the fee that an authorizer may annually assess is the greater of: (1) the basic formula allowance for that year; or (2) the lesser of: (i) the maximum fee factor times the basic formula allowance for that year; or (ii) the fee factor times the basic formula allowance for that year times the charter school’s adjusted pupil units for that year. The fee factor equals .015. The maximum fee factor equals 4.0.”<sup>lviii</sup> In addition, “for the preoperational planning period, after a school is chartered, the authorizer may assess a charter school a fee equal to the basic formula allowance.”<sup>lix</sup>

**Includes a process for holding authorizers accountable for how funding is used**

Minnesota law states that “by September 30 of each year, an authorizer shall submit to the commissioner a statement of income and expenditures related to chartering activities during the previous school year ending June 30.”<sup>lx</sup>

## Endnotes

<sup>i</sup> Language in ESSA Framework Details section below was taken directly and adapted from Title IV, Part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), §§ 4301 to 4311 (20 U.S.C. §§ 7221 to 7221j)—<https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-discretionary-grants-support-services/charter-school-programs/state-entities/funding-and-legislation/>; Language in the NACSA: Framework Details section below were taken directly or adapted from the following resources: National Association of Charter School Authorizers: Quality Authorizing Practices; Reinvigorating the Pipeline; Authorizer Accountability Model Language; Higher Education Institution Authorizers; Leadership, Commitment, Judgment: Elements of Successful Charter School Authorizing; Findings from the Quality Practice Project; Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing; Putting an End to Authorizer Shipping; Language in the Alliance: Framework Details section below were taken directly or adapted from the following resources: National Alliance for Public Charter Schools: 2019 State Charter Law Ranking—<https://www.publiccharters.org/ranking-state-public-charter-school-laws-2019>; 2016 Model Charter School Law—<https://www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/migrated/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/2016ModelCharterSchoolLaw.pdf>

<sup>ii</sup> Minnesota Legislative Reference Library, *Minnesota Issues Resources Guides, Charter Schools*. Retrieved from <https://www.leg.state.mn.us/lrl/guides/guides?issue=charter>

<sup>iii</sup> Laws of Minnesota 2009, Chapter 96.

<sup>iv</sup> Minnesota Association of Charter Schools, *Policy Brief #2-2014, Charter Law Changes* (May 2014). Retrieved from [https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwjooKWP24TqAhXERjABHWwaCPYQFjAAegQIARAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.mncharterschools.org%2F\\_uls%2Fresources%2FPolicy\\_Brief\\_2\\_Charter\\_School\\_Law\\_Changes.pdf&usg=AOvVaw1Hc8hht6nxQyCPB1doxwSP](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwjooKWP24TqAhXERjABHWwaCPYQFjAAegQIARAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.mncharterschools.org%2F_uls%2Fresources%2FPolicy_Brief_2_Charter_School_Law_Changes.pdf&usg=AOvVaw1Hc8hht6nxQyCPB1doxwSP)

<sup>v</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.05, subdivision 1.

<sup>vi</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.06 Subdivision 1.

<sup>vii</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.06, subdivision 2.

<sup>viii</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.06, subdivision 4.

<sup>ix</sup> *Id.*

<sup>x</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.05, subdivision 4.

<sup>xi</sup> *Id.*

<sup>xii</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.06, subdivision 4.

<sup>xiii</sup> *Id.*

<sup>xiv</sup> *Id.*

<sup>xv</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.06, subdivision 5.

<sup>xvi</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.06, subdivision 4.

<sup>xvii</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.06, subdivision 1.

<sup>xviii</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.06, subdivision 4.

<sup>xix</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.05, subdivision 3.

<sup>xx</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.10, subdivision 1.

<sup>xxi</sup> *Id.*

<sup>xxii</sup> *Id.*

<sup>xxiii</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.09.

<sup>xxiv</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.12, subdivision 1.

- xxv Minn. Stat. § 124E.07, subdivision 1.
- xxvi Minn. Stat. § 124E.07, subdivision 6.
- xxvii Minn. Stat. § 124E.16, subdivision 2.
- xxviii Minn. Stat. § 124E.06, subdivision 4.
- xxix Minn. Stat. § 124E.16, subdivision 1.
- xxx Minn. Stat. § 124E.10, subdivision 3.
- xxxi Minn. Stat. § 120B.11, subdivision 5.
- xxxii Minn. Stat. § 124E.05, subdivision 5.
- xxxiii Minn. Stat. §§ 124E.05, subdivision 3 and 124E.10, subdivision 1.
- xxxiv Minnesota Department of Education, *Minnesota Performance Evaluation System Rubric* (September 2019). Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-1-d&q=Minnesota+Department+of+Education%2C+Minnesota+Performance+Evaluation+System+Rubric+%28Sept.+2019%29.#>
- xxxv *Id.*
- xxxvi *Id.*
- xxxvii Minn. Stat. § 124E.10, subdivision 4.
- xxxviii *Id.*
- xxxix *Id.*
- xl *Id.*
- xli Minn. Stat. § 124E.10, subdivision 1.
- xlii *Id.*
- xliiii Minn. Stat. § 124E.10, subdivision 6.
- xliv Minn. Stat. § 124E.05, subdivision 3.
- xlv Minn. Stat. § 124E.05, subdivision 5
- xlvi Minn. Stat. § 124E.16, subdivision 2.
- xlvii Minn. Stat. § 124E.05, subdivision 6.
- xlviii Minnesota Department of Education, *Minnesota Performance Evaluation System Rubric* (September 2019). Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-1-d&q=Minnesota+Department+of+Education%2C+Minnesota+Performance+Evaluation+System+Rubric+%28Sept.+2019%29.#>
- xlvi *Id.*
- <sup>1</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.05, subdivision 4.
- <sup>ii</sup> Minnesota Department of Education, *2019 Application to Authorize Charter Schools in Minnesota*. Retrieved from [https://education.mn.gov/mdeprod/idecplg?IdcService=GET\\_FILE&dDocName=MDE070287&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary](https://education.mn.gov/mdeprod/idecplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&dDocName=MDE070287&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary)
- <sup>iii</sup> *Id.* See also Minnesota Department of Education, *Minnesota Performance Evaluation System Rubric* (September 2019). Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-1-d&q=Minnesota+Department+of+Education%2C+Minnesota+Performance+Evaluation+System+Rubric+%28Sept.+2019%29.#>
- <sup>iiii</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.07, subdivision 7.
- <sup>liv</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.11(e).
- <sup>lv</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.03, subdivision 3.
- <sup>lvi</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.10, subdivision 1.

<sup>lvii</sup> Minn. Stat. § 124E.10, subdivision 3.

<sup>lviii</sup> *Id.*

<sup>lix</sup> *Id.*

<sup>lx</sup> Minn. Stat. §124E.05, subdivision 8.