

# CGMI-A Authorizer Implementation Guide

## Methodology

How charter authorizers can adopt CGMI-A protocols for oversight, renewal, and portfolio management.

CGMI-F v1.0 · Published 2026-01-01

# Contents

- 1 Who This Guide Is For**
- 2 What CGMI-A Provides**
- 3 How CGMI Levels Map to Authorizer Decisions**
- 4 The CGMI-A Evidence Package**
- 5 Using CGMI in Oversight Processes**
- 6 Portfolio-Level Analytics**
- 7 Designation Requirements**
- 8 Adoption Process & Timeline**
- 9 Frequently Asked Questions**

---

This guide provides charter authorizers with everything needed to adopt CGMI-A protocols for oversight, renewal, and portfolio management.

# 1 Who This Guide Is For

This guide is written for charter school authorizers — the organizations responsible for granting charters, overseeing school performance, and making renewal decisions. This includes state education agencies, independent chartering boards, university authorizers, and nonprofit authorizers.

CGMI-A is relevant to authorizers who want to:

- Incorporate a structured, evidence-based governance assessment into their oversight toolkit
- Receive standardized governance evidence packages from schools in their portfolio
- Track governance maturity trends across their portfolio over time
- Use governance maturity as a component of renewal evaluation
- Identify schools with governance risk before it becomes a compliance crisis
- Recognize and reward schools that demonstrate governance excellence

CGMI-A does not replace an authorizer's existing performance framework. It supplements it with a structured governance maturity lens that is more granular than typical authorizer governance indicators and backed by behavioral evidence rather than document review alone.

## 2 What CGMI-A Provides

Authorizers who adopt CGMI-A protocols gain access to a set of tools and evidence structures that integrate into existing oversight and renewal processes.

### Portfolio Dashboard

A single view showing the CGMI maturity level of every school in the authorizer's portfolio. Filter by level, trend direction, or specific domain. Identify which schools are advancing, which are stagnant, and which are at governance risk.

### Level Trend Reporting

Track each school's CGMI level over time — cycle over cycle. See whether governance maturity is improving, stable, or declining. Identify portfolio-wide patterns (e.g., systematic weakness in financial governance across multiple schools).

### Evidence Packages

Schools pursuing renewal or undergoing oversight review can submit a pre-formatted CGMI-A evidence package generated automatically from their appraisal. The package includes domain ratings, evidence citations, capability profile, and advancement history.

### Renewal Criteria Language

Optional pathway to reference CGMI Level thresholds as a component of renewal evaluation. For example: "Schools at CGMI Level 3 or above demonstrate governance quality that meets the authorizer's expectations for renewal."

### Peer Benchmarking

Compare your portfolio's governance maturity distribution against comparable authorizer portfolios. Understand whether your schools' governance maturity is in line with, above, or below sector averages.

### 3 How CGMI Levels Map to Authorizer Decisions

Each CGMI maturity level carries specific implications for authorizer oversight and renewal decisions. The table below provides recommended interpretations.

Level	Governance Quality	Oversight Implication	Renewal Implication
<b>L1</b> <b>Emerging</b>	Reactive, ad hoc, fragile. Dependent on individuals.	Active monitoring recommended. Compliance notices likely warranted. Consider requiring a governance improvement plan.	Not suitable for renewal without a documented remediation plan and evidence of progress.
<b>L2</b> <b>Developing</b>	Compliant. Basic processes in place. Predictable at minimum level.	Standard oversight schedule. Governance meets minimum expectations. No elevated concern.	Satisfactory for renewal consideration. Governance is not a differentiating factor.
<b>L3</b> <b>Established</b>	Proactive. Documented. Consistent regardless of who is serving.	CGMI-A formally activates. Positive indicator in oversight reviews. Evidence package adds value to review process.	Strong renewal candidate. Governance is a positive factor in the evaluation.
<b>L4</b> <b>Advanced</b>	Data-driven, benchmarked, continuously improving.	Authorizer may consider reduced oversight frequency under CGMI-A protocols. School demonstrates self-correcting governance.	Excellent renewal position. May qualify for expedited renewal review under CGMI-A.
<b>L5</b> <b>Exemplary</b>	Institutional capability. Sector model. Adaptive.	Reference school. Authorizer may use as governance model for other schools. Lowest oversight burden.	Highest renewal confidence. Governance is an asset that strengthens the charter portfolio.

**Important:** These are recommended interpretations, not requirements. Each authorizer retains full discretion over how CGMI ratings are weighted in their own oversight and renewal processes. CGMI-A provides the evidence and the framework; the authorizer determines how to use it.

## 4 The CGMI-A Evidence Package

When a school completes a Guided or Certified Appraisal at Level 2 or above, a CGMI-A evidence package is generated automatically. This package is formatted specifically for authorizer consumption and can be attached directly to oversight reports or renewal applications.

### Package Contents

Component	Description
<b>Cover Summary</b>	School name, appraisal date, appraisal tier, overall CGMI level, and GMS score.
<b>Domain Capability Profile</b>	Level rating for each of the five domains (D1–D5). Shows where the school is strong and where it needs improvement.
<b>Practice Area Scores</b>	Score (0–5) for each of the 20 practice areas, organized by domain. Provides granular detail for authorizers who want to understand specific governance dimensions.
<b>Gate Status</b>	Pass/fail status for every gate requirement at the school's current level. Shows which gates are met and which are outstanding.
<b>Evidence Citations</b>	Specific evidence references for each domain rating. Meeting records, training completions, policy audit findings, and financial data cited as the basis for each score.
<b>Year-over-Year Comparison</b>	If prior appraisals exist: domain-by-domain comparison showing improvement, stability, or decline over time.
<b>Advancement Plan Summary</b>	Key actions recommended for the school to reach its next maturity level. Gives the authorizer visibility into the school's governance improvement trajectory.

The evidence package is designed to be read in under 10 minutes by an authorizer staff member who is not a CGMI specialist. The cover summary provides the key takeaway; the detailed sections are available for deeper review when needed.

## 5 Using CGMI in Oversight Processes

CGMI-A is designed to integrate into existing authorizer oversight processes, not replace them. The following table suggests integration points for common authorizer activities.

Authorizer Activity	How CGMI-A Integrates	Evidence Used
<b>Annual Oversight Review</b>	Include CGMI level and domain profile as a governance indicator alongside academic and financial performance data.	CGMI-A evidence package (cover summary + domain profile)
<b>Site Visit Preparation</b>	Review CGMI domain ratings before a site visit to identify governance areas for follow-up discussion with the board.	Practice area scores + gate status
<b>Compliance Monitoring</b>	Schools at Level 1 may warrant proactive outreach before a compliance issue is formally triggered.	Portfolio dashboard + level trend
<b>Charter Renewal</b>	Reference CGMI level as a governance quality indicator in renewal evaluation. Schools submit evidence package with application.	Full evidence package + YOY comparison
<b>Portfolio Risk Assessment</b>	Use portfolio dashboard to identify schools trending downward in governance maturity before they reach crisis.	Portfolio dashboard + trend reporting
<b>Board Training Recommendations</b>	CGMI domain ratings identify specific governance areas where additional board training would be most impactful.	Domain profile + advancement plan

## 6 Portfolio-Level Analytics

CGMI-A provides authorizers with portfolio-level analytics that go beyond individual school monitoring. These analytics surface systemic governance patterns across the entire portfolio.

**Level Distribution.** How many schools are at each CGMI level? Is the distribution shifting upward over time? Are there clusters of schools at Level 1 that need attention?

**Domain Heatmap.** Which governance domains are systematically weak across the portfolio? If multiple schools score low in D4 (Financial Governance), there may be a systemic capacity gap that the authorizer can address through portfolio-wide training or technical assistance.

**Trend Analysis.** Which schools are improving, stable, or declining? Trend data is a leading indicator of future governance risk — a school declining from Level 3 to Level 2 is more informative than a static Level 2 rating.

**Peer Benchmarking.** How does this authorizer's portfolio compare to comparable portfolios? Are governance maturity levels in line with sector averages, or is the portfolio systematically under- or over-performing?

**Renewal Pipeline.** Which schools approaching renewal are at Level 3+ (strong governance) vs. Level 1–2 (governance risk)? Helps the authorizer allocate pre-renewal support to the schools that need it most.

## 7 Designation Requirements

To become a CGMI-A Recognized Authorizer, the following requirements must be met:

- ✓ **Requirement 1.** Authorizer has reviewed and accepted the CGMI-A protocol documentation.
- ✓ **Requirement 2.** At least one authorizer staff member has completed CGMI-A orientation training.
- ✓ **Requirement 3.** Authorizer has established a process for receiving and reviewing CGMI evidence packages from schools.
- ✓ **Requirement 4.** Authorizer has committed to referencing CGMI ratings in at least one formal oversight process (renewal, annual review, or compliance monitoring).

### Annual Renewal

The CGMI-A Recognized Authorizer designation is subject to annual renewal. Renewal requires confirmation that the authorizer continues to use CGMI-A protocols in at least one formal oversight process. No additional training is required for renewal unless CGMI-A protocol changes are published.

## 8 Adoption Process & Timeline

The typical CGMI-A adoption process takes 4–6 weeks from initial inquiry to designation issuance.

Step	Activity	Timeline	Participants
1	Authorizer completes CGMI-A designation inquiry form	Day 1	Authorizer leadership
2	CGMI conducts orientation session with authorizer staff	Week 1–2	CGMI team + authorizer staff
3	Authorizer reviews CGMI-A protocol documentation	Week 2–3	Authorizer staff
4	Authorizer establishes evidence package receipt process	Week 3–4	Authorizer operations
5	Authorizer signs the CGMI-A Recognition Agreement	Week 4–5	Authorizer leadership
6	CGMI issues CGMI-A Recognized Authorizer designation	Week 5–6	CGMI
7	Portfolio dashboard activated; schools notified	Upon designation	CGMI + authorizer

There is no cost to pursue CGMI-A designation. The designation and portfolio dashboard access are provided at no charge to authorizers. CGMI's goal is broad authorizer adoption to maximize the value of CGMI ratings for schools.

## 9 Frequently Asked Questions

### Does CGMI-A replace our existing performance framework?

No. CGMI-A supplements your existing framework with a structured governance maturity lens. It provides granular governance data that most authorizer performance frameworks do not capture. You decide how to weight CGMI ratings alongside your existing academic, financial, and organizational indicators.

### What if a school in our portfolio has not completed a CGMI appraisal?

CGMI-A applies only to schools that have completed at least one CGMI appraisal (Self-Assessment, Guided, or Certified). Schools without an appraisal simply have no CGMI rating. The portfolio dashboard shows rated and unrated schools separately.

### Can we require schools to complete a CGMI appraisal?

That is your decision as an authorizer. Some authorizers may choose to encourage CGMI appraisals as part of their oversight expectations. Others may adopt CGMI-A to receive evidence from schools that voluntarily pursue appraisals. CGMI does not prescribe the authorizer's policy.

### What appraisal tier should our schools use?

Self-Assessment (SA) is a good starting point for schools new to CGMI, but is capped at Level 2. Guided Appraisal (GA) is the standard annual appraisal and is capped at Level 4. For schools pursuing Level 5 or needing an official rating for high-stakes decisions, Certified Appraisal (CA) is recommended.

### How do CGMI ratings relate to NACSA standards?

CGMI domains map directly to NACSA Performance Framework standards. D2 maps to NACSA compliance indicators, D3 to oversight and evaluation, D4 to financial performance, and D5 to transparency and public accountability. A CGMI-C compliance exhibit documents these mappings for each appraisal.

### What data does the authorizer need to provide?

None. All CGMI data comes from the school's appraisal process. The authorizer receives the CGMI-A evidence package and portfolio analytics — there is no data entry or reporting burden on the authorizer side.

### Is there a cost to schools for CGMI appraisals?

Self-Assessment is free. Guided Appraisal costs depend on the governance management platform the school uses. Certified Appraisal fees are set by the individual CGMI Certified Appraiser. CGMI-A designation for the authorizer is provided at no charge.

---

### CGMI-A · Authorizer Integration

Contact: [cgmi@chartervision.org](mailto:cgmi@chartervision.org) · Web: [www.cgmi.institute/integration/authorizer](http://www.cgmi.institute/integration/authorizer)  
© CGMI. All rights reserved. CGMI is a trademark of Charter Vision.