

Framework Specification

CGMI-F v1.0

Five domains · Twenty practice areas · Five maturity levels
Three appraisal tiers · Governance Maturity Score (0–100)
Three integration profiles · Four ecosystem designations

Initial Publication · Published 2026-01-01

Contents

Part I Maturity Framework

- 1 Framework Overview
- 2 Five Domains
- 3 Twenty Practice Areas
- 4 Five Maturity Levels
- 5 Level 1 — Emerging
- 6 Level 2 — Developing
- 7 Level 3 — Established
- 8 Level 4 — Advanced
- 9 Level 5 — Exemplary
- 10 Capability Matrix
- 11 Gate Requirements Summary

Part II Appraisal & Scoring

- 12 Appraisal Methodology
- 13 Governance Maturity Score
- 14 Score Interpretation & Gate Thresholds

Part III Integration Layer

- 15 Integration Profiles
- 16 Integration Designations
- 17 Integration Outputs by Tier

Part IV Appendices

- 18 Core Design Principles
- 19 Comparison: CGMI vs. Alternatives
- 20 IP, Citation & Contact

This document is the complete CGMI-F v1.0 framework specification. It consolidates the maturity model, appraisal methodology, scoring system, and integration layer into a single authoritative reference. For the machine-readable schema, visit www.cgmi.institute/schema/cgmi-f-v1.json.

Part I

Maturity Framework

1 Framework Overview

CGMI — Charter Governance Maturity & Integration — is a staged governance maturity framework built specifically for charter school boards. It measures governance across five domains and twenty practice areas. Each school earns a CGMI maturity level from 1 (Emerging) to 5 (Exemplary), determined by the lowest of its five domain ratings.

The framework supports three tiers of appraisal — from manual self-assessment through formal certified evaluation — so schools at every stage of maturity have a clear, actionable path forward. Ratings map directly to NACSA principles and CSP rubric sections, making them immediately legible to authorizers without translation.

CGMI operates across two layers. The **Maturity layer** (Part I of this specification) determines how mature a school's governance is. The **Integration layer** (Part III) connects that rating to the broader charter ecosystem through three integration profiles: CGMI-A (authorizer), CGMI-P (partner), and CGMI-C (compliance).

Level Determination Logic. A school's overall CGMI level is determined by its lowest domain rating. A school that is Level 4 in four domains but Level 2 in one is rated Level 2 overall. This staged approach prevents strong areas from masking weak ones and ensures balanced governance capability across all five dimensions of board effectiveness.

| 5 Domains | 20 Practice Areas | 5 Levels | 3 Appraisal Tiers | GMS 0–100 |
|--|---|----------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Board composition, processes, oversight, finance, transparency | Four per domain — operational units of governance | Emerging through Exemplary | Self-Assessment, Guided, Certified | Composite governance health metric |

2 Five Domains

CGMI organizes charter school governance into five independent domains. Each domain contains four practice areas and is measured independently at each maturity level. Together the five domains provide comprehensive coverage of every dimension of board governance.

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| <p>D1</p> | <p>Board Composition & Competency</p> <p>A governance body is only as capable as its members. This domain measures whether the board has the right people, in the right roles, with the right knowledge.</p> | <p>NACSA: Governing in the Public Interest — Board composition and independence</p> <p>CSP: Section H — Governing Board Quality</p> |
| <p>D2</p> | <p>Governance Processes & Compliance</p> <p>Processes are the engine of governance. This domain measures whether governance operates through repeatable, documented processes that meet legal requirements and best practice standards.</p> | <p>NACSA: Compliance indicators across all five performance domains</p> <p>CSP: Section G — Governance Policies & Procedures</p> |
| <p>D3</p> | <p>Strategic Oversight & Accountability</p> <p>Boards govern strategy, not operations. This domain measures whether the board provides meaningful strategic direction, evaluates school leadership, and maintains accountability for the charter's promises.</p> | <p>NACSA: Ongoing oversight and evaluation — school quality accountability</p> <p>CSP: Section A — Grant Project Goals</p> |
| <p>D4</p> | <p>Financial Governance & Sustainability</p> <p>Charter boards are fiduciaries of public funds. This domain measures whether the board provides meaningful financial oversight — not just receives reports, but actively understands, monitors, and acts on financial health.</p> | <p>NACSA: Financial performance domain — fiscal oversight and auditing</p> <p>CSP: Section F — Financial Management & Sustainability</p> |
| <p>D5</p> | <p>Transparency & Stakeholder Accountability</p> <p>Charter schools are public institutions. This domain measures whether the board governs transparently — making information available to the public, engaging the community, and fulfilling its obligations as a steward of public education.</p> | <p>NACSA: Transparency and public accountability standards</p> <p>CSP: Section E — Student Demand and Community/Local Support</p> |

3 Twenty Practice Areas

Each domain contains four practice areas — the operational units of governance measurement. Every practice area is scored 0–5 during an appraisal. Scores roll up into domain scores and the composite Governance Maturity Score.

D1 Board Composition & Competency

| ID | Practice Area | Key Measures |
|--------|-------------------------------------|--|
| D1.PA1 | Board Composition | Board size, seat count, required positions (Chair, Treasurer, Secretary), vacancy management, term limits |
| D1.PA2 | Member Competency | Role-specific knowledge, certification completion, ongoing professional development, skill gap identification |
| D1.PA3 | Succession Planning | Officer election cycles, recruitment pipeline, transition protocols, knowledge transfer processes |
| D1.PA4 | Diversity & Independence | Board composition diversity (skills, background, community representation), independence from management and EMO/CMO |

D2 Governance Processes & Compliance

| ID | Practice Area | Key Measures |
|--------|--|---|
| D2.PA1 | Meeting Management | Notice compliance, quorum achievement, agenda structure, open meetings law adherence, closed session protocols |
| D2.PA2 | Records & Documentation | Minutes quality, completeness, timeliness, retention, public records compliance, document management |
| D2.PA3 | Policy Framework | Policy library completeness, currency, alignment with state law, conflict of interest enforcement, whistleblower protection |
| D2.PA4 | Legal & Regulatory Compliance | Charter agreement adherence, state statute compliance, federal law compliance (IDEA, FERPA, Title IX), authorizer reporting |

D3 Strategic Oversight & Accountability

| ID | Practice Area | Key Measures |
|--------|---------------------------------|--|
| D3.PA1 | Strategic Planning | Existence and currency of strategic plan, board role in plan development, monitoring of strategic milestones |
| D3.PA2 | Leadership Oversight | Executive director/principal evaluation process, performance metrics, accountability mechanisms, management separation |
| D3.PA3 | Academic Accountability | Board oversight of academic performance data, response to underperformance, alignment with charter mission |
| D3.PA4 | Charter Promise Fidelity | Monitoring compliance with charter commitments, enrollment targets, grade expansion, program fidelity |

D4 Financial Governance & Sustainability

| ID | Practice Area | Key Measures |
|--------|----------------------------|--|
| D4.PA1 | Financial Oversight | Budget approval and monitoring, fund balance management, Treasurer engagement, financial dashboard use, board financial literacy |

| | | |
|--------|--------------------------------------|---|
| D4.PA2 | Audit & Internal Controls | Annual audit process, audit committee function (if applicable), response to audit findings, internal control policies |
| D4.PA3 | Financial Sustainability | Revenue diversification, reserve fund management, multi-year financial planning, facility cost management |
| D4.PA4 | Procurement & Compliance | Procurement policy compliance, conflict of interest in contracting, CMO/EMO financial independence, grant management |

D5 Transparency & Stakeholder Accountability

| ID | Practice Area | Key Measures |
|--------|--------------------------------|--|
| D5.PA1 | Public Transparency | Meeting notice publication, agenda and minutes availability, annual report publication, public access compliance |
| D5.PA2 | Community Engagement | Parent and community input mechanisms, stakeholder communication, public comment processes |
| D5.PA3 | Authorizer Relationship | Quality of authorizer communication, proactive disclosure, response to authorizer requests, renewal readiness |
| D5.PA4 | Continuous Improvement | Board self-assessment practice, governance review cycles, learning from failures, benchmarking against peers |

4 Five Maturity Levels

A staged maturity model where each level represents a meaningful threshold of governance capability, with cumulative gate requirements. A school's overall level is the lowest of its five domain ratings. Sections 5–9 contain the full specification for each level.

1**Level 1 — Emerging****Reactive. Ad hoc. Dependent on individuals.**

Governance exists nominally but is not systematically practiced. The board meets minimum legal requirements inconsistently. Success depends on individual heroics rather than repeatable processes.

2**Level 2 — Developing****Aware. Basic processes in place. Compliance-focused.**

The board has established basic governance processes and consistently meets legal compliance requirements. Governance is predictable at a minimum level but practices are compliance-driven rather than quality-driven.

3**Level 3 — Established****Proactive. Documented standards. Governance-driven culture.**

The board governs through well-defined, documented processes that go beyond minimum compliance. Governance quality is consistent regardless of which individuals are serving.

4**Level 4 — Advanced****Data-driven. Measured. Benchmarked. Continuously improving.**

The board manages governance quality through quantitative data and proactive benchmarking. Year-over-year improvement is demonstrated and measured. Governance is a competitive advantage.

5**Level 5 — Exemplary****Systemic. Institutional. Adaptive. A governance model for others.**

Governance is deeply embedded in organizational culture. The board continuously improves, contributes to sector-wide knowledge, and adapts governance systems. Level 5 schools are governance exemplars.

5 Level 1 — Emerging

Reactive. Ad hoc. Dependent on individuals.

Governance exists nominally but is not systematically practiced. The board meets minimum legal requirements inconsistently. Success depends on individual heroics rather than repeatable processes. Governance quality is fragile and would deteriorate significantly if key individuals left.

Gate Requirements

- ✓ School is legally incorporated as a nonprofit
- ✓ Board has minimum required seats (per bylaws)
- ✓ School has an active charter agreement
- ✓ Board has met at least once in the past 90 days

Domain Characteristics

| Domain | Characteristic at Level 1 |
|--|---|
| D1 Board Composition & Competency | Board has required seats filled but little formal orientation, inconsistent training, and no succession planning. |
| D2 Governance Processes & Compliance | Meetings happen but notice compliance is inconsistent, minutes are often late or incomplete, and policies exist but aren't actively maintained. |
| D3 Strategic Oversight & Accountability | Board receives reports but doesn't actively drive strategy. Leadership evaluation is informal or absent. |
| D4 Financial Governance & Sustainability | Budget is approved annually but financial oversight between meetings is limited. Treasurer may be the only board member engaging with financial data. |
| D5 Transparency & Stakeholder Accountability | Required notices are posted but community engagement is minimal. Authorizer relationship is reactive. |

Signals & Indicators

- Governance Maturity Score typically 0–45
- Meeting notice compliance below 70%
- Less than 50% board certification completion
- Multiple unresolved Critical policy audit findings
- No financial documents uploaded in 90+ days

Authorizer Perspective

Significant governance risk. Likely to receive compliance notices from authorizer. Renewal at risk if not addressed.

Integration Profile Status

| Profile | Status |
|---------------|--|
| CGMI-C | Diagnostic only |
| CGMI-A | Not active — significant governance risk |
| CGMI-P | Not active |

6 Level 2 — Developing

Aware. Basic processes in place. Compliance-focused.

The board has established basic governance processes and consistently meets legal compliance requirements. Governance is predictable at a minimum level. The board understands its responsibilities but governance practices are compliance-driven rather than quality-driven. There is limited proactive governance activity.

Gate Requirements

- ✓ All Emerging gates met
- ✓ Meeting notice compliance ≥ 85% over trailing 6 months
- ✓ Minutes approved within 30 days for ≥ 80% of meetings
- ✓ No unresolved Critical policy audit findings
- ✓ Annual audit completed within required timeframe
- ✓ At least 50% of board members have completed foundational training

Domain Characteristics

| Domain | Characteristic at Level 2 |
|--|--|
| D1 Board Composition & Competency | All board positions filled, roles understood, basic orientation for new members. Training is happening but not systematically tracked. |
| D2 Governance Processes & Compliance | Meeting notices consistently posted on time, minutes completed within 30 days, basic policy library in place. |
| D3 Strategic Oversight & Accountability | Strategic plan exists and is referenced. Leadership receives performance feedback. Academic data is reviewed at meetings. |
| D4 Financial Governance & Sustainability | Annual audit completed on time. Budget reviewed monthly. Treasurer actively engaged. No material audit findings. |
| D5 Transparency & Stakeholder Accountability | Meeting documents published. Parent input mechanisms exist. Authorizer reporting completed on time. |

Signals & Indicators

- Governance Maturity Score typically 45–62
- Meeting notice compliance 85–95%
- 50–75% board certification completion
- Policy audit: only Advisory findings remain
- Financial documents uploaded on schedule

Authorizer Perspective

Satisfactory governance. Meets minimum compliance expectations. Not at risk but not distinguished.

Integration Profile Status

| Profile | Status |
|---------------|---|
| CGMI-C | Active — appraisal report accepted as compliance evidence |
| CGMI-A | Eligible — meets minimum compliance |

| | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| CGMI-P | Tracking — network monitoring begins |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|

7 Level 3 — Established

Proactive. Documented standards. Governance-driven culture.

The board governs through well-defined, documented processes that go beyond minimum compliance requirements. Governance quality is consistent regardless of which individuals are serving. The board is proactive — it anticipates issues rather than reacting to them. There is a clear culture of governance quality and continuous improvement.

Gate Requirements

- ✓ All Developing gates met
- ✓ 100% of board members certified in role-specific training
- ✓ Board self-assessment conducted within last 12 months
- ✓ Strategic plan current (adopted within 3 years, progress reviewed annually)
- ✓ Formal executive evaluation process documented and executed annually
- ✓ Policy audit: zero unresolved Advisory findings older than 90 days
- ✓ Governance Maturity Score ≥ 70

Domain Characteristics

| Domain | Characteristic at Level 3 |
|--|---|
| D1 Board Composition & Competency | All members certified in their roles. Succession plan active. Board composition regularly reviewed against strategic needs. Skills gaps identified and recruitment targets set. |
| D2 Governance Processes & Compliance | Governance processes are documented and followed consistently. Policy library fully compliant, regularly reviewed, and maintained. Board self-assessment conducted annually. |
| D3 Strategic Oversight & Accountability | Multi-year strategic plan actively monitored. Executive evaluation is formal, documented, and tied to charter commitments. Academic performance data drives board discussion. |
| D4 Financial Governance & Sustainability | Board financial literacy demonstrated across multiple members. Audit committee functioning. Reserve fund policy in place and funded. Financial risks proactively monitored. |
| D5 Transparency & Stakeholder Accountability | Transparency portal fully active. Annual community engagement cycle in place. Authorizer relationship is collaborative and proactive. Board self-assessment drives annual improvements. |

Signals & Indicators

- Governance Maturity Score typically 63–78
- Meeting notice compliance $\geq 95\%$
- 100% board certification completion
- Policy audit: only Informational findings
- Multi-year financial trend positive or stable
- Transparency portal fully active and current

Authorizer Perspective

Strong governance. Likely to receive positive feedback at oversight reviews. Good renewal candidate.

Integration Profile Status

| Profile | Status |
|---------|--------|
|---------|--------|

| | |
|---------------|--|
| CGMI-C | Active — Enhanced evidentiary weight |
| CGMI-A | Active — formally recognized in authorizer oversight |
| CGMI-P | Tracking — eligible for governance peer support |

8 Level 4 — Advanced

Data-driven. Measured. Benchmarked. Continuously improving.

The board manages governance quality through quantitative data and proactive benchmarking. Governance decisions are evidence-based. The board tracks its own performance metrics, compares to peers, and uses data to prioritize improvement. Year-over-year governance improvement is demonstrated and measured. At this level, governance is a competitive advantage for the school.

Gate Requirements

- ✓ All Established gates met
- ✓ Governance Maturity Score ≥ 80 for two consecutive cycles
- ✓ Year-over-year improvement documented across at least 3 of 5 domains
- ✓ Peer benchmark comparison conducted and acted upon
- ✓ Board composition skills matrix current and actively used for recruitment
- ✓ Multi-year financial model maintained and reviewed quarterly
- ✓ At least 2 board members advancing to intermediate/expert training tier

Domain Characteristics

| Domain | Characteristic at Level 4 |
|--|---|
| D1 Board Composition & Competency | Board composition is data-informed (skills matrix, community representation analysis). Member performance is tracked. Development plans exist for each member. |
| D2 Governance Processes & Compliance | Governance processes are measured and their effectiveness is evaluated. Compliance rates are tracked as KPIs. Process improvement is data-driven. |
| D3 Strategic Oversight & Accountability | Strategic planning is tied to quantitative outcomes. Executive evaluation uses objective metrics aligned to charter commitments. Academic accountability includes leading indicators. |
| D4 Financial Governance & Sustainability | Board financial oversight includes trend analysis, scenario planning, and peer benchmarking. Financial risk indicators are defined and monitored. Multi-year financial model is maintained. |
| D5 Transparency & Stakeholder Accountability | Community engagement is tracked and measured. Authorizer feedback loop is formalized. Annual governance review compares year-over-year on all dimensions. |

Signals & Indicators

- Governance Maturity Score typically 78–90
- Year-over-year score improvement documented
- Peer benchmark: top 25% of comparable schools
- Zero compliance incidents in trailing 12 months
- Board self-assessment drives measurable improvement

Authorizer Perspective

Exemplary governance. Likely cited as a model school by authorizer. Strong renewal position.

Integration Profile Status

| Profile | Status |
|---------|--------|
|---------|--------|

| | |
|---------------|---|
| CGMI-C | Active — Enhanced, full artifact set |
| CGMI-A | Active — Distinguished, may qualify for expedited renewal |
| CGMI-P | Active — Anchor school eligible |

9 Level 5 — Exemplary

Systemic. Institutional. Adaptive. A governance model for others.

Governance is deeply embedded in the school's organizational culture and operates as a systemic capability. The board continuously improves its own governance practices, contributes to sector-wide knowledge, and adapts governance systems to meet evolving needs. At this level, the school's governance practices are worth studying and replicating. Level 5 schools are candidates to serve as governance exemplars for their authorizers and state associations.

Gate Requirements

- ✓ All Advanced gates met
- ✓ Governance Maturity Score ≥ 90 for two consecutive cycles
- ✓ Active contribution to charter governance sector (hosting learning, speaking, publishing, or mentoring)
- ✓ Expert-tier training completion for at least one board member per role
- ✓ Zero compliance incidents across any domain in trailing 24 months
- ✓ Authorizer has cited school as a governance model or best practice
- ✓ Full year-over-year improvement documented across all 5 domains

Domain Characteristics

| Domain | Characteristic at Level 5 |
|--|---|
| D1 Board Composition & Competency | Board composition is a strategic asset. Governance knowledge is institutionalized — not dependent on individuals. Alumni network of past board members actively contributes. |
| D2 Governance Processes & Compliance | Governance processes evolve continuously based on evidence. The board proactively updates policies in response to regulatory changes before being required to do so. |
| D3 Strategic Oversight & Accountability | Strategic oversight is anticipatory. The board regularly engages with emerging challenges before they become crises. Charter promise delivery is a point of organizational pride. |
| D4 Financial Governance & Sustainability | Financial governance is a model for the sector. The school may mentor other boards on financial oversight practices. Long-term financial sustainability is structurally assured. |
| D5 Transparency & Stakeholder Accountability | The school actively contributes to the charter governance ecosystem — sharing practices, participating in sector improvement, and hosting peer learning for other boards. |

Signals & Indicators

- Governance Maturity Score consistently ≥ 90
- Peer benchmark: top 10% of comparable schools
- School cited by authorizer or state association as governance model
- Expert-tier training completion

Authorizer Perspective

Governance exemplar. Authorizer would use this school as a reference for other schools. Highest renewal confidence.

Integration Profile Status

| Profile | Status |
|---------------|---|
| CGMI-C | Active — Enhanced, reference-quality (requires Certified Appraisal) |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| CGMI-A | Active — Exemplar, reference school (requires Certified Appraisal) |
| CGMI-P | Active — Anchor school, governance mentor (requires Certified Appraisal) |

10 Capability Matrix

Five domains across the horizontal axis, five maturity levels on the vertical. Every cell describes what governance looks like in that domain at that level.

| Level | Board Comp. | Processes | Oversight | Financial | Transparency |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| L5 Exemplary | Board composition is a strategic asset. Governance knowledge is institutionalized — not dependent on individuals. Alumni... | Governance processes evolve continuously based on evidence. The board proactively updates policies in response to regula... | Strategic oversight is anticipatory. The board regularly engages with emerging challenges before they become crises. Cha... | Financial governance is a model for the sector. The school may mentor other boards on financial oversight practices. Lon... | The school actively contributes to the charter governance ecosystem — sharing practices, participating in sector improve... |
| L4 Advanced | Board composition is data-informed (skills matrix, community representation analysis). Member performance is tracked. De... | Governance processes are measured and their effectiveness is evaluated. Compliance rates are tracked as KPIs. Process im... | Strategic planning is tied to quantitative outcomes. Executive evaluation uses objective metrics aligned to charter comm... | Board financial oversight includes trend analysis, scenario planning, and peer benchmarking. Financial risk indicators a... | Community engagement is tracked and measured. Authorizer feedback loop is formalized. Annual governance review compares ... |
| L3 Established | All members certified in their roles. Succession plan active. Board composition regularly reviewed against strategic nee... | Governance processes are documented and followed consistently. Policy library fully compliant, regularly reviewed, and m... | Multi-year strategic plan actively monitored. Executive evaluation is formal, documented, and tied to charter commitment... | Board financial literacy demonstrated across multiple members. Audit committee functioning. Reserve fund policy in place... | Transparency portal fully active. Annual community engagement cycle in place. Authorizer relationship is collaborative a... |
| L2 Developing | All board positions filled, roles understood, basic orientation for new members. Training is happening but not systemati... | Meeting notices consistently posted on time, minutes completed within 30 days, basic policy library in place. | Strategic plan exists and is referenced. Leadership receives performance feedback. Academic data is reviewed at meetings... | Annual audit completed on time. Budget reviewed monthly. Treasurer actively engaged. No material audit findings. | Meeting documents published. Parent input mechanisms exist. Authorizer reporting completed on time. |
| L1 Emerging | Board has required seats filled but little formal orientation, inconsistent training, and no succession planning. | Meetings happen but notice compliance is inconsistent, minutes are often late or incomplete, and policies exist but aren... | Board receives reports but doesn't actively drive strategy. Leadership evaluation is informal or absent. | Budget is approved annually but financial oversight between meetings is limited. Treasurer may be the only board member ... | Required notices are posted but community engagement is minimal. Authorizer relationship is reactive. |

11 Gate Requirements Summary

Cumulative gate requirements across all five levels. Each level requires all prior-level gates to remain in effect.

| Level | New Gates at This Level | Cumulative Total |
|-----------------------|--|------------------|
| L1 Emerging | Nonprofit incorporation • Minimum seats filled • Active charter • Met in past 90 days | 4 |
| L2 Developing | Notice compliance \geq 85% • Minutes within 30 days \geq 80% • No Critical audit findings • Audit on time • 50% training | 10 |
| L3 Established | 100% certified • Self-assessment within 12mo • Strategic plan current • Executive eval • Zero Advisory findings >90d • GMS \geq 70 | 17 |
| L4 Advanced | GMS \geq 80 (2 cycles) • YOY improvement in 3/5 domains • Peer benchmark • Skills matrix • Multi-year financial model • 2 members in advanced training | 24 |
| L5 Exemplary | GMS \geq 90 (2 cycles) • Sector contribution • Expert training • Zero incidents (24mo) • Authorizer citation • YOY all 5 domains | 31 |

Part II

Appraisal & Scoring

12 Appraisal Methodology

CGMI maturity ratings are assigned through a three-tier appraisal system ranging from manual self-assessment to formal, human-certified evaluation. Each tier serves a different need at a different level of rigor and cost.

Three Appraisal Tiers

| Tier | Description | Conducted by | Level Cap | Rigor |
|-------------------------------|---|--|----------------|--------------|
| SA Self-Assessment | Manual, point-in-time assessment. Board and school leadership independently gather governance artifacts and evaluate each domain against CGMI criteria. | Board members + school administrators | Level 2 | Foundational |
| GA Guided Appraisal | Structured annual appraisal facilitated through a governance management platform. Automates evidence collection and maps evidence to CGMI criteria. | Platform-facilitated + automated evidence analysis | Level 4 | High |
| CA Certified Appraisal | Formal appraisal by a trained, CGMI Certified Appraiser. Combines platform data with structured interviews, document review, and direct observation. | CGMI Certified Appraiser (human) | No cap | Highest |

Six-Step Appraisal Process

- 1. Intake** — School confirms state, fiscal year, and appraisal scope (full 5-domain or targeted). Evidence collection period defined.
- 2. Evidence Collection** — Governance data collected from platform systems or gathered manually: meeting records, training completions, policy audit findings, financial data, compliance events.
- 3. Domain Analysis** — Each domain analyzed against CGMI level criteria. Evidence mapped to practice areas. Gaps identified with specific references.
- 4. Level Determination** — Domain ratings assigned (Level 1–5 per domain + capability level per practice area). Overall maturity level determined by lowest domain score.
- 5. Report Generation** — Governance Maturity Appraisal Report generated: domain ratings, evidence citations, strengths, gaps, advancement recommendations, peer comparison.
- 6. Action Planning** — Prioritized advancement plan generated: specific actions per domain, estimated improvement potential, recommended timeline for next level.

Evidence Standards

Acceptable evidence must be objective, verifiable, and tied to actual governance activity. Evidence sources include: meeting minutes, training records, policy audit findings, financial reports, compliance event logs, board self-assessment results, strategic planning documents, executive evaluation records, and platform activity logs from governance

management platforms.

13 Governance Maturity Score

The GMS is a 0–100 composite score calculated from practice-area-level assessments across all five CGMI domains. Each domain contributes up to 20 points (4 practice areas × 5 points each). The GMS serves as a diagnostic tool at Levels 1–2 and becomes a formal gate requirement at Levels 3–5.

Formula: $GMS = D1 (0-20) + D2 (0-20) + D3 (0-20) + D4 (0-20) + D5 (0-20)$

Practice Area Scoring Scale

| Score | Level | What It Means |
|-------|--------------|---|
| 0 | Not assessed | Practice area has not been evaluated or school is non-compliant with foundational requirements. |
| 1 | Emerging | Governance activity exists but is ad hoc, inconsistent, and dependent on individuals. |
| 2 | Developing | Basic processes in place. Minimum compliance requirements met consistently. |
| 3 | Established | Documented, repeatable processes that go beyond compliance. Proactive governance culture. |
| 4 | Advanced | Data-driven, measured, benchmarked. Year-over-year improvement demonstrated. |
| 5 | Exemplary | Systemic, institutional capability. Continuous improvement. Sector model. |

Scoring by Appraisal Tier

| Tier | How Scores Are Assigned | Score Authority | Level Cap |
|-----------|---|---|----------------|
| SA | Board and admins self-score each practice area 0–5 based on collected artifacts. | Informational. Cannot be used for Level 3+. | Level 2 |
| GA | Platform analyzes evidence across all 20 practice areas using standardized criteria. | Authoritative. Used for gate evaluation up to Level 4. | Level 4 |
| CA | Certified Appraiser validates practice area scores through interviews, review, and observation. | Official. Highest evidentiary weight. Required for Level 5. | No cap |

14 Score Interpretation & Gate Thresholds

GMS Score Ranges

| GMS | Label | Interpretation |
|--------|----------------------|--|
| 0–29 | Critical | Critical governance gaps. Immediate attention required across multiple domains. |
| 30–44 | Foundational | Foundational governance in place but inconsistent. Significant improvement needed. |
| 45–62 | Compliant | Basic processes established. Compliance-focused. Room for proactive governance. |
| 63–69 | Approaching | Governance culture emerging. Approaching Level 3 gate threshold. |
| 70–79 | Strong | Strong governance culture. Proactive, documented, consistent across domains. |
| 80–89 | Distinguished | Data-driven governance. Measurable improvement. Benchmarked against peers. |
| 90–100 | Exemplary | Institutional governance capability. Sector model. Sustained excellence. |

GMS as Gate Requirement

| Level | Type | GMS Threshold | Note |
|----------------|-------------|---------------|---|
| L1 Emerging | Signal | 0–45 | Diagnostic indicator only |
| L2 Developing | Signal | 45–62 | Diagnostic indicator |
| L3 Established | Gate | ≥ 70 | Must be met in a single appraisal cycle |
| L4 Advanced | Gate | ≥ 80 | Sustained for two consecutive cycles |
| L5 Exemplary | Gate | ≥ 90 | Sustained for two consecutive cycles |

The GMS is a **companion metric** to the CGMI maturity level — it does not replace it. A school's overall level is still determined by its lowest domain rating (the staged model). The GMS provides a single-number summary of governance health and serves as an additional gate requirement at Levels 3–5. A school could have a high GMS but a low overall level if one domain lags significantly behind the others. This is by design — the staged model ensures balanced capability, while the GMS rewards overall strength.

Capability Profile Example

Every appraisal produces a domain-level capability profile alongside the composite GMS. Schools see exactly which domains are strong and where to focus improvement.

| Domain | Score | Avg PA Score | Implied Level |
|-----------------------------|---------|--------------|---------------|
| D1 Board Composition | 16 / 20 | 4.0 | Level 4 |
| D2 Processes | 14 / 20 | 3.5 | Level 3 |
| D3 Oversight | 17 / 20 | 4.25 | Level 4 |
| D4 Financial | 13 / 20 | 3.25 | Level 3 |

| | | | |
|------------------------|---------|------|---------|
| D5 Transparency | 15 / 20 | 3.75 | Level 3 |
|------------------------|---------|------|---------|

GMS: 75 / 100 • Overall Level: 3 (Established) • Overall level determined by lowest domain (D4 at 3.25 → Level 3). GMS of 75 satisfies the ≥ 70 gate.

Part III

Integration Layer

15 Integration Profiles

CGMI's Integration layer extends a school's maturity rating into the broader charter ecosystem. Three integration profiles connect schools, authorizers, network partners, and compliance programs under a common governance standard.

| Profile | For | Purpose | Activates at |
|--------------------------|---|--|----------------|
| CGMI-A Authorizer | Charter authorizers | Formally recognize and use CGMI ratings in oversight, renewal, and portfolio management. Portfolio-level maturity distribution and trend reporting. Optional pathway to reference CGMI level thresholds in renewal criteria. | Level 3 |
| CGMI-P Partner | CMOs, EMOs, network operators | Portfolio-wide maturity tracking across network schools. Systemic gap identification and network benchmarking. Governance anchor school designation for Level 4+ schools. | Level 2 |
| CGMI-C Compliance | Schools, state associations, grant programs | Pre-mapped CGMI criteria to CSP grant rubrics, NACSA standards, and state-level requirements. Appraisal reports serve as compliance evidence artifacts. Cross-reference tables with evidence citations. | Level 2 |

CGMI-A Authorizer Level Thresholds

| CGMI Level | Authorizer Implication |
|----------------|--|
| Level 1 | Significant governance risk. Not suitable for renewal without remediation plan. |
| Level 2 | Meets minimum compliance expectations. Satisfactory for renewal consideration. |
| Level 3 | Strong governance. Positive indicator in renewal evaluation. CGMI-A formally activates. |
| Level 4 | Exemplary governance. May qualify for expedited renewal or reduced oversight under CGMI-A protocols. |
| Level 5 | Reference school. Authorizer may designate as governance model for portfolio peers. |

16 Integration Designations

Integration designations are available to ecosystem participants — not just schools. Authorizers, network partners, and compliance programs can each pursue a formal CGMI designation that signals their commitment to the governance standard.

| Designation | Awarded to | What It Signals |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| CGMI-A Recognized Authorizer | Charter authorizer | Has formally adopted CGMI-A protocols in oversight and renewal |
| CGMI-P Recognized Network | CMO / EMO / network operator | Has implemented CGMI-P portfolio governance tracking |
| CGMI-C Aligned Program | State association / grant program | Has formally mapped program requirements to CGMI criteria |
| CGMI-CA Certified Appraiser | Individual practitioner | Credentialed to conduct official CGMI Certified Appraisals |

17 Integration Outputs by Appraisal Tier

Integration outputs are generated automatically for schools at Level 2 and above. No additional appraisal work is required — Integration artifacts are produced from the same evidence base as the maturity determination.

| Tier | Maturity Output | Integration Output |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Self-Assessment | Self-attested domain ratings (capped at Level 2) | CGMI-C diagnostic: which compliance frameworks current level satisfies |
| Guided Appraisal | Maturity Appraisal Report + Level Certificate (capped at Level 4) | CGMI-A evidence package (authorizer-formatted) + CGMI-C compliance exhibit |
| Certified Appraisal | Official level rating + signed appraiser report (any level; required for Level 5) | Full CGMI-A, CGMI-P, and CGMI-C artifact set — complete integration-ready package |

Appendices

18 Core Design Principles

Staged Model

A school's overall CGMI level equals the lowest of its five domain ratings. The staged model ensures balanced governance capability — strength in one area cannot mask weakness in another. This forces holistic governance improvement across all five dimensions.

Cumulative Gate Requirements

Each level has explicit gate requirements that must all be met — cumulatively — to achieve that level. Gates are behavioral and evidence-based: meeting notice compliance rates, certification completion, GMS thresholds, policy audit status. Levels cannot be skipped.

Capability Level Profile

In addition to overall level, every appraisal produces a capability profile across all five domains, exposing strengths and advancement targets. A school may be Level 3 overall but Level 4 in Financial Governance — the profile shows this nuance.

Evidence-Based Assessment

CGMI ratings are assigned from objective evidence — meeting records, training completions, policy audit findings, financial data — not from self-assessment questionnaires. This eliminates the primary flaw of all prior governance assessment approaches.

Authorizer Legibility

CGMI ratings map directly to NACSA performance framework principles and CSP rubric sections. Authorizers can understand a school's governance maturity without translation.

Open Specification

CGMI is published as an open specification with a machine-readable JSON schema, a structured public comment process for revisions, and a versioned changelog.

19 Comparison: CGMI vs. Alternatives

| | CGMI | Board Self-Assessment | General Governance Tools |
|-------------------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Evidence-based, behavioral data | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ |
| Charter-school-specific criteria | ✓ | ✗ | ~ |
| Staged maturity levels (1–5) | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ |
| Cumulative gate requirements | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ |
| Domain-level capability profiles | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ |
| Continuous + formal appraisal tiers | ✓ | ~ | ✗ |
| Authorizer-legible ratings | ✓ | ✗ | ~ |
| Maps to NACSA & CSP standards | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ |
| Machine-readable schema (JSON) | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ |
| Public comment governance process | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ |

20 IP, Citation & Contact

Trademark. CGMI is a trademark of Charter Vision. The CGMI-F framework specification may be cited and referenced with attribution.

Proprietary Components. The appraisal methodology, rating engine, appraiser certification program, and integration profile implementation specifications are proprietary.

Citation. When referencing CGMI in publications, use: "CGMI-F v1.0, Charter Governance Maturity & Integration Framework Specification, published 2026-01-01 by CGMI."

JSON Schema. The machine-readable framework schema is available at www.cgmi.institute/schema/cgmi-f-v1.json for citation, integration, and programmatic consumption.

Public Comment. CGMI maintains a structured public comment process for framework revisions. Submit comments via www.cgmi.institute/comment.

Advisory Board. CGMI Advisory Board membership will be announced with the launch of the first public comment cycle.

Contact

Email: cgmi@chartervision.org

Web: www.cgmi.institute

CGMI-F v1.0 · Charter Governance Maturity & Integration Framework Specification

Published 2026-01-01 · Initial Publication

© CGMI. All rights reserved. CGMI is a trademark of Charter Vision. Developed and maintained by Charter Vision.