ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

AZ Charter Schools Program

Monitoring Handbook

2020-24 (Comprehensive)

A. Governance

Element 1- The governing authority creates and monitors the approved Logic Model.

Indicator 1.1 The governing authority reviews and revises its approved Logic Model.

√	Status	Description
	Ineffective	The governing authority has not implemented any aspect of its Logic Model.
	Developing	Evidence was provided to demonstrate the governing authority has implemented aspects of its Logic Model but lacks the level of oversight that leads to effective project implementation. Student achievement data does not align with Logic Model outcome expectations
	Effective	Adequate evidence was provided to demonstrate, at least annually, the governing authority measures the impact of project implementation through data collection and analysis, evaluates findings, and revises or adjusts the Logic Model as needed to achieve identified outcomes. Student achievement data may or may not align with Logic Model outcome expectations.
	Highly Effective	Sufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate the governing authority systematically measures the impact of project implementation through rigorous data collection and analysis, evaluates findings, and regularly revises or adjusts the Logic Model as needed to achieve or improve identified outcomes. Student achievement data indicates high or increasing performance and aligns with Logic Model outcome expectations.

Key Questions	Artifacts Reviewed
1. Does the governing authority systematically use the Logic Model to guide, monitor, and report on project implementation?	
2. Does the governing authority use data to analyze the effectiveness of project implementation as presented in the Logic Model?	
3. Does the governing authority routinely evaluate, and revise project implementation based upon data analysis and analytical findings, including student achievement performance?	
4. Is there a system in place to collect, analyze and report student achievement data to the governing authority in a clear, consistent and timely manner?	

Sample artifacts to be reviewed:
- Logic Model revisions

- Governing Authority meeting agendas, minutes, and associated materials
- Logic Model review schedule
- Examples of data analyses presented to the governing authority
- Examples of documentation as evidence of Logic Model implementation

Indicator 1.2 – The governing authority demonstrates efforts to develop an organizational structure.		
√	**Status**	**Description**
	Ineffective	The governing authority has not developed an organizational structure.
	Developing	The governing authority has developed an organizational structure but lacks clarity.
	Effective	The governing authority has developed an organizational structure. The governing authority submitted adequate evidence to demonstrate the reporting structure within the organization ensures the decisions and actions are in accordance with defined roles and responsibilities of the governing body.
	Highly Effective	The governing authority has developed an organizational structure. The governing authority submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate the reporting structure within the organization ensures the decisions and actions are in accordance with defined roles and responsibilities of the governing body. The succession plan and organizational structure are consistent within the organization.
Key Questions		**Artifacts Reviewed**
1. Does the governing authority have a comprehensive set of bylaws?		
2. Is there a job description for the governing authority as a whole and for each officer position?		
3. Has the governing authority developed a reporting structure?		
4. Does the governing authority consistently adhere to its reporting structure?		

Sample artifacts to be reviewed:
- Bylaws; Organizational structure chart
- Job description for the governing authority and officer positions
- Succession plan
- Policy review process
- Governing authority meeting agendas and minutes; reporting structure

Indicator 1.3 – The governing authority demonstrates efforts to recruit, select, hire, and retain quality leaders.	
√ **Status**	**Description**

√	Status	Description
	Ineffective	The governing authority has not yet developed processes and criteria to recruit, select, and hire qualified teachers and leaders.
	Developing	The governing authority has submitted limited evidence to demonstrate it has developed processes and criteria adequate to recruit, select, and hire qualified teachers and leaders.
	Effective	The governing authority submitted adequate evidence to demonstrate a system with processes and criteria to recruit, select, and hire qualified teachers and leaders.
	Highly Effective	The governing authority submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate a comprehensive system to recruit, select, hire, and retain qualified teachers and leaders to implement adopted curriculum and instructional practices effectively.

Key Questions	Artifacts Reviewed
1. Does the governing authority have an annual recruitment plan for qualified educators?	
2. Does the governing authority have a clearly specified set of criteria to select qualified educators?	
3. Does the governing authority have a codified HR process to hire qualified educators?	
4. Does the governing authority have a sound plan to retain effective educators?	
5. Has the governing authority developed an evaluation process to measure the school leader's performance?	

Sample artifacts to be reviewed:

- Recruitment plan
- Interview questionnaire and selection criteria

Indicator 1.4 – The governing authority demonstrates efforts to maintain the succession plan for governing board members and key school leadership to sustain the school's mission.		
√	**Status**	**Description**
	Ineffective	The governing authority has not developed a succession plan for board members and key school leaders.
	Developing	The governing authority has submitted limited evidence to demonstrate it has developed a sustainable succession plan for board members and key school leaders.
	Effective	The governing authority submitted adequate evidence to demonstrate a sound succession plan for governing board members and key school leaders who are advocates for the school's mission and improvement efforts.
	Highly Effective	The governing authority submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate a sound succession plan for governing board members and key school leaders who are

Key Questions	Artifacts Reviewed
1. Does the membership of the board represent the broad cross-section of skills (finance, legal, academic, governance, and facilities) to govern effectively?	
2. Does the governing authority have a sound recruitment plan for its membership?	
3. Does the governing authority have a formal and transparent process for nominating and selecting new members?	
4. Does the governing authority consistently adhere to its formal nominating and selection process?	
5. Has the governing authority developed a formal assessment process to determine whether a candidate has the skill set, necessary time, philosophical alignment with the school, and temperament to serve as a member?	
6. Do the governing board members receive comprehensive training to help them be more effective?	

(The top of the table continues from the previous page:) advocates for the school's mission and improvement efforts. The plan provides for professional growth for leaders to sustain the school's mission.

Sample artifacts to be reviewed:
- Résumé or biographies of board members
- Policies and procedures for nominating and selecting members; member recruit plan
- Minutes from meetings documenting adherence to the nominating and selection process
- Standard list of interview questions asked of all candidates
- Numerical score sheet for evaluating candidates
- Governing authority training plan

A. Governance

Element 2- Regulatory and Fiduciary Compliance

Indicator 2.1 - The grant recipient meets the federal definition of the term "charter school."

Criteria	Status	Artifacts Reviewed
1. The school has an approved charter contract from its state approved	Met	

authorizer. Date contract signed:_____	Not Met	
2. The authorizer of the awarded schools shall make available to the public its authorization policies which include a financial, academic, and operational performance framework and polices for reauthorizing its schools primarily based on student achievement toward state mandated goals and assessments.	Met	
	Not Met	
3. The school makes available to the public its annual State report card, information on the educational program, student support services, parent contract requirement (if application), financial obligations or fees, enrollment criteria (as applicable), annual performance and enrollment data for each of the subgroups of students.	Met	
	Not Met	
4. The school has complied with the State's open meetings and open records laws. ESEA Title IV, Part C, Sec.4303(f)(1)(F).	Met	
	Not Met	
5. The school application clearly states that the charter school is a tuition free public school and meets the federal definition of a charter school ESEA §4310(2). A) in accordance with a specific State statute authorizing the granting of charters to schools, is exempt from significant State or local rules that inhibit the flexible operation and management of public schools, but not from any rules relating to the other requirements of this paragraph;	Met	
(B) is created by a developer as a public school, or is adapted by a developer from an existing public school, and is operated under public supervision and direction; (C) operates in pursuit of a specific set of educational objectives determined by the school's developer and agreed	Not Met	

to by the authorized public chartering agency; (D) provides a program of elementary or secondary education, or both; (E) is nonsectarian in its programs, admissions policies, employment practices, and all other operations, and is not affiliated with a sectarian school or religious institution; *(see artifacts) (F) does not charge tuition; (G) complies with the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; (H) is a school to which parents choose to send their children, and that admits students on the basis of a lottery, if more students apply for admission than can be accommodated; and that posts the lottery policy and process on its website and in the school's handbook for parents/students; (I) agrees to comply with the same Federal and State audit requirements as do other elementary schools and secondary schools in the State, unless such requirements are specifically waived for the purpose of this program; (J) meets all applicable Federal, State, and local health and safety requirements; (K) operates in accordance with State law; and (L) has a written performance contract with the authorized public chartering agency in the State that includes a description of how student performance will		

be measured in charter schools pursuant to State assessments that are required of other schools and pursuant to any other assessments mutually agreeable to the authorized public chartering agency and the charter school. (M) may serve students in early childhood education programs or postsecondary students.		
6. The school has a policy for student record transfer. ESEA Title IV, Part C, Sec. 4308.	Met	
	Not Met	
7. The school's governing body shall have written Conflict of Interest polices that conform to *2 CFR § 200.112* The charter holder contract with its charter management organization does not cede charter school control of funds and operations to the management organization.	Met	
The charter holder has appropriate internal controls between the two entities to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of CSP dollars (for example, preventing related-party transactions, preventing conflict of interest, ensuring appropriate segregation of duties between schools and management organizations).	Not Met	
8. The charter school complies with the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and Part B of the IDEA.	Met	
	Not Met	
9. The charter school demonstrates a high degree of autonomy over budget and operations, including autonomy over personnel decisions. ESEA 4303(f)(2)(A)	Met	
	Not Met	
10. The charter school has created a communication network with parents and community and avenues for parent involvement in the life of the school.	Met	
	Not Met	
11. School submits and Governing Body reviews and approves financial statements as documented in board agendas and minutes.	Met	
	Not Met	

12. Governing Body meeting minutes document discussions demonstrating fiduciary oversight of school.	Met	
	Not Met	
13. The school's governing body ensures the school leader must actively participate in AZCSP Technical Assistance and clears the district/school calendar for leadership attendance throughout the life of the grant.	Met	
	Not Met	
14. Recruitment and retention policies are in place that promote inclusion of all students, including eliminating barriers to enrollment for educationally disadvantaged students and retention of all students.	Met	
	Not Met	
15. The school has policies in place in the event of a closure that include the transfer of school records.	Met	
	Not Met	
16. The school has record retention policies.	Met	
	Not Met	
17. The school has considered and planned for student transportation needs.	Met	
	Not Met	

Sample artifacts to be reviewed:
- Approved charter contract
- School application
- Lottery policy
- School policy manual
- Financial reports
- Evidence in board meeting agendas and minutes that financial reports have been submitted for review/approval
- Documentation in minutes of financial oversight by the board
- Financial policy discussions, review of financial statements, development/review/revisions/approval of school budget, purchases, etc.

* AZCSP will tour the entire school to ensure that paintings, sculptures and/or artifacts of a religious nature are displayed only as exemplars of classic art or within a curricular context, i.e. study of Medieval, Renaissance art and culture, etc.

B. Academic Program

The school ensures strong academic outcomes for all students.

Indicator 1.1 – The school has an articulated curriculum aligned with the school's purpose and Arizona Standards.		

√	Status	Description
	Ineffective	The school has not developed a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum including supplemental curriculum based on clearly defined and measurable expectations for student learning.
	Developing	The school has developed a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum including supplemental curriculum. The school has provided limited evidence to demonstrate systematic implementation across the school.
	Effective	The school has developed a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum including supplemental curriculum based on clearly defined and measurable expectations for student learning. The school has provided adequate evidence to demonstrate systematic implementation across the school.
	Highly Effective	The school has developed a system to create, implement, evaluate, and revise school curriculum including supplemental curriculum based on clearly defined and measurable expectations for student learning. The school has provided sufficient evidence demonstrating a formalized process for systematic and sustainable implementation across the school.

Key Questions	Artifacts Reviewed
1. Is the curriculum aligned with Arizona Standards?	
2. Do the curriculum materials provide a scope and sequence for instruction throughout the year?	
3. Are teachers' lesson plans aligned to Arizona Standards, school curriculum, pacing, and the essential learning outcomes?	
4. Does the school evaluate the effectiveness, timeliness, and fairness of the curriculum?	
5. Is there a process in place to review and revise curriculum materials based on student progress?	

Sample artifacts to be reviewed:

- Curriculum map; course of study
- Teacher lesson plans
- Class observation records
- Instructional materials and supplementary materials utilized by teachers
- Curriculum review report
- Revised curriculum materials

	Indicator 1.2 – The school has an instructional design system that is aligned with the school's purpose and curriculum (aligned with Arizona Standards).	

√	Status	Description
	Ineffective	The school has not yet developed a system to design, implement, evaluate, and adjust instructional methodology, which is proven, research-based, and reflective of best practices.
	Developing	The school has developed a system to design, implement, evaluate, and adjust instructional methodology, which is proven, research-based, and reflective of best practices. The school has provided limited evidence to demonstrate systematic implementation across the school.
	Effective	The school has developed a system to design, implement, evaluate, and adjust instructional methodology which is evidence-based, and reflective of best practices. The school has provided adequate evidence to demonstrate systematic implementation across the school.
	Highly Effective	The school has developed a system to design, implement, evaluate, and adjust instructional methodology, which is proven, evidence-based, and reflective of best practices. The school has provided sufficient evidence demonstrating a formalized process for systematic and sustainable implementation across the school.

Key Questions	Artifacts Reviewed
1. Has the school adopted evidence-based instructional methodologies, as described in the CSP application, aligned with the curriculum to increase student achievement?	
2. Do teachers' lesson plans reflect adopted instructional methodologies?	
3. Do teachers within a grade level or content area implement adopted instructional methodologies?	
4. Is there a process in place to evaluate and improve instructional methodologies based on student progress?	
5. Does the school have a formalized process to engage staff in collaborative learning communities to improve instruction and student learning?	

Sample artifacts to be reviewed:
- Instructional strategies identified by grade level and content area
- Instructional materials and supplementary materials utilized by teachers
- Lesson plans
- Evidence that teachers are utilizing expected instructional strategies
- Evidence that teachers are working collaboratively to identify learning outcomes
- Evidence that improvements were made to content and instructional strategies

Indicator 1.3 – The school has a balanced assessment system that is aligned with the curriculum (aligned with Arizona Standards) and instructional methodology.		
√	**Status**	**Description**
	Ineffective	The school has not developed a balanced assessment system based on defined performance measures.
	Developing	The school has developed a balanced assessment system based on defined performance measures. The school has provided limited evidence to demonstrate systematic implementation across the school.
	Effective	The school has developed a balanced assessment system based on defined performance measures. The school has provided adequate evidence to demonstrate systematic implementation across the school.
	Highly Effective	The school has developed a balanced assessment system based on defined performance measures aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology. The school has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate a formalized process of data collection, analysis and use to monitor instructional effectiveness and adjust curriculum and instruction in response to data.

Key Questions	Artifacts Reviewed
1. Has the school developed and implemented a balanced assessment system which is aligned with its curriculum and instructional methodology?	
2. Does the system provide reliable and valid evidence of student learning for teachers and administrators to monitor academic progress in the classroom?	
3. Is there a system in place to collect, analyze and report student performance data at grade and school level?	
4. Do teachers and administrators utilize collected data to evaluate student learning and instructional effectiveness?	
5. Do teachers and administrators utilize school-wide trend data to determine the problem of practice?	
6. Are teachers and administrators regularly engaged in professional development programs which address the problem of practice?	
7. Does the school leadership team use multiple objective metrics to determine school success (i.e. assessment results, graduation rates, student retention rates, survey, etc.)?	

Sample artifacts to be reviewed:

- Teacher developed, benchmark, formative, summative assessments
- Documentation or description of evaluation protocols
- Variety of assessment reports
- Evidence of data analysis
- Evidence of instructional strategy planning based on data analysis
- Agenda and meeting minutes with teachers and staff addressing data analysis, use of student achievement data to monitor student progress
- Professional development calendar and agendas by topic; tools to assess PD effectiveness

	Indicator 1.4 – The school leadership team demonstrates efforts to monitor instructional practices, provide feedback, and make available opportunities for professional development.	

√	Status	Description
	Ineffective	The school leadership team has not developed a system to monitor and evaluate instructional practices.
	Developing	The school leadership team has developed a system to monitor and evaluate instructional practices. The school has provided limited evidence to demonstrate systematic implementation across the school.
	Effective	The school leadership team has developed a system to monitor and evaluate instructional practices. The school has provided adequate evidence to demonstrate systematic implementation across the school.
	Highly Effective	The school leadership team has developed a comprehensive system to monitor and evaluate instructional practices. The school has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate a formalized process of using data and feedback from multiple sources to inform professional development decisions.

Key Questions	Artifacts Reviewed
1. Has the school leader provided sufficient daily instructional time to support student learning and ample time to support teacher in planning, collaboration, and reflection?	
2. Are teachers given access to sufficient instructional resources?	
3. Does the leader regularly evaluate the effectiveness of teaching staff?	
4. Has the school leader provided sufficient resources and learning opportunities for teaching staff to improve effectiveness?	
5. Has the school leader established a uniform code of conduct throughout the school that supports quality teaching and learning?	
6. Has the school leader developed a written professional development plan for instructional improvement based on multiple sources of data?	

Sample artifacts to be reviewed:
- School daily, weekly, yearly schedule
- Instructional resources available for teachers
- Teacher evaluation instruments and process
- Record of internal and external professional learning opportunities
- School wide instructional improvement plan
- Professional development plan

Project Status Monitoring (Annually)		
Criteria	Status	Artifacts Reviewed
1. The educational program/grant activities observed matches the grant application description.	Met	
	Not Met	
2. The school met all grant special/specific conditions and assurances (e.g., AZCSP Technical Assistance).	Met	
	Not Met	
3. Grades served versus those proposed Number of available seats versus those proposed.		
4. Number of students enrolled versus those proposed.		
5. Number of faculty/staff versus those proposed.		
6. Student demographics versus those proposed.		
7. Student academic results.		
8. Percent of special education students compared to local schools.		
9. Percent of EL students compared to local schools.		
10. The school is meeting the education needs of all students including students with disabilities and ELs.	Met	
	Not Met	
11. Components within subgrant application are being followed/adhered.	Met	
	Not Met	
12. Milestones/benchmarks are being met.	Met	
	Not Met	