

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

AZ Charter Schools Program

Comprehensive Monitoring Handbook

Project Years 2024-2026

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 is not analyzed or 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.
Provisions		Artifacts Reviewed
1. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority systematically uses the Logic Model to guide and monitor project implementation.		
2. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority uses data to analyze the effectiveness of project implementation as presented in the Logic Model.		
3. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority routinely evaluates and revises project implementation based upon data analysis and analytical findings, including student achievement performance.		
4. Provide evidence to demonstrate a system is in place to collect, analyze and report student achievement data to the governing authority in a clear, consistent and timely manner.		

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, including board meeting minutes, 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.
Provisions		Artifacts Reviewed
1. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority has a comprehensive set of bylaws.		
2. Provide evidence to demonstrate there is a job description for the governing authority as a whole and for each officer position.		
3. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority has developed an organizational reporting structure and consistently adheres to its reporting structure.		

Indicator 1.3 – The governing authority demonstrates efforts to recruit, select, hire, and retain quality leaders.		
√	Status	Description
	Ineffective	The governing authority has not yet developed processes and criteria to recruit, select, and hire quality leaders.
	Developing	The governing authority has submitted limited evidence to demonstrate it has developed processes and criteria adequate to recruit, select, and hire quality leaders.
	Effective	The governing authority submitted adequate evidence to demonstrate a system with processes and criteria to recruit, select, and hire quality leaders.
	Highly Effective	The governing authority submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate a comprehensive system to recruit, select, hire, and retain quality leaders to support implementation of adopted curriculum and instructional practices effectively.
Provisions		Artifacts Reviewed

1. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority has a recruitment plan for hiring quality leaders for the school.	
2. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority has a clearly specified set of criteria to select quality leaders for the school.	
3. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority has a codified HR process to hire quality school leaders.	
4. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority has a sound plan to retain effective school leaders.	
5. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority has an evaluation process, aligned with A.R.S. 15.189.06.B., to measure the school leader's performance.	

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 advocates for the school's mission and improvement efforts. The plan provides for professional growth for leaders to sustain the school's mission.

Provisions	Artifacts Reviewed
1. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority has a succession plan for governing body members and key school leadership to sustain the school's mission.	
2. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority has a membership recruitment plan, including a formal and	

transparent process for nominating and selecting new members.	
3. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing authority has 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.	
4. Provide evidence to demonstrate the governing board members receive comprehensive training to help them be more effective.	

A. Governance		
Element 2- Regulatory and Fiduciary Compliance		
Indicator 2.1 - The grant recipient meets the federal definition of the term “charter school.”		
For each item listed below, provide appropriate evidence to demonstrate regulatory and/or fiduciary compliance.	Status	Artifacts Reviewed
1. The charter school has provided an approved charter contract signed by both parties from its state approved authorizer. Date contract signed: _____	Met	
	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	This item does not require a submission from the charter school.
	Not Met	
3. The charter school provided evidence to demonstrate the school makes available to the public its annual State report card when available, information on the educational program, student support services, parent contract requirement (if applicable), financial obligations or fees, enrollment criteria (as applicable), annual performance	Met	
	Not Met	

and enrollment data for each of the subgroups of students.		
4. The charter school provided evidence to demonstrate 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 charter school provided evidence to demonstrate the 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; (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 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; (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	Met	
	Not Met	

<p>504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(J) meets all applicable Federal, State, and local health and safety requirements;</p> <p>(K) operates in accordance with State law; and</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(M) may serve students in early childhood education programs or postsecondary students.</p>		
<p>6. The charter school provided evidence that the school has a policy for student record transfer in accordance with applicable State law. ESEA Title IV, Part C, Sec. 4308.</p>	<p>Met</p>	
	<p>Not Met</p>	

<p>7. The charter school provided evidence that the school's governing body has written Conflict of Interest polices that conform to 2 CFR § 200.112 If applicable, the charter holder's contract with its charter management organization does not cede charter school control of funds and operations to the management organization. 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).</p>	Met	
	Not Met	
<p>8. The charter school provided evidence that the 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.</p>	Met	
	Not Met	
<p>9. The charter school provided evidence to demonstrate the school has a high degree of autonomy over budget and operations, including autonomy over personnel decisions. ESEA 4303(f)(2)(A).</p>	Met	
	Not Met	
<p>10. The charter school provided evidence to demonstrate the school has created a communication network with parents and community as well as avenues for parent involvement in the life of the school.</p>	Met	
	Not Met	
<p>11. The charter school provided a selection of board meeting agendas and minutes to demonstrate the school's Governing Body discusses, reviews, and approves financial statements submitted by the school.</p>	Met	
	Not Met	
<p>12. The charter school provided evidence to demonstrate the school posts the annual financial audit report on the school's website.</p>	Met	
	Not Met	
<p>13. The charter school provided evidence of recruitment and retention policies in place that promote inclusion</p>	Met	

of all students, including eliminating barriers to enrollment for educationally disadvantaged students and retention of all students.	Not Met	
14. The charter school provided evidence to demonstrate the school has considered and planned for student transportation needs.	Met	
	Not Met	

B. Academic Program

The school ensures strong academic outcomes for all students.

Indicator 1.1 – The school has an articulated curriculum and supplemental curriculum aligned with the school’s model and Arizona Standards to meet the unique needs of disadvantaged students including children with learning disabilities and English learners.

√	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.

Provisions	Artifacts Reviewed
1. Provide evidence to demonstrate a process of creating the school’s curriculum and supplemental curriculum as described in the AZCSP RFA Part II Subgrant Application.	
2. Provide evidence to demonstrate that curriculum and supplemental curriculum materials provide a scope and sequence for instruction throughout the year.	
3. Provide evidence to demonstrate that teachers’ lesson plans are aligned to the Arizona Standards, school curriculum,	

<p>4. Provide evidence to demonstrate a process of implementing the school's curriculum and supplemental curriculum to meet the unique needs of the students the school serves.</p>	
<p>5. Provide evidence to demonstrate a process of evaluating and revising the school's curriculum and supplemental curriculum to meet the unique needs of the students the school serves</p>	

Indicator 1.2 – The school has an instructional design system that is aligned with the school's model, curriculum, and supplemental curriculum to meet the unique needs of disadvantaged students including children with disabilities and English learners.

√	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.

Provisions	Artifacts Reviewed
<p>1. Provide evidence to demonstrate a process of adopting evidence-based instructional methodologies/instructional model, as described in the AZCSP RFA Part II Subgrant Application, aligned with the school's curriculum to increase student achievement?</p>	
<p>2. Provide evidence to demonstrate that the teachers' lesson plans reflect the adopted instructional methodologies/instructional model.</p>	
<p>3. Provide evidence to demonstrate a process of implementing the adopted</p>	

instructional methodologies/instructional model to meet the unique needs of the students the school serves.	
4. Provide evidence to demonstrate a process of evaluating and improving instructional practices based on student progress.	

Indicator 1.3 – The school has a comprehensive assessment system that is aligned with the curriculum and instructional methodology to determine students’ learning progress and measure their academic performance

√	Status	Description
	Ineffective	The school has not developed a comprehensive assessment system to determine students’ learning progress and measure their academic performance.
	Developing	The school has developed a comprehensive assessment system that includes assessment both for learning and of learning to determine students’ learning progress. The school has provided limited evidence of data collection, analysis, and use for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.
	Effective	The school has developed a comprehensive assessment system that includes assessment both for learning and of learning to determine students’ learning progress. The school has provided adequate evidence of data collection, analysis, and use for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.
	Highly Effective	The school has developed a comprehensive assessment system that includes assessment both for learning and of learning to determine students’ learning progress. The school has provided sufficient evidence of data collection, analysis, and use for ongoing planning, decision making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.

Provisions	Artifacts Reviewed
1. Provide evidence to demonstrate that the school has developed and implemented a comprehensive assessment system aligned with its curriculum and instructional methodology as described in the AZCSP RFA Part II Subgrant Application.	
2. Provide evidence to demonstrate a process of data collection from multiple assessment sources across all subjects and all grade levels both for learning and of learning.	
3. Provide evidence to demonstrate a process of data analysis.	
4. Provide evidence to demonstrate a process of data use for ongoing planning, decision	

making, and modification of curriculum and instruction.	
5. Provide evidence to demonstrate the school's continuous improvement process utilizing the school-wide trend data to meet the unique needs of the students the school serves.	
6. Provide evidence to demonstrate that the school leadership team use multiple objective metrics to determine school success (i.e. assessment results, graduation rates, student retention rates, survey, etc.).	

Indicator 1.4 – The school demonstrates efforts to monitor and evaluate educator effectiveness and provide professional learning opportunities to support educator professional growth.

√	Status	Description
	Ineffective	The school leadership team has not developed a system to monitor and evaluate educator effectiveness.
	Developing	The school leadership team has developed a system to monitor and evaluate educator effectiveness. The school has provided limited evidence to demonstrate a process of data collection, analysis, and use from multiple sources to improve educator effectiveness.
	Effective	The school leadership team has developed a system to monitor and evaluate educator effectiveness. The school has provided adequate evidence to demonstrate a process of data collection, analysis, and use from multiple sources to improve educator effectiveness, inform professional learning decisions, and support educators in their professional growth. .
	Highly Effective	The school leadership team has developed a comprehensive system to monitor and evaluate educator effectiveness. The school has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate a formalized process of data collection, analysis, and use from multiple sources to improve educator effectiveness, inform professional learning decisions, support educators in their professional growth, and measure the effectiveness of professional learning.

Provisions	Artifacts Reviewed
1. Provide evidence to demonstrate that the school has developed a system to monitor and measure educator effectiveness as described in the AZCSP RFA Part II Subgrant Application.	
2. Provide evidence that the teachers have given access to sufficient instructional resources.	
3. Provide evidence to demonstrate a process of data collection, analysis, and use from multiple sources to improve educator effectiveness and inform professional learning decisions.	

4. Provide evidence to demonstrate a process of data collection, analysis, and use from multiple sources to support educators in their professional growth.	
5. Provide evidence to demonstrate a process of data collection, analysis, and use from multiple sources to measure the effectiveness of professional learning.	

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		
4. Number of students enrolled versus those proposed.		
5. Student demographics versus those proposed.		
6. Student academic results.		
7. Percent of special education students		
8. Percent of EL students		
9. The school is meeting the education needs of all students including students with disabilities and ELs.	Met	
	Not Met	
10. Components within subgrant application are being followed/adhered.	Met	
	Not Met	
11. Milestones/benchmarks are being met.	Met	
	Not Met	
12. Annual State report card is available to the when available.	Met	
	Not Met	