

New Charter Application for 2018-2019

Discussion Document

Statutory Provisions

A.R.S. §15-183 requires a charter school sponsor to post on the sponsor's website the "application, application process and application time frames". The law further requires that the application adopted by the sponsor include a detailed educational, business and operational plan and any other materials required by the sponsor.

Additionally, Arizona Administrative Code R7-5-201, Application for a New Charter states, "By March 31 of each year, the Board shall approve and make available online at its web site an application for a new charter for a specified annual application cycle."

Subcommittee Meeting Materials

The meeting materials include the following:

- A draft New Charter Application for discussion with substantive revisions.
- A table that addresses the substantive changes by section.
- A document addressing the implementation plan if the application is approved.

As part of the new charter application process, during the month of December, staff begins updating the new charter application to reflect the upcoming cycle. Typically, technical changes are made to provide clarity and transparency to the instructions and are based on feedback from stakeholders. However, the feedback received from applicants that came before the Board in December, the Arizona Charter Association, the Department's Arizona Charter Schools Program, and the Technical Review Panel ("TRP") include substantive changes that contain two main attributes that have been considered in this revision:

- In order for the Board to assess the applicant's critical and strategic thinking as it relates to specific areas of operation (i.e. promotion/retention, enrollment, governance, etc.), the instructions and criteria include specific language to address the applicant's capacity of their understanding of the requirements of the new charter application and describe how the applicant will execute the critical components of their charter aligned to the mission and vision.
- Curriculum samples have been re-designed to provide the Board an analysis of the applicant's knowledge on instruction. An applicant is asked to provide a response for standards within grade level bands in reading, writing, math, and science, which will minimize the quantity of responses for this section.

Action Item for Subcommittee Consideration

Direct staff to make the necessary changes to the New Charter Application Instructions and related documents as outlined in this document and discussed during today's meeting and present final versions to the Board for approval at its February 13th meeting.

New Charter Application Revisions

The table provides the proposed substantive changes to sections of a plan and the rationale for the change. The proposed changes described below are intended to reduce administrative workload while providing the Applicant sufficient opportunity to demonstrate the capacity to design and implement a plan for operating a school to serve the target population. Overall, criteria require applicants to provide clear and comprehensive descriptions in narrative responses. Requiring this level of detail in the written responses is intended to reduce the amount of time spent by the Technical Review Panel during the capacity interview asking for further clarification to responses and allowing for discussion of the practical implementation and evaluation of the Applicant’s capacity to implement the plan as described in the charter application.

A common attribute for the application being considered is clarifying and aligning the language between the “*Applicant Instructions*” and the “*Evaluation Criteria*”.

Education Plan Section	Change
A.1 Educational Philosophy	Expanded response to include criteria that focuses on describing how the philosophical approach speaks to how students will learn and what the teacher’s role is. Criteria includes alignment to the mission and describing the rationale for improving pupil achievement.
A.2 Target Population	Expanded the response to include criteria that focuses the applicant on describing what the “identified” needs are of the community they intend to serve.
A.3 Program of Instruction	Expanded the response to include criteria that describes the applicant’s rationale for the selected program and how the program supports improving pupil achievement.
A. 3.1 Mastery and Promotion	Revised the language to focus the response on describing a comprehensive plan for assessing mastery and promotion that includes the school’s criteria. In addition, to provide a rationale for those criteria.
A. 3.2 Course Offerings and Graduation Requirements	Revised the language to focus the response on describing a comprehensive plan for awarding course credit that includes the school’s criteria. In addition, to provide a rationale for the criteria that demonstrates the student’s capacity to pass the end of course State assessments.
A.4 School Calendar and Weekly Schedule	Removed criteria referring to an Alternative Calendar. That is no longer an option.
A.5 Academic Systems Plan	Revised instructions and criteria to reflect student data only on “Percent Passing”. In addition, the tables in the criteria have been reformatted for clarity. Cost and Budget Line item was removed from this section because these are already discussed in the budget narratives.
A.6 Instructional Analysis	Curriculum Samples were replaced with Instructional Analysis. The number of documents was reduced from 3 per grade level served, to 3-4 per grade span served. The instructional analysis is designed to allow the Applicant to demonstrate capacity to identify essential skills and knowledge in a specific standard, describe how instruction aligned with

	the educational philosophy and program of instruction will be used to develop skills and knowledge. Other components address how student progress and mastery are assessed, and the Applicant’s process for providing support to students that do not make progress and/or master the standard. This differs from the curriculum samples that were more closely aligned to a lesson plan format that required detailed description of instructional content and student activities over a series of lessons.
Operational Plan Section	Rationale
B.1 Applicant Entity	Combined item d. and f. due to similarity of items to eliminate a response that in most cases would have been redundant.
B.2 Governing Body	Moved b. to a. to establish responsibilities of governing body as primary focus of this section. Expanded response for c. to also include how governing body composition is qualified to fulfill responsibilities and support the Applicant’s mission. Expanded response for d. to connect process with governing body responsibilities so that Applicant has opportunity to clearly articulate its understanding of governing body responsibilities and capacity to identify individuals/characteristics that have the experience and knowledge to fulfill those responsibilities
B.3 Management and Operation	Moved criteria pertaining to enrollment to section C.2. Marketing & Student Enrollment because enrollment is the logical follow-up to the advertising and promotion plan. Expanded response to a. to require an organizational chart and narrative that addresses each position in the chart rather than just a list of the roles and responsibilities.
B.3.1 Education Service Providers	Split criterion a. into two parts – a narrative description and data demonstrating success with the target population. Also added component to demonstrate how the Education Service Provider supports the mission and program of instruction.
B.3.2 Contracted Services	Clarified minimum expectations and added “and/or experience” to allow Applicant opportunity to demonstrate capacity to identify qualified personnel or service providers. Revised wording for clarity.
Business Plan Section	Rationale
C.1 Facilities Acquisition	Moved timeframe to be the first criterion because the timeframe provides a general overview of the full plan that is described in further detail in the remaining criteria. This sequence provides a logical progression.
C.2 Marketing and Student Enrollment	Moved timeframe to be the first criterion (see C.1). Revised to clarify that purpose of plan is to meet the projected enrollment numbers for the target population. Enrollment is separate and expanded to allow Application to clearly articulate components in the enrollment process separately and distinct from the admission/registration process.
C.3 Personnel	Revised criterion a. to incorporate requirements similar to contracted services regarding minimum qualifications and/or experience. Added to allow Applicant opportunity to demonstrate capacity in identifying quality staff. Revised b. to focus on description of how staffing plan will result in implementation of program of instruction and operation of school. Added item d. to address how qualifications and proposed salaries are adequate to implement the program of instruction.

C.4 Start-Up Budget Template C.5 Three-Year Operational Budget Template	"SAIS" was changed to "SIS" (student information system) in the budget templates to reflect changes made to the Arizona Educational Learning and Accountability System.
--	---

For Discussion Purposes

Timeline for the New Charter Application 2018-2019 Process

The table below provides an overview of the timeframe and implementation stages of the process.

Timeframe	Process Stage
February 13	Application considered and approved by the Board
February 14	Application posted on website (<i>18 weeks prior to the due date</i>).
Mid-March	New Charter Application Workshop
Late March	Online Technical Assistance videos posted on ASBCS website
May 17	Soft deadline date (<i>26 days prior to the due date</i>).
June 22	Administrative completeness review notifications for application packages submitted prior to the soft deadline date.
June 23	Application package due date
Early July	Administrative completeness review notification
Late August	Substantive completeness review notification
Mid-September	Revised application package due
Mid-October	2 nd Substantive completeness review notification
Early November	Capacity Interviews
January 2018	Board Decisions