



NATIONAL  
CHARTER SCHOOL  
RESOURCE CENTER

# High-Quality Charter Authorizing Policy Profiles: Arizona

U.S. Department of Education  
January 2020



NATIONAL  
CHARTER SCHOOL  
RESOURCE CENTER

The National Charter School Resource Center (NCSRC) provides technical assistance to Federal grantees and resources supporting charter sector stakeholders. NCSRC is funded by the U.S. Department of Education and managed by Manhattan Strategy Group in partnership with WestEd.

NCSRC acknowledges the major contributions of Robin Chait and Lauren Outlaw in the development of this profile.

NCSRC would like to thank Charter School Programs State Entity grantee representatives for their reviews and feedback on their respective State's profile.

Suggested citation: National Charter School Resource Center (2020). *High-Quality Charter Authorizing Policy Profiles: Arizona*. Bethesda, MD: Manhattan Strategy Group.

This publication was produced in whole or in part with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under contract number GS10FO201T. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the Federal government.

# Arizona: Overview of State Law and Snapshot of Quality Authorizing Practices

## Introduction and Methodology

The National Charter School Resource Center (NCSRC) created the [Policy Framework for High-Quality Charter Authorizing Practices \(Framework\)](#) as a tool for assessing a State policy environment's support for high-quality authorizing practices. The Framework is based on a review of high-quality authorizing practices referenced in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and literature by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) and the National Alliance of Public Charter Schools (Alliance).<sup>i</sup> NCSRC staff used this review to identify common themes or categories of policies that are essential to State support for high-quality authorizing and incorporated them into the Framework.

NCSRC then created High-Quality Charter Authorizing Policy Profiles (State Authorizing Profiles) that describe states' authorizing policy contexts based on the Framework. As of winter 2020, NCSRC staff created 19 profiles for the States that were awarded Charter School Programs (CSP) State Entities grants between FY2017 and FY2019, including:

- Alabama
- Arizona
- Arkansas
- Colorado
- Delaware
- Idaho
- Indiana
- Maryland
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Mississippi
- New Mexico
- New York
- North Carolina
- Oklahoma
- Rhode Island
- Texas
- Washington
- Wisconsin

CSP State Entity (SE) Grants provide funding for State entities to support eligible applicants in planning and preparation for the opening of new charter schools and the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools. Grant funds must also be used by the State entity to provide technical assistance to eligible applicants and to improve the quality of authorizing.

More State Authorizing Profiles may be added in the future. In addition, NCSRC may publish updated versions of State Authorizing Profiles to reflect changes in State policy.

The State Authorizing Profiles are intended to be used by state policymakers and practitioners to learn about their own authorizing policy environments and those of their peers. They may also be useful to charter school support organizations and charter management organizations that are looking to learn about different states' policy contexts.

Each State profile includes a (i) Framework Snapshot, which is an assessment of a State's authorizing practices using the Framework described in the first paragraph above and (ii) a more detailed description of the state context for each practice. The basis for the State Profiles was a review of the charter law and significant State policies for applicable states. Significant

state policies included those issued by the state education agency and/or state board of education. NCSRC used this review to identify whether the authorizing practices specified in the Framework were present in state law or policy. That is, boxes that were checked in the Framework Snapshot indicated that particular aspects of an authorizing practice(s) were included in state law or policy.

The State Authorizing Profiles provide a foundation for understanding authorizing practices in the State. The profiles are not an exhaustive review of the State's authorizing policies and practices; it is intended to describe the key elements of the State's policy context for supporting high-quality authorizing practices. Therefore, it is possible that certain State policies are not reflected in the profiles, and that individual authorizers within a state are implementing other practices as well. In addition, the review does not assess the quality of implementation of the policies; it is possible that state policy or statute articulates a quality practice that authorizers do not implement with fidelity.

Finally, state policy is one strategy for advancing high-quality authorizing practices and is the strategy we are focusing on in these profiles. However, there are other strategies and sources of support, including technical assistance and resources provided by state, regional, and local charter support associations. While this report does not address those other strategies, it provides a narrative of the policy context in which authorizers operate. We articulate this context to support authorizers and authorizer support organizations in understanding how to implement quality authorizing practices in their States.

## Overview of State Law

The Arizona charter school law was passed in June 1994. The original law was amended in 2000 to (i) prohibit local school districts from authorizing charters outside of their boundaries, (ii) require that new charter school and renewal applications include a business plan,<sup>ii</sup> (iii) remove the 25-school cap on charter growth, and (iv) replace the previous funding schedule with allocations in 12 equal installments. In 2002, the State Board of Education (SBE) requested and the legislature agreed to a moratorium on additional SBE-authorized charter schools, and required the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools (ASBCS) to provide oversight for existing SBE-sponsored schools.<sup>iii</sup> The ASBCS is a separate State entity from the SBE and its board members are appointed by the governor.

In 2018, the legislature passed House Bill 2460 thereby prohibiting school districts that have decided to sell/lease a vacant and unused building from accepting an offer from a potential buyer/lessee that is less than an offer from a charter or private school.<sup>iv</sup> In July 2019, the ASBCS implemented additional transparency requirements for the charter schools it authorizes, including (i) notifying the board whether it has a contract/agreement with an education service provider, (ii) notifying the board within 10 business days of receipt of any report regarding a tax lien, default, or other instance of “financial stress,” and (iii) posting a permanent link on its website to its academic performance dashboard and financial and operational performance dashboards on the board’s website.

# State Authorizing Profile: Arizona

## Framework Snapshot<sup>1</sup>

### **Authorization**

- Does not cap charter school growth
- Provides for more than one authorizing pathway

*Application includes the following:*

- Specific application criteria
- Timelines
- Evaluation review process
- Process for denied applications

*Performance-based contract includes and provides for the following:*

- Separate post-application agreement
- Rights and responsibilities of authorizer and school
- Academic, financial, and operational performance expectations for schools
- Initial term of not more than five years
- Fiscal, legal, and programmatic autonomy for schools
- Independent charter school governing boards

### **Performance Monitoring**

- Provides for annual authorizer evaluation of schools based on the performance goals and expectations set forth in performance-based contract
- Establishes a comprehensive accountability/monitoring system that includes performance expectations and compliance requirements
- Minimizes schools' administrative and reporting burden
- Articulates authorizer action for schools that fail to meet performance expectations (e.g., probation, sanction, or turnaround)

### **Renewal/Revocation**

- Establishes a clear renewal process and decision-making criteria
- Requires that decisions to renew/revoke be based on student academic achievement
- Requires clear school closure procedures (e.g., parent notification, student enrollment, student record transfer, and disposition of assets)

### **Authorizer Accountability**

- Provides for a registration process for eligible authorizing entities
- Requires the State entity to review authorizers' performance
- Requires authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing

### **Authorizer Leadership, Student Access, and Student Services**

- Requires a mission or strategic vision for authorizing
- Promotes quality authorizing by requiring technical assistance or professional development for authorizers and/or charter school applicants
- Ensures equitable access to all students
- Requires appropriate services for educationally disadvantaged students (e.g., students with special needs, English learners, students in foster care, or unaccompanied homeless youth)

### **Authorizer Funding**

- Provides a mechanism for guaranteed access to authorizer funding
- Includes a process for holding authorizers accountable for how funding is used

**Source(s):** Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.), Title 15, Chapter 1, Article 8; Arizona Administrative Code (A.A.C.), Title 7, Charter 5, Articles 3 and 5.

<sup>1</sup> As noted in the Introduction and Methodology section, boxes checked in the framework snapshot indicate that aspects of an authorizing practice(s) were included in State law or policy. If individual authorizers create and follow a certain policy that is not in State statute or policy, then the box will not be checked for the entire State.

## Authorization

- Does not cap charter school growth
- Provides for more than one authorizing pathway

### Does not cap charter school growth

Arizona law does not limit charter school growth.

### Provides for more than one authorizing pathway

Under State law, charter authorizing entities include either the State Board of Education, the ASBCS, a university under the jurisdiction of the Arizona Board of Regents, and a community college district/group of community college districts. As noted above, the legislature transferred responsibility to authorize and monitor charter schools from the SBE to the ASBCS in 2002. In addition to the ASBCS, the Arizona State University (ASU) Educational Outreach and Student Services is also a state authorizing entity, which follows the ASBCS's policies.<sup>v</sup>

*Application includes the following:*

- Specific application criteria
- Timelines
- Evaluation review process
- Process for denied applications

### Specific application criteria

Arizona law requires the application to include a detailed educational plan, business plan, operational plan, and other materials required by the authorizer.<sup>vi</sup> Applicants must also submit a full set of fingerprints.<sup>vii</sup>

### Timelines

State law requires authorizers to publish the charter school application, application process, and time frames on its website.<sup>viii</sup> In addition, the Arizona Administrative Code states that the ASBCS shall post the application for new schools on its website by March 31. The ASBCS then has 200 days to review applications for new schools (administrative completeness review 25 days, substantive review 175 days).<sup>ix</sup>

### Evaluation review process

As noted above, the law requires authorizers to post the application, application process, and application time frames on its website.<sup>x</sup> In addition to requirements specified by the authorizer in the application on its website, the application must include detailed educational, business, and operational plans. Authorizers can approve applications that meet the statutory requirements and if the authorizer determines the applicant is sufficiently qualified to operate a charter school.<sup>xi</sup>

The ASBCS's review of the charter school application is a two-stage process consisting of an administrative and a substantive review. Once an application is determined to be complete, the application moves to the substantive review process where it is reviewed by a Technical Review Panel. This panel assigns a score of "meets criteria," "approaches criteria," or "falls below

criteria” to each evaluation criterion. An application package meets the board’s requirements if: (i) no evaluation criterion is scored “falls below the criteria,” (ii) no more than one evaluation criterion is scored “approaches the criteria,” and (iii) at least 95 percent of the evaluation criteria in the educational plan, operational plan, and business plan is scored “meets the criteria.”<sup>xii</sup>

Application packages that meet the ASBCS’s requirements participate in an in-person interview. In determining whether the applicant is sufficiently qualified to operate a charter school, ASBCS considers the application package, scoring rubric, results of in-person interview, information from investigation, and verification of employment, experience, education background, board staff report, testimony presented at board meeting, and information on any current/former charter operations or education service provider.<sup>xiii</sup>

### Process for denied applications

Under Arizona law, if the SBE or the ASBCS rejects the preliminary application, the applicable authorizer shall notify the applicant in writing of the reasons for the rejection and provide suggestions for improving the application. In addition, an applicant may submit a revised application for reconsideration by the SBE or the ASBCS.<sup>xiv</sup>

Per ASBCS rules, if an application is found to be incomplete during the administrative review process, the board will issue a notice of deficiency to the applicant; if the applicant believes its application erroneously designated as incomplete, it can submit written request for reconsideration within ten days after receiving the notice. An applicant that receives a notice of denial during the substantive review process may either submit a new application package in a later annual application cycle; or appeal the board’s decision.

*Performance-based contract includes and provides for the following:*

- Separate post-application agreement
- Rights and responsibilities of authorizer and school
- Academic, financial, and operational performance expectations for schools
- Initial term of not more than five years
- Fiscal, legal, and programmatic autonomy for schools
- Independent charter school governing boards

### Separate post-application agreement

The Arizona Administrative Code law differentiates between the application and the school’s charter (or charter contract), which is executed after an application is approved.<sup>xv</sup>

### Rights and responsibilities of authorizer and school

The law and application to open a new school identify the rights and responsibilities of an authorizer and a school. Though not stated expressly in the law, the ASBCS’s draft contract indicates that a school’s application is incorporated by reference into the contract. To that end, the draft contract states that “this Charter is entered into between [the] Charter Holder and the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools for the purpose of establishing a charter school to operate...” and that “incorporated herein by reference, is a true and correct copy of the Application Package of the Charter Holder, relied upon by the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools in granting this Charter.”<sup>xvi</sup>

## Academic, financial, and operational performance expectations for schools

Under Arizona law, a school’s charter/contract must ensure the charter school (i) designs a method to measure pupil progress toward the pupil outcomes adopted by the State Board of Education pursuant to section, (ii) is subject to the same financial and electronic data submission requirements as a school district, including the uniform system of financial records, procurement rules, and audit requirements, and (iii) complies with all federal and State laws relating to the education of children with disabilities in the same manner as a school district.<sup>xvii</sup> The ASBCS has established academic, financial, and operational performance frameworks that it uses to assess a school’s performance.<sup>xviii</sup> While the law does not require the contract to include its authorizer’s performance framework, as discussed below, the authorizer is required to use this framework when reviewing performance and making renewal/revocation decisions.<sup>xix</sup> Arizona law requires each charter school to conduct an annual financial audit by an independent certified public accountant.<sup>xx</sup>

## Initial term of not more than five years

The initial term for new charter contracts is 15 years.<sup>xxi</sup>

## Fiscal, legal, and programmatic autonomy for schools

The law provides for fiscal, legal, and programmatic autonomy by exempting charter schools from statutes and rules related to public schools, governing boards, and school districts with the exception that charter schools are subject to federal/state/local rules regarding health, safety, civil rights, insurance, disabilities, academic accountability, annual report cards, statewide assessments, and financial and electronic data submission.<sup>xxii</sup> Charter schools have statutory authority to enter into contracts and leases, sue and be sued, and to receive and disburse funds.<sup>xxiii</sup>

## Independent charter school governing boards

The law requires a school’s charter “ensure[s] that it provides for a governing body for the charter school that is responsible for the policy decisions of the charter school.”<sup>xxiv</sup> The law also states that “charter schools may contract, sue and be sued.”<sup>xxv</sup>

## Performance Monitoring

- ☑ Provides for annual authorizer evaluation of schools based on the performance goals and expectations set forth in performance-based contract
- ☑ Establishes a comprehensive accountability/monitoring system that includes performance expectations and compliance requirements
- ☑ Minimizes schools’ administrative and reporting burden
- ☑ Articulates authorizer action for schools that fail to meet performance expectations (e.g., probation, sanction, or turnaround)

## Provides for annual authorizer evaluation of schools based on performance goals and expectations set forth in performance-based contract

Authorizers are charged with monitoring and oversight of schools they approve. The law requires authorizers to review their schools in five-year intervals and use performance

frameworks to assess a school’s performance. Authorizers must ground all charter school decisions in evidence of the school’s performance in accordance with the framework.<sup>xxvi</sup> The ASBCS requires an annual evaluation of charter schools based on the Academic Performance Framework.

ASBCS policy provides for an annual evaluation of charter schools in the authorizer’s portfolio based on ASBCS’s academic, operational, and financial frameworks. The purpose of the evaluation is to determine if the charter school meets or is making sufficient progress toward the academic, operational, and financial expectations set forth in the ASBCS’s performance framework or in any improvement plans.<sup>xxvii</sup>

### **A comprehensive accountability/monitoring system that includes performance expectations and compliance requirements**

Arizona law requires authorizers to adopt and publish a performance framework on their websites that includes the academic performance expectations of the charter school and the measurement of sufficient progress toward the academic, operational, and financial performance expectations. Authorizers must also publish intervention and improvement policies. Charter schools are required to participate in the State’s accountability system, to adhere to generally accepted accounting principles, and to provide an independent annual audit to its authorizer. Charter schools are also required to submit any data that is required and requested and that is necessary to compile the achievement profile for the department of education.<sup>xxviii</sup>

### **Minimizes schools’ administrative and reporting burden**

The Arizona Administrative Code states that “to avoid duplicative reporting burdens, the ASBCS shall use data collected from a variety of sources that reflect on the charter [school’s] compliance with the charter contract, and other contractual agreements with the Board, federal and state law.”<sup>xxix</sup>

### **Articulates authorizer action for schools that fail to meet performance expectations (e.g., probation, sanction, or turnaround)**

The law requires authorizers to include intervention and improvement policies in the performance frameworks posted on the ASBCS website.<sup>xxx</sup>

## **Renewal/Revocation**

- ☒ Establishes a clear renewal process and decision-making criteria
- ☒ Requires that decisions to renew/revoke be based on student academic achievement
- ☒ Requires clear school closure procedures (e.g., parent notification, student enrollment, student record transfer, and disposition of assets)

### **Establishes a clear renewal and decision-making criteria**

The law requires authorizers to publish a renewal application and permits authorizers to renew charter schools for successive periods of 20 years.<sup>xxxi</sup>

At least 18 months before the expiration of a school’s charter, the authorizer must notify the school that it can apply for renewal, and a school applying for renewal must submit its renewal

application at least 15 months before the expiration of the charter.<sup>xxxii</sup> If the authorizer denies a school's renewal request, it is required to provide to the school (i) written notice of its intent to deny the renewal at least 12 months before the charter is set to expire, (ii) the data used in making renewal decisions available to the school and the public, and (iii) a public report summarizing the evidence basis for each decision.<sup>xxxiii</sup>

Arizona law also permits charter operators to apply for early renewal and requires that it submit a letter of intent to apply for early renewal to the authorizer at least nine months before the school's intended renewal consideration. For early renewal requests, authorizers may review fiscal audits and academic performance data for the charter school that are annually collected by the sponsor, review the current contract, and provide the school with a renewal application. The authorizer may deny an early renewal request for a school's failure to (i) meet or make sufficient progress towards its academic, operational, and financial framework and/or improvement plans, (ii) complete the obligations of the contract, or (iii) comply with this article or any provision of law from which the charter school is not exempt.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

### **Requires that decisions to renew/revoke be based on student academic achievement**

Per state law, authorizers may revoke a charter at any time if the charter school breaches one or more provisions of its charter, or if the authorizer determines that the school failed to (i) meet or make sufficient progress toward the academic, operational, and financial performance expectations or any improvement plans, or (ii) comply with the articles or any provision of law from which the school is not exempt.<sup>xxxv</sup>

### **Requires clear school closure procedures (e.g., parent notification, student enrollment, student record transfer, and disposition of assets)**

On its website, the ASBCS includes a School Closure Request form. Pursuant to the process detailed on this form, a charter holder requesting to close one or more of its schools must provide a description of the plan to communicate closure to the school community, and how the charter holder will assist displaced students with (i) identifying other options, and (ii) enrolling in another school.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

## **Authorizer Accountability**

- Provides for a registration process for eligible authorizing entities
- Requires the State entity to review authorizers' performance
- Requires authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing

### **Provides for a registration process for eligible authorizing entities**

The law does not provide for an application for a university, a community college, or group of community college districts to become an authorizer.

### **Requires the State entity to review authorizers' performance**

The law requires authorizers to submit an annual report to the auditor general on or before October 1.<sup>xxxvii</sup> The report shall include (i) the current number of charters authorized and the number of schools operated by authorized charter holders, (ii) the academic, operational, and financial performance of the schools in the authorizer's portfolio as measured by the sponsor's

adopted performance framework, (iii) for the prior year, the number of new charters approved, the of charter schools closed and the reason for the closure, and (iv) the authorizer’s application, amendment, renewal and revocation processes, charter contract template and current performance framework. If the authorizer fails to submit the annual report or the auditor general finds significant noncompliance, on or before December 31 of each year, the auditor general shall report to the governor, the president of the senate, the speaker of the house of representatives, and the chairs of the senate and house education committees or their successor committees, and the legislature shall consider revoking the sponsor’s authority to sponsor charter schools.

### **Requires authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing**

While Arizona law does not require authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing, in 2015, Arizona passed several authorizer quality policies to promote strong practices for all authorizers.<sup>xxxviii</sup> In addition, the ASBCS partners with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) on the charter application evaluation process and utilizes NACSA standards when creating its performance frameworks.<sup>xxxix</sup>

## **Authorizer Leadership, Student Access, and Student Services**

- Requires a mission or strategic vision for authorizing
- Promotes quality authorizing by requiring technical assistance or professional development for authorizers and/or charter school applicants
- Ensures equitable access to all students
- Requires appropriate services for educationally disadvantaged students (e.g., students with special needs, English learners, students in foster care, or unaccompanied homeless youth)

### **Requires a mission and strategic vision for authorizing**

While not required by state law, the ASBCS has three strategic goals:

1. Approve quality applications and grant charters to qualified applicants.
2. Increase the quality of the board’s portfolio of charter schools by monitoring academic performance and fiscal and contractual compliance.
3. Promote the board’s mission in providing quality educational choices.<sup>xl</sup>

### **Promotes quality authorizing by requiring technical assistance or professional development for authorizers and/or charter school applicants**

The “applicant may request, and the state board of education or the state board for charter schools may provide, technical assistance to improve its application.”<sup>xli</sup> The ASBCS also provides applicant workshops and/or webinars for charter applicants on topics like application overview; educational, academic systems, operational, and business plans; and instructional analysis.<sup>xlii</sup>

### **Ensures equitable access to all students**

The law requires open enrollment for charter schools, and charter schools are prohibited from limiting admission based on ethnicity, national origin, gender, income level, disabling condition, proficiency in the English language or athletic ability. In addition, the law permits an enrollment

preference for children who are in foster care or meet the definition of unaccompanied youth prescribed in the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.<sup>xliii</sup>

### **Requires appropriate services for educationally disadvantaged students (e.g., students with special needs, English learners, students in foster care, or unaccompanied homeless youth)**

Arizona law provides that each charter school in the State is its own local education agency and thus is responsible for the special education needs of its enrolled students.<sup>xliiv</sup> A school's charter/contract must ensure compliance with all federal and State laws relating to the education of children with disabilities in the same manner as a school district.<sup>xliv</sup> Charter schools are also required to enroll and provide educational services to students requiring special education and to English learner students.<sup>xlvi</sup>

## **Authorizer Funding**

- Provides a mechanism for guaranteed access to authorizer funding
- Includes a process for holding authorizers accountable for how funding is used

### **Provides a mechanism for guaranteed access to authorizer funding**

The Arizona Administrative Code states that the authorizer “may charge a new charter application processing fee to any applicant ... [and that] the application fee shall fully cover the cost of application review and any needed technical assistance.”<sup>xlvii</sup> Authorizers may approve policies that allow a portion of the fee to be returned to the applicant whose charter is approved.<sup>xlviii</sup>

### **Includes a process for holding authorizers accountable for how funding is used**

Under Arizona State Law, the ASBCS is required to “prepare a budget for expenditures necessary for the proper maintenance of the board and the accomplishment of its purpose.”<sup>xlix</sup>

## Endnotes

- <sup>i</sup> Language in ESSA Framework Details section below was taken directly and adapted from Title IV, Part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), §§ 4301 to 4311 (20 U.S.C. §§ 7221 to 7221j)—<https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-discretionary-grants-support-services/charter-school-programs/state-entities/funding-and-legislation/>; Language in the NACSA: Framework Details section below were taken directly or adapted from the following resources: National Association of Charter School Authorizers: Quality Authorizing Practices; Reinvigorating the Pipeline; Authorizer Accountability Model Language; Higher Education Institution Authorizers; Leadership, Commitment, Judgment: Elements of Successful Charter School Authorizing; Findings from the Quality Practice Project; Principles and Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing; Putting an End to Authorizer Shipping; Language in the Alliance: Framework Details section below were taken directly or adapted from the following resources: National Alliance for Public Charter Schools: 2019 State Charter Law Ranking—<https://www.publiccharters.org/ranking-state-public-charter-school-laws-2019>; 2016 Model Charter School Law—<https://www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/migrated/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/2016ModelCharterSchoolLaw.pdf>
- <sup>ii</sup> Hassel, B. & Terrell, M. G., *The Rugged Frontier, A Decade of Public Charter Schools in Arizona*, Progressive Policy Institute: Washington, DC (June 2004). Retrieved from <https://fordhaminstitute.org/national/commentary/rugged-frontier-decade-public-charter-schools-arizona>
- <sup>iii</sup> *Id.*
- <sup>iv</sup> House Bill 2460 Charter Schools, Vacant Buildings, Equipment. Retrieved from <https://apps.azleg.gov/BillStatus/GetDocumentPdf/461202>
- <sup>v</sup> A.R.S. § 15-183(C). See also interview on March 9, 2020 with Mark Francis (Project Director, Charter School Program, Arizona Department of Education), Jane Smoudi (Education Program Specialist, Arizona Department of Education), and Kelly McQuaid (Education Program Specialist, Arizona Department of Education); 2018 CSP application.
- <sup>vi</sup> A.R.S. § 15-183(A).
- <sup>vii</sup> A.R.S. § 15-183(C)(4).
- <sup>viii</sup> *Id.*
- <sup>ix</sup> A.A.C. R7-5-201 and 203.
- <sup>x</sup> A.R.S. § 15-183(A).
- <sup>xi</sup> A.R.S. § 15-183(C).
- <sup>xii</sup> A.A.C. R7-5-203.
- <sup>xiii</sup> A.A.C. R7-5-204.
- <sup>xiv</sup> A.R.S. § 15-183(C)(2)(f).
- <sup>xv</sup> A.A.C. R7-5-101.
- <sup>xvi</sup> ASBCS website, Sample New Charter Contract. Retrieved from <https://asbcs.az.gov/sites/default/files/New%20Charter%20Contract-%20Modified%2005-21-2014.pdf>
- <sup>xvii</sup> A.R.S. § 15-183(E)(4).
- <sup>xviii</sup> ASBCS website, Academic Performance Framework. Retrieved from <https://asbcs.az.gov/academic-performance-framework>
- <sup>xix</sup> A.R.S. § 15-183 (I)(1).
- <sup>xx</sup> A.R.S. § 15-183(I).
- <sup>xxi</sup> *Id.*

- xxii A.R.S. § 15-183(E)(6).
- xxiii A.R.S. § 15-183(H).
- xxiv A.R.S. § 15-183(E)(8).
- xxv A.R.S. § 15-183(H).
- xxvi A.R.S. § 15-183(I)(3).
- xxvii A.A.C. R7-5-401, et seq.
- xxviii A.R.S. § 15-183(R).
- xxix A.A.C. R7-5-403(A).
- xxx A.R.S. § 15-183 (R)(4).
- xxxi A.R.S. § 15-183(J).
- xxxii A.R.S. § 15-183(I)(1).
- xxxiii *Id.*
- xxxiv A.R.S. § 15-183(I)(2).
- xxxv A.A.C. R7-5-401, et seq.
- xxxvi ASBCS website, School Closure Amendment Request. Retrieved from [https://asbcs.az.gov/sites/default/files/School%20Closure\\_Request%20rev%207.11.18.pdf](https://asbcs.az.gov/sites/default/files/School%20Closure_Request%20rev%207.11.18.pdf)
- xxxvii A.R.S. § 15-183(HH).
- xxxviii National Association of Charter School Authorizers, *On the Road to Better Accessibility, Autonomy & Accountability, State Policy Analysis 2015*. Retrieved from <https://charterschoolcenter.ed.gov/publication/road-better-accessibility-autonomy-and-accountability-state-policy-analysis-2015>
- xxxix 2018 CSP application.
- xl ASBCS website, About the Board. Retrieved from <https://asbcs.az.gov/board-staff-information>
- xli A.R.S. § 15-183(C)(2)(f).
- xlii See ASBCS website, New Charter Application at <https://asbcs.az.gov/applicant-resources>
- xliii A.R.S. § 15-184.
- xliv A.R.S. § 15-184(C).
- xlv A.R.S. § 15-183(7).
- xlvi A.R.S. § 15-184.
- xlvii A.R.S. § 15-183(C)(C).
- xlviii A.A.C. R7-5-202.
- xliv A.R.S. § 15-182(E)(8).