



NATIONAL
CHARTER SCHOOL
RESOURCE CENTER

High-Quality Charter Authorizing Policy Profiles: Michigan

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: Michigan*. 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.

Michigan: 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).ⁱ 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

Michigan’s first charter legislation—House Bill 5124—was signed into law in December 1993; this law was subsequently repealed by Senate Bill 896 which then became Public Act 362 of 1993, signed into law in January 1994.ⁱⁱ This law faced constitutional challenges. Ultimately, in 1997 the Michigan Supreme Court held that Public Act 362 did not violate the State constitution, the legislature must provide for the free and appropriate education for all students, and the legislature has broad authority to establish different types of schools. In 2011, legislation passed that (i) gradually increased the number of school academies that could be authorized by State public universities from 2012 to 2014 and eliminated the cap in subsequent years; (ii) detailed requirements and responsibilities for authorizers, rules for financial and management disclosure by schools, terms for revocation of charters, and targets for student achievement; and (iii) discontinued the practice of requesting an annual report from the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) that analyzed charter school performance.ⁱⁱⁱ

The initial law was amended to add three additional types of charter schools (referred to a public school academies [PSAs]), including:^{iv}

- (i) Urban High School Academies (UHSAs): These schools can only be authorized by State public universities.^v
- (ii) Schools of Excellence (SOEs): SOEs are established as either (i) a replication of a high performing school, (ii) a cyber school, or (iii) a conversion of a PSA based on criteria that define superior academic performance.^{vi} These schools can be authorized by the board of a school district, an intermediate school board, the board of a community college, the governing board of a State public university, or two or more of the public agencies.^{vii}
- (iii) Strict Discipline Academies (SDAs): SDAs are established to serve suspended, expelled, or incarcerated young people.^{viii} These schools can be authorized by the board of a school district that operates grades K–12, an intermediate school board, the board of a community college, or the governing board of a State public university.^{ix}

Michigan State law defines a PSA as a “state-supported public school under the state constitution, operating under a charter contract issued by a public authorizing body.”^x

State Authorizing Profile: Michigan

Framework Snapshot¹

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): Michigan Revised School Code §§ 6A Public School Academies, 6E Schools of Excellence, and 380.1331b Strict Discipline Academies; State School Aid Act of 1979.

¹ 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

While Michigan law is generally free of caps on charter school growth, the law does limit to 15 the growth of schools of excellence which are cyber charter schools.^{xi}

Provides for more than one authorizing pathway

Michigan law permits the following entities to authorize charter schools: the board of a school district, an intermediate school board, the board of a community college, the governing board of a State public university, and two or more of these agencies.^{xii}

Application includes the following:

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

Specific application criteria

Under Michigan statute, a charter school application must include proposed board members, articles of corporation, name of proposed school, purpose, education goals, curricula, student assessments, admission policy, a description of the method to be used to monitor the PSA's compliance with applicable law and its performance in meeting its targeted educational objectives. The law permits applications for new schools and for conversion of a public school to a charter school.

Timelines

The law does not specify any application timelines.

Evaluation review process

When considering an application, the authorizer must evaluate the following

- (i) the resources available for the proposed school,
- (ii) the population to be served,
- (iii) the educational goals,
- (iv) the applicant's track record, if any, in organizing schools,
- (v) the graduation rate of a school district, the population of a county, and the number of schools and pupils on waiting lists for existing charter schools in proximity to where the school plans to be located."^{xiii}

In addition, an authorizer "may give priority to an applicant that is intended to replace a closed charter school, will operate all of the same grade levels as closed charter school, and will work toward operating all of grades 9 to 12 within six years after it begins operations."^{xiv}

Process for denied applications

If the authorizer decides not to issue a charter contract, the applicant may petition the board to include a question as to why the contract was not issued on the ballot to be decided by school electors of the school district.^{xv} However, the authorizer is not required to provide reasons for denial in writing or in a public forum.

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

A charter contract is defined as “the executive act taken by an authorizing body that evidences the authorization of a public school academy and that establishes, subject to the constitutional powers of the state board and applicable law, the written instrument executed by an authorizing body conferring certain rights, franchises, privileges, and obligations on a public school academy, as provided by this part, and confirming the status of a public school academy as a public school in this state.”^{xvi} Within 10 days after issuing a contract, the authorizer is required to submit a copy of the executed contract to the superintendent of public instruction.^{xvii}

Rights and responsibilities of authorizer and school

As stated above, the charter contract establishes the rights and responsibilities of the authorizer and school.

Academic, financial, and operational performance expectations for schools

Under Michigan law, the charter contract must include elements such as:

- (i) “the educational goals the [school] is to achieve and the methods by which it will be held accountable... [including,] to the extent possible, the pupil performance [which] shall be assessed using at least the Michigan student test of educational progress (M-STEP) or the Michigan merit examination;”
- (ii) “a description of the method to be used to monitor the [school’s] compliance with applicable law and its performance in meeting its targeted educational objectives;”
- (iii) “requirements and procedures for financial audits ... [which] shall be conducted at least once annually by a certified public accountant in accordance with generally accepted governmental auditing principles;”
- (iv) “a certification, signed by an authorized member of the [school’s] board of directors, that the [school] will comply with the contract and all applicable law;” and,
- (v) “a requirement that the [school’s] board of directors shall make information concerning its operation and management available to the public and to the authorizing body in the same manner as is required by state law for school districts.”^{xviii}

Initial term of not more than five years

The law does not specify the length of the initial term for approved charter schools.

Fiscal, legal, and programmatic autonomy for schools

Per Michigan law, charter schools are required to include education goals in their applications. Charters schools are also granted authority to enter contracts (with the exception of an agreement with an educational management organization that the authorizer must approve); to sue or be sued; and to “acquire by purchase, gift, devise, lease, sublease, installment purchase agreement, land contract, option, or by any other means, hold and own in its own name buildings and other property for school purposes.”^{xxix} Charters receive State funding from their authorizer as well.^{xx} However, State law also requires that charter schools (i) comply with all laws required of traditional public schools (with the exception of being part of the collective bargaining agreement of the district in which the charter school resides), and (ii) hire certified teachers.^{xxi} The contract includes the information from the school’s application, and the application must include “an agreement that the public school academy will comply with the provisions of this part and, subject to the provisions of this part, with all other State law applicable to public bodies and with federal law applicable to public bodies or school districts.”^{xxii}

Independent charter school governing boards

Michigan law requires charter schools to be “organized and administered under direction of a board of directors and that “a public school academy corporation shall be organized under the nonprofit.”^{xxiii} State law also specifies that “a contract issued to organize and administer a public school academy shall contain at least all of the following ... a certification, signed by an authorized member of the board of directors ... that the public school academy will comply with the contract and all applicable law.”^{xxiv} Lastly, the law states that “a public school academy may take action to ... enter into binding legal agreements with persons or entities as necessary for the operation, management, financing, and maintenance of the public school academy.”^{xxv}

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 the performance goals and expectations set forth in performance-based contract

State law requires authorizers to oversee charter school compliance with the charter contract and all applicable law. The law does not require schools to submit an annual report to its authorizer. During the interview with the MDE, staff indicated authorizers do submit annual reports on schools.^{xxvi}

Establishes a comprehensive accountability/monitoring system that includes performance expectations and compliance requirements

The law requires authorizers to (i) oversee charter schools to ensure the board of directors is in compliance with the terms of the charter contract and applicable law, and (ii) develop and implement a process for holding charter schools accountable for meeting applicable academic performance standards set forth in the contract.^{xxvii}

Minimizes schools' administrative and reporting burden

While State law does not expressly mention minimizing schools' administrative and reporting burden, in its 2018 CSP application, MDE referenced using its assurance and verification site visits with authorizers to avoid duplication of work for charter schools and authorizers.^{xxviii}

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

The law requires authorizers to develop a process for implementing corrective action for schools that do not meet the standards set forth in their contracts.^{xxix}

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)

Requires a clear renewal process and decision-making criteria

Charter contracts must include a description of the process and standards for charter renewal. An authorizer can revoke a charter's contract if it determines the school failed to “(i) demonstrate improved pupil academic achievement for all groups of pupils or meet the educational goals set forth in the contract, (ii) comply with all applicable law, and/or (iii) meet generally accepted public sector accounting principles and demonstrate sound fiscal stewardship.”^{xxx} Before an authorizer revokes a school's charter, State law permits the authorizer to consider and take corrective measures to avoid revocation.^{xxxi} An authorizer may also reconstitute the charter school in a final attempt to improve student educational performance or to avoid interruption of the educational process.^{xxxii} An authorizer's decision to “issue, not issue, or reconstitute a contract under this part, or to terminate or revoke a contract under this section, is solely within the authorizer's discretion, is final, and is not subject to review by a court or any State agency.”^{xxxiii}

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

As stated above, the charter contracts must include a description of the process and standards for charter renewal; in addition, decisions to renew/revoke must consider increases in student academic achievement for all groups of pupils as “the most important” factor.^{xxxiv}

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

If an authorizer revokes a contract, the authorizer must work with a school district or another public school, or with a combination of these entities, to ensure a smooth transition for the affected pupils.^{xxxv}

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

Though the law does not provide for a formal registration process for eligible authorizing entities, new authorizers must (i) notify the MDE of its actions, and (ii) provide copies of its charter application and charter contract to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for review within ten days of approval.^{xxxvi}

Requires the State entity to review authorizers' performance

Michigan law does not require that the State review authorizers' performance; however, the law grants the Superintendent of Public Instruction authority to suspend an authorizer's ability to issue new contracts and to operate charter schools if it finds the authorizer is not continuously monitoring the schools in its portfolio.^{xxxvii}

Requires authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing

Though Michigan law does not require authorizers to adhere to standards for high-quality authorizing, the MDE works extensively with the Michigan Council of Charter School Authorizers (MCCSA).^{xxxviii} In 2019, MCCSA published a *Model for Authorizing Accountability* in which it "approved [various] assurances and developed a review process that requires an authorizer to demonstrate compliance with the assurances prior to going through the accreditation process."^{xxxix} These assurances align with MCCSA's authorizing standards and reflect its commitment to quality authorizing practices.^{xl} Moreover, in the MDE's 2018 CSP application, the MCCSA (i) refined an authorizer accreditation framework that focuses on authorization processes, and (ii) maintains oversight and accountability standards that are aligned to the National Association of Charter School Authorizers' (NACSA's) principles and standards for quality authorizing. The MDE's Authorizer 101 program is aligned to NACSA's principles and standards as well.

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 or strategic vision for authorizing

The law does not require authorizers to have a mission or strategic vision.

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

While State law does not require technical assistance or professional development to promote quality authorizing, the MDE’s 2018 CSP application indicates the Public School Academies Unit (PSAU)—located within the MDE—is working to (i) collect best practices for system-wide implementation, and (ii) promote information sharing through technical assistance to authorizers, schools, and charter school applicants. Technical assistance is also provided during authorizer assurances and verification visits.^{xli}

Ensures equitable access to all students

The law requires charter schools to be open to all students in the State, and schools cannot discriminate in its pupil admissions policies or practices on the basis of intellectual or athletic ability, measures of achievement or aptitude, status as a student with a disability, or any other basis that would be illegal if used by a school district. In addition, charter school applicants must ensure their proposed admission policy and criteria comply with section 504 requirements.^{xlii}

Requires appropriate services for all students including students with disabilities and English learners

Under Michigan law, charter schools are entities independent from traditional school districts and therefore serve as their own local education agencies for special education purposes.^{xliii} In addition, the law provides additional funding for at-risk students, and states that “a district or public school academy receiving funding under this section shall use that money only to provide instructional programs and direct noninstructional services, including, but not limited to, medical, mental health, or counseling services, for at-risk pupils; for school health clinics...”^{xliv}

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

Michigan law permits authorizers to charge a fee of up to three percent of the total State School Aid received by a charter school for considering an application for a contract, for issuing a contract, or for providing oversight of a contract for a public school academy.^{xlv}

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

Michigan law does not specify holding authorizers accountable for how funding is used. However, as stated above, if the Superintendent of Public instruction finds that an authorizing body is not engaging in appropriate continuing oversight of one or more public school academies operating under a contract issued by the authorizing body, it can suspend the power of the authorizing body to issue new contracts to organize and operate public school academies.^{xlvi} As stated in the 2018 CSP application and during an interview with MDE staff,

through MDE’s assurance and verification program, PSAU staff visit each authorizer once every two to three years, during which authorizers provide evidence of compliance with various oversight categories, including financial auditing and sustainability.^{xlvii}

Endnotes

- ⁱ 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>
- ⁱⁱ Goenner, J., *The Originations of Michigan’s Charter School Policy: An Historical Analysis*, Michigan State University (2011). Retrieved from <https://d.lib.msu.edu/etd/872/datastream/OBJ/view>
- ⁱⁱⁱ Michigan Charter Schools, Charter Schools FAQs. Retrieved from <https://www.charterschools.org/about-michigan-charter-schools>
- ^{iv} Revised School Code § 380.501, et seq.
- ^v Revised School Code § 380.521, et seq.
- ^{vi} Michigan Charter Schools, Charter Schools FAQs. Retrieved from <https://www.charterschools.org/about-michigan-charter-schools>
- ^{vii} Revised School Code § 380.551, et seq.
- ^{viii} Revised School Code § 380.1311b, et seq.
- ^{ix} Michigan Charter Schools, Charter Schools FAQs. Retrieved from <https://www.charterschools.org/about-michigan-charter-schools>
- ^x Revised School Code § 380.501(1).
- ^{xi} Revised School Code § 380.552(2).
- ^{xii} The State of Michigan has 57 Intermediate School Districts – (ISD) sometimes called Regional Educational Service Agencies (RESA), Educational Service Agencies (ESA), Regional Educational Service District (RESD) or Educational Service District (ESD). Each ISD has a Board of Education and a Superintendent, just like your local school district. The boundaries of an ISD follow county lines, some ISDs cover more than one county.
- ^{xiii} Revised School Code § 380.50(1).
- ^{xiv} Revised School Code § 380.50(2).
- ^{xv} Revised School Code § 380.502(3).
- ^{xvi} Revised School Code § 380.501(2)(d).
- ^{xvii} Revised School Code § 380.503(4).
- ^{xviii} Revised School Code § 380.503(6).
- ^{xix} Revised School Code § 380.503(10).
- ^{xx} Revised School Code § 380.507(3).
- ^{xxi} Revised School Code §§ 380.502(3)(h) and 380.505. See also Michigan Charter Schools, Charter Schools FAQs. Retrieved from <https://www.charterschools.org/about-michigan-charter-schools>

- xxii Revised School Code § 380.502(3)(h).
- xxiii Revised School Code § 380.502(1).
- xxiv Revised School Code § 380.503(6)(i).
- xxv Revised School Code § 380.504a(d).
- xxvi Interview on April 10, 2020 with Neil Beckwith (Consultant with the Michigan Department of Education, Charter School Grant Program).
- xxvii Revised School Code § 380.507(1)(d) and (e).
- xxviii 2018 CSP grant application.
- xxix Revised School Code § 380.507(1)(3).
- xxx Revised School Code § 380.507(4).
- xxxi Revised School Code § 380.507(8).
- xxxii *Id.*
- xxxiii Revised School Code § 380.507(7).
- xxxiv Revised School Code § 380.503(6)(h).
- xxxv Revised School Code § 380.507(9).
- xxxvi Revised School Code §§ 380.503(4) and 380.507(1).
- xxxvii Revised School Code § 380.502(5).
- xxxviii See interview on April 10, 2020 with Neil Beckwith; 2018 CSP grant application.
- xxxix “In 2002, a group of authorizers created MCCSA with a shared vision of working together toward a dynamic and diverse system of public education for all kids. While blazing the path for chartering schools, MCCSA members meet on a regular basis to share best practices and, in 2005, created the first standards for Michigan authorizers in conjunction with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA).” Michigan Council of Charter School Authorizers, *Advancing Excellence Michigan’s Model for Authorizing Accountability* (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.michiganauthorizers.com/s/6x9-Advancing-Excellence-2019-9-30-1.pdf>
- xl *Id.*
- xli 2018 CSP grant application.
- xlii Revised School Code § 380.502(3).
- xliii Revised School Code §§ 380.504(2) and 380.1751.
- xliv “At-risk students” are defined as “a pupil in grades K to 12 for whom the district has documentation that the pupil meets any of the following criteria: the pupil (i) is economically disadvantaged, (ii) is an English language learner, (iii) is chronically absent as defined by and reported to the center, (iv) is a victim of child abuse or neglect, (v) is a pregnant teenager or teenage parent, and (vi) has a family history of school failure, incarceration, or substance abuse.” Revised School Code § 388.1631a(19).
- xlv Revised School Code § 380.502(6).
- xlvi Revised School Code § 380.503(6)(h).
- xlvii Revised School Code § 380.507(9).