

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

A. Commitment and Capacity

A.01 – Mission and Strategic Plan: The sponsor has a clear mission and a strategic plan for sponsoring community schools.

Key Indicators:

- The mission cites sponsoring practices and is available on the sponsor’s website.
- The strategic plan articulates clear sponsoring priorities, measurable goals and time frames for achievement.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF A SPONSORING MISSION WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor submitted a mission that cites sponsoring –but– The mission is not available on the sponsor’s website.	The sponsor submitted a mission that cites sponsoring –and– The mission is available on the sponsor’s website.	2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted a strategic plan that includes sponsoring goals.	3-Point Requirements –and– The goals in the strategic plan are measurable and include time frames for achievement.

A.02 – Goals and Self-Evaluation: The sponsor uses a defined improvement process to evaluate its work and to implement strategic actions based on the findings.

Key Indicators:

- The improvement process occurs annually according to a defined process.
- The sponsor uses the findings from this process to develop goals and implement strategic action steps.
- The sponsor uses this process to evaluate its work against national standards for community school sponsors (e.g. National Association of Charter School Authorizers - NACSA).

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF EVALUATING ITS SPONSORING OBLIGATIONS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor submitted evidence that it evaluates its sponsoring obligations –but– The sponsor did not submit evidence of using a defined improvement process to do so.	The sponsor submitted evidence that it uses a defined improvement process to evaluate its sponsoring obligations –and– The sponsor has written goals for improvement.	2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it develops and implements action steps based on the findings from its improvement process.	3-Point Requirements –and– The improvement process includes a way for the sponsor to compare its work to national standards for sponsoring.

Optional: The sponsor may submit a narrative explanation of how the submitted documents support the sponsor’s practice as it pertains to this standard. Evaluators may use narrative explanations in the scoring process if they are substantiated by documentary evidence.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

A.03 – Roles and Responsibilities: The sponsor provides guidance and offers training to assist schools in understanding the roles and responsibilities outlined in the contract.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor publishes guidance that complements the contract and delineates and defines the roles and responsibilities of the sponsor and the school.
- The sponsor shares this guidance and offers training to school leaders and/or governing authority members.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF GUIDANCE PROVIDED AS A COMPLEMENT TO THE CONTRACT THAT DELINEATES THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SPONSOR AND THE SCHOOL WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor submitted evidence of communicating information to its schools that complements the contract and delineates the roles and responsibilities of the sponsor and the school –but– The sponsor did not submit a written guidance document.	The sponsor submitted evidence of having written guidance that complements the contract and delineates the roles and responsibilities of the sponsor and the school.	2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of sharing the written guidance with its schools prior to the first day of school.	3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of offering training on the written guidance for school leaders and/or school governing authority members.

Note: The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools, which was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e. e-schools, Dropout Prevention and Recovery (DOPR) schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

A.04 – Conflicts of Interest: No conflicts of interest exist between the sponsor and its community schools or within the sponsor’s board or staff, and the sponsor collects signed conflict of interest statements from its staff and board members.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor has a written policy to disclose potential or existing conflicts of interest.
- The sponsor has an established process it follows if a conflict of interest is discovered.
- No conflicts of interest exist between the sponsor and its community schools.
- No conflicts of interest exist within the sponsor’s board or staff.
- Staff members, contractors, and board members must sign an annual conflict of interest statement.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF A CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY OR IDENTIFICATION OF AN UNADDRESSED CONFLICT OF INTEREST WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor submitted a conflict of interest policy. -and- There is no evidence of an unaddressed conflict of interest.	1-Point Requirement –and– The submitted policy addresses internal AND external conflicts of interest between the sponsor and its community school(s) and within the sponsor’s board, staff and contractors.	2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of collecting signed conflict of interest statements for the review period from staff members, contractors with sponsoring responsibilities, and each board member.	3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted an established policy that prescribes the process it follows if a conflict of interest is discovered.

NOTE: The entire body of submitted documentation may be taken into account during the review of this standard.

Optional: The sponsor may submit a narrative explanation of how the submitted documents support the sponsor’s practice as it pertains to this standard. Evaluators may use narrative explanations in the scoring process if they are substantiated by documentary evidence.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

A.05 – Staff Expertise: The sponsor has sufficient expertise and sponsoring experience to carry out its responsibilities (i.e. reviewing applications, overseeing school performance and legal compliance, making renewal decisions, and providing technical assistance).

Key Indicators:

- The organizational chart and/or job descriptions indicate a clear structure of sponsoring responsibilities and reflect designated staff for each sponsoring responsibility.
- Résumés and/or bios demonstrate the sponsor has some staff members with several years of sponsoring experience, and its regular staff includes a member who is a licensed school treasurer (or its equivalent).
- The sponsor's staff has expertise in the areas pertinent to sponsoring obligations, or it contracts with external sources as needed. The areas of expertise include: curriculum, instruction, assessment, special education, school accountability, school governance, and, as needed, ELL instruction, school facilities, and community school law.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT AN ORGANIZATIONAL CHART WITH A CLEAR STRUCTURE OF SPONSORING RESPONSIBILITIES WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The sponsor's submitted organizational chart and/or job descriptions indicate a clear structure of sponsoring responsibilities.</p>	<p>1-Point Requirements –and– Sponsoring responsibilities are designated to specific staff and/or contractors.</p>	<p>2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that at least one of its staff members has two or more years of sponsoring experience, and that it has a staff member who is a licensed school treasurer or its equivalent –and– There is evidence that staff members have expertise in the areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment, special education, school accountability, school governance, and, as needed, ELL instruction, school facilities, and community school law.</p>	<p>3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that at least two staff members each have three or more years of experience in sponsoring community schools.</p>

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

A.06 – Staff Development: The sponsor makes evidence-based selections of professional development activities that align to sponsoring responsibilities for its staff members.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor’s staff members regularly participate in professional development that is aligned to sponsoring responsibilities (e.g. compliance monitoring of current community school laws and rules; state and federal funding, including grants; educational programs; instructional delivery, including blended and online; requirements of special education; governance; state assessments; health and safety).
- The sponsor uses evidence (e.g. needs survey, details from staff résumés, goals from the strategic plan, school performance data, etc.) to select professional development activities for its staff members.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF ITS STAFF PARTICIPATING IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor submitted evidence that demonstrates at least one member of the sponsoring staff participates in at least one professional development session.	The sponsor submitted evidence that demonstrates a majority of the sponsoring staff participates in at least one professional development session.	2-Point Requirements –and– The professional development sessions attended align to sponsoring responsibilities.	3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it uses data or other documentation to select professional development activities for its staff.

NOTE: The entire body of submitted documentation may be taken into account during the review of this standard.

Optional: The sponsor may submit a narrative explanation of how the submitted documents support the sponsor’s practice as it pertains to this standard. Evaluators may use narrative explanations in the scoring process if they are substantiated by documentary evidence.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

A.07 – Allocation of Resources: The sponsor has a budget commensurate with its sponsoring responsibilities and has a plan to allocate resources to support its priorities and the needs of its school(s).

Key Indicators:

- The budget demonstrates that revenues are sufficient for fulfilling sponsoring responsibilities.
- The sponsor's fees and/or separate agreements do not include inducements, incentives, or disincentives that compromise its judgment in approval and accountability decision-making.
- The sponsor uses data and information about its schools' needs to allocate resources to support school improvement and fulfill its responsibilities.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT A BUDGET THAT REFLECTS REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES THAT RELATE TO SPONSORING RESPONSIBILITIES WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The sponsor submitted a budget that reflects revenues and expenditures related to sponsoring</p> <p>–but–</p> <p>The sponsor's fees and/or separate agreements contain inducements, incentives or disincentives that may compromise its objective judgment.</p>	<p>The sponsor submitted a budget that reflects revenues and expenditures related to sponsoring</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>There is no evidence of the sponsor's fees and/or separate agreements creating a potential conflict of interest.</p>	<p>2-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor's budget reflects sufficient funds for fulfilling its sponsoring responsibilities.</p>	<p>3-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence of making data-driven decisions regarding resource allocation.</p>

NOTE: The entire body of submitted documentation may be taken into account during the review of this standard.

Optional: The sponsor may submit a narrative explanation of how the submitted documents support the sponsor's practice as it pertains to this standard. Evaluators may use narrative explanations in the scoring process if they are substantiated by documentary evidence.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

B. Application Process & Decision-Making

B.01 – Application Process, Timeline and Directions: The sponsor uses a documented, systematic application process that includes a defined development timeline, clear directions, detailed guidance, defined evaluation criteria, and an interview.

Key Indicators:

- The application and related guidance include the following documented components:
 - A timeline that allows for a planning stage of six months or more
 - Directions on the content and format required
 - Criteria used to evaluate the application
 - An interview for final school applicants
- The application is readily available to the public.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF A FORMAL APPLICATION PROCESS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>There is a documented application process, which includes one or fewer of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a defined timeline - vague requirements for the submission of the application - vague criteria used to evaluate the application - an interview of final applicants 	<p>There is a documented application process, which includes at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a defined timeline - vague requirements for the submission of the application - vague criteria used to evaluate the application - an interview of final applicants 	<p>There is a documented application process, which includes <u>all</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a defined timeline, which includes a planning stage of at least 6 months - vague requirements for the submission of the application - vague criteria used to evaluate the application - an interview of final applicants - public availability on the organization's website 	<p>There is a documented, systematic application process, which includes <u>all</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a defined timeline, which includes a planning stage of at least 9 months - prescriptive requirements for the submission of the application - prescriptive criteria used to evaluate the application - sponsoring priorities - an interview of final applicants - public availability on the organization's website

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

B.02 – Rigorous Criteria for New Schools: The sponsor requires school applicants to describe seven areas of school planning and operations and to submit additional data and documents that sufficiently corroborate these plans.

Key Indicators:

- All school applicants must present information about the following:
 - Mission and vision
 - Educational program
 - Staffing plan
 - Business plan
 - Market research
 - Governance and management structures
 - Capacity to execute its plan

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT A WRITTEN APPLICATION THAT REQUIRES SCHOOL APPLICANTS TO DESCRIBE AT LEAST ONE OF THE SEVEN ITEMS BELOW WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The submitted application requires school applicants to describe <u>one or two</u> of the following: - mission and vision - education plan - staffing plan - business plan - market research - governance and management structures - the capacity to execute its plan	The submitted application requires school applicants to describe <u>three or four</u> of the following: - mission and vision - education plan - staffing plan - business plan - market research - governance and management structures - the capacity to execute its plan	The submitted application requires applicants to describe <u>five or six</u> of the following: - mission and vision - education plan - staffing plan - business plan - market research - governance and management structures - the capacity to execute its plan	The submitted application requires applicants to describe <u>all</u> of the following: - mission and vision - education plan - staffing plan - business plan - market research - governance and management structures - the capacity to execute its plan

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

B.03 – Rigorous Criteria for Replicators and Schools Seeking a Change in Sponsor: The sponsor requires potential replicators and schools seeking a change in sponsor to submit a written application. The sponsor considers academic, operational, and fiscal data in addition to interviewing the applicant and its current sponsor.

Key Indicators:

- For replicators:
 - Sponsors review the following information:
 - Academic data
 - Sponsor's compliance reports
 - School's board meeting minutes
 - Financial records, including recent audits
 - Business or growth plan and market research
 - The sponsor also interviews both the applicant and applicant's current sponsor.

- For schools seeking a change in sponsor:
 - Sponsors review the following information:
 - Academic data
 - Sponsor's compliance reports
 - School's board meeting minutes
 - Financial records, including recent audits
 - Provide information about how it has remedied any deficiency cited by the current sponsor
 - The sponsor also interviews both the applicant and the applicant's current sponsor.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT A PROCESS FOR REVIEWING SCHOOL REPLICATOR APPLICANTS OR SCHOOLS SEEKING A CHANGE IN SPONSOR WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor submitted evidence that it requires either potential school replicators <u>or</u> schools seeking a change in sponsor to submit a written application.	The sponsor submitted evidence that it requires both potential school replicators <u>and</u> schools seeking a change in sponsor to submit a written application.	2-Point Requirements –and– The application process for replicators and schools seeking a change in sponsor includes a review of the following: - academic data - sponsor's compliance reports - financial records - recent audit reports - for replicators: a business or growth plan and market research - for schools seeking a change in sponsor: any deficiencies cited by the current sponsor, along with the school's remedies	3-Point Requirements -and– The sponsor's submitted review process includes interviewing the current sponsor of the applicant –and– The sponsor's submitted review process includes interviewing the school applicant.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

B.04 – Reviewer Expertise: The sponsor has an application review team with sufficient expertise and sponsoring experience to make informed application decisions.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor's application review team is comprised of multiple reviewers, including external sources when there are not enough sponsor staff members who are available and/or possess the necessary expertise.
- Résumés and/or bios demonstrate that at least one application reviewer has several years of community school and/or sponsoring experience.
- The sponsor's review team has expertise in the four main areas of school planning and operations: education plan, governance, finance, and accountability. If an application includes an area of specialization (e.g. career-technical program, dropout recovery program), at least one reviewer has expertise in that area.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF HAVING AN APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The sponsor submitted evidence of having at least three application reviewers.</p>	<p>1-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor has at least one reviewer with one or more years of community school and/or sponsoring experience</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>Reviewers have expertise in at least two of the four listed areas of school planning and operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - education plan - governance - finance - accountability 	<p>2-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor has at least one reviewer with two or more years of community school and/or sponsoring experience</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>Reviewers have expertise in all four of the listed areas of school planning and operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - education plan - governance - finance - accountability <p>–and–</p> <p>If the sponsor receives an application that proposes an area of specialization, at least one reviewer has expertise in that area.</p>	<p>3-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor has at least two reviewers with three or more years of experience in sponsoring community schools.</p>

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

B.05 – Reviewer Protocols: Reviewers carefully and consistently examine application materials.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor has specific protocols for evaluating applications which include a rubric with selection criteria.
- The protocols require each reviewer to score and document the rating for each selection criteria.
- Reviewers are trained on the protocols prior to reviewing applications.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT PROTOCOLS FOR EVALUATING APPLICATIONS OR EVIDENCE THAT REVIEWERS RECEIVE TRAINING ON THE PROTOCOLS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor submitted evidence of written protocols for evaluating applications –or– There is some evidence that reviewers receive training on the protocols.	The sponsor submitted evidence of detailed written protocols for evaluating applications –and– There is some evidence that reviewers receive training on the protocols.	The sponsor’s submitted detailed written protocols for evaluating applications, which include a rubric with selection criteria and require each reviewer to score and document the rating for each selection criteria –and– New reviewers receive training on the protocols.	3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of reviewer calibration –and– All reviewers receive training on the protocols annually.

Optional: The sponsor may submit a narrative explanation of how the submitted documents support the sponsor’s practice as it pertains to this standard. Evaluators may use narrative explanations in the scoring process if they are substantiated by documentary evidence.

SPONSORS THAT DID NOT RECEIVE ANY APPLICATIONS DURING THE 2017-18 SCHOOL YEAR MUST UPLOAD A MEMO STATING THAT A PORTION OF THE STANDARD IS NOT APPLICABLE AND WHY. THE DEPARTMENT MAY SUPPLY THE EVALUATION TEAM WITH CORROBORATING INFORMATION.

- Evaluators: Check this box if the sponsor did not receive any applications during the 2017-18 school year. Such sponsors are evaluated only on the application review protocols and training portion of this standard.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

B.06 – Rigorous Decision-Making: The sponsor approves only those applicants that meet an approval threshold of at least 75% of possible points.

Key Indicators:

- Reviewers document evidence to support whether the applicant meets the selection criteria.
- The sponsor approves only those applicants that earn at least 75% of possible points.
- The sponsor’s staff provide evidence-based recommendations to the sponsor’s board regarding application decisions.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF REVIEWING THE APPLICATIONS OF SCHOOLS THAT WERE GIVEN PRELIMINARY AGREEMENTS DURING THE REVIEW YEAR WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The documentation submitted by the sponsor demonstrates reviewers do not cite evidence to support whether the applicant meets the selection criteria</p> <p>–or–</p> <p>Sponsor submitted evidence that at least one school applicant receiving a preliminary agreement earned fewer than 50% of possible points.</p>	<p>The documentation submitted by the sponsor demonstrates reviewers cite some evidence to support whether the applicant meets the selection criteria</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>Sponsor submitted evidence that all school applicants receiving a preliminary agreement earned at least 50% of possible points.</p>	<p>The documentation submitted by the sponsor demonstrates reviewers cite evidence to support whether the applicant meets <u>each</u> selection criterion</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>Sponsor submitted evidence that all school applicants receiving a preliminary agreement earned at least 66% of possible points.</p>	<p>The documentation submitted by the sponsor demonstrates reviewers cite evidence to support whether the applicant meets <u>each</u> selection criterion</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>Sponsor submitted evidence that all school applicants receiving a preliminary agreement earned at least 75% of possible points</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence that its staff provides evidence-based recommendations to the sponsor’s board regarding application decisions.</p>

Optional: The sponsor may submit a narrative explanation of how the submitted documents support the sponsor’s practice as it pertains to this standard. Evaluators may use narrative explanations in the scoring process if they are substantiated by documentary evidence.

SPONSORS THAT DID NOT RECEIVE ANY APPLICATIONS DURING THE 2017-18 SCHOOL YEAR MUST UPLOAD A MEMO STATING THAT THE STANDARD IS NOT APPLICABLE AND WHY. THE DEPARTMENT MAY SUPPLY THE EVALUATION TEAM WITH CORROBORATING INFORMATION.

- Evaluators: Check this box if the sponsor did not receive any applications during the 2017-18 school year. Such sponsors are not evaluated on this standard.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

C. Performance Contracting

C.01 – Contract Student Performance Measures: The sponsor’s contracts include a performance framework that defines each school’s expected academic and non-academic outcomes with clear, measurable, and inclusive targets.

Key Indicators:

- Contracts include all applicable measures of student performance included on the state report card (e.g. proficiency rates on state tests, student academic growth, attendance rates, graduation rates).
- Contracts include additional academic and non-academic measures of student performance (e.g. student performance on other valid and reliable assessments, student engagement, student discipline, and post-secondary outcomes).
- Contracts include targets for student subgroups.
- Contracts include goals that compare the school’s performance to other schools (e.g. schools serving similar populations, schools in the same geographic region, statewide community schools) and/or mission-specific academic goals.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR’S REVIEWED CONTRACTS TO CONTAIN PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORKS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The majority of reviewed contracts do not include multiple measures of student performance.	The majority of reviewed contracts include multiple measures for student performance, but do not contain specific metrics and/or targets for subgroups of students.	All reviewed contracts include multiple measures of student performance, specific metrics and/or targets for subgroups of students.	3-Point Requirements –and– All reviewed contracts include targets that compare the school’s student performance to the state, schools serving similar populations, schools in the same geographic area and/or mission-specific goals.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

C.02 – Contract Terms for Renewal and Non-Renewal: The sponsor specifies the renewal application process in each school’s contract.

Key Indicators:

- Contracts specify a required high-stakes review to take place prior to contract renewal or at least every five years (whichever comes first).
- Contracts define the criteria and conditions for renewal beyond those listed in [ORC 3314.03\(A\)\(4\)](#) and [ORC 3314.07\(B\)\(1\) through \(4\)](#).

A “high-stakes review,” for the purposes of the Critical Area C: Performance Contracting, is a rigorous evaluation of a school’s performance (academic, financial, operational and governance) over the entire contract term.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR’S REVIEWED CONTRACTS TO SPECIFY REQUIRED HIGH-STAKES REVIEWS OR TO CONTAIN TERMS AND CONDITIONS REQUIRED OF SCHOOLS FOR CONTRACT RENEWAL WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The majority of reviewed contracts do not specify a high-stakes review to take place prior to renewal</p> <p>–or–</p> <p>The majority of reviewed contracts do not specify the level of performance required of schools for contract renewal.</p>	<p>The majority of reviewed contracts specify a high-stakes review to take place prior to renewal</p> <p>–or–</p> <p>The majority of reviewed contracts define the level of performance required of schools for contract renewal.</p>	<p>All reviewed contracts specify a high-stakes review to take place prior to renewal</p> <p>–or–</p> <p>All reviewed contracts clearly define the level of performance required of schools for contract renewal.</p>	<p>All reviewed contracts specify a high-stakes review to take place prior to renewal</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>All reviewed contracts clearly define the level of performance required of schools for contract renewal.</p>

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

C.03 – Contract Amendment and Updates: The sponsor updates its contract language to ensure consistency with changes in law, and performance measures are updated annually to support higher achievement.

Key Indicators

- The sponsor’s reviewed contracts include language regarding the conditions for amendment or modifications.
- The sponsor has a process to review changes in federal and/or state law to determine the need for contract modifications.
- The sponsor has a process to review school data and/or changes to Ohio’s achievement reporting to determine the need for modifications to the contract performance measures.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR’S REVIEWED CONTRACTS TO INCLUDE CONDITIONS FOR AMENDMENT OR MODIFICATIONS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The reviewed contracts include language regarding the conditions for amendment or modifications</p> <p>–but–</p> <p>The sponsor did not submit evidence of a process to review changes in federal and/or state law to determine the need for contract modifications.</p>	<p>The reviewed contracts include language regarding the conditions for amendment or modifications</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence of a process to review changes in federal and/or state law to determine the need for contract modifications.</p>	<p>2-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence of updating its contract template based on changes in federal and/or state law.</p>	<p>3-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence of a process to review school data and/or changes to Ohio’s achievement reporting to determine the need for modifications to the contract performance measures.</p>

Optional: The sponsor may submit a narrative explanation of how the submitted documents support the sponsor’s practice as it pertains to this standard. Evaluators may use narrative explanations in the scoring process if they are substantiated by documentary evidence.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

D. Oversight and Evaluation

D.01 – Oversight Transparency: The sponsor’s oversight, intervention and evaluation processes are transparent, and the sponsor shares how it will monitor academic, operational and financial performance.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor has documented processes for its oversight, intervention and evaluation systems.
- The sponsor proactively communicates its timelines related to its systems for oversight and evaluation, and for gathering school performance, compliance and fiscal data.
- The sponsor defines its processes for oversight, intervention and evaluation through its contract with its community school(s) and/or separate documented guidance.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT DOCUMENTED PROCESSES FOR ITS OVERSIGHT AND EVALUATION SYSTEM WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor submitted at least one documented process for its oversight, intervention and/or evaluation system, but there is no evidence that this information was shared with the sponsor’s school(s).	1-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of communicating in advance its timelines related to its systems for oversight and evaluation.	2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of defining its processes for oversight, intervention and evaluation through its contracts and/or documented guidance.	3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of communicating the process, methods, and timing of gathering and reporting school performance and compliance data.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

D.02 – Enrollment and Financial Reviews: The sponsor reviews and provides feedback on the enrollment and financial records of each school monthly.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor reviews the enrollment and financial records of each school monthly.
- The sponsor has policies and procedures in place for conducting enrollment and financial reviews.
- The sponsor provides written feedback to the school following each month’s reviews, including proactive recommendations to improve the governing authority’s decision-making.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF CONDUCTING AN ENROLLMENT AND FINANCIAL REVIEW WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The sponsor submitted evidence of conducting monthly enrollment and financial reviews</p> <p>–but–</p> <p>The sponsor did not submit evidence of providing feedback to its school(s) after conducting such reviews.</p>	<p>The sponsor submitted evidence of conducting monthly enrollment and financial reviews</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence of providing feedback to its school(s) after conducting such reviews.</p>	<p>2-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted at least six examples of financial and enrollment review results for each selected school</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted detailed policies and procedures for conducting enrollment and financial reviews.</p>	<p>3-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The financial reviews include budget ledgers and transaction detail reports, and at least one includes a review of the five-year forecast</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>When a review indicates financial instability, or falling enrollment, the sponsor makes proactive recommendations to the school's board regarding financial and enrollment decision-making.</p>

Note: The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools, which was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e. e-schools, DOPR schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

D.03 – Onsite Visits: The sponsor conducts onsite reviews at least twice per year while school is in session, which includes an examination of the school’s compliance with state law and the school’s academic performance.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor collects data from a variety of school employees and/or other stakeholders (e.g. the school's board members, students, parents, staff, management company staff, etc.) during onsite reviews.
- Onsite visit protocols specify process of conducting onsite reviews, including the goal of visits, data collected and its source and observation and/or interview guidance.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF HAVING CONDUCTED AT LEAST TWO ONSITE REVIEWS WHILE SCHOOL IS IN SESSION WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The sponsor submitted evidence of having conducted at least two onsite reviews while school is in session –and–</p> <p>During the onsite review, data are collected from a school employee on the day of the review.</p>	<p>1-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence of an onsite visit protocol.</p>	<p>2-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it collects data from school employees, including at least one administrator and a sample of instructors</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>The submitted onsite visit protocol includes observation guidelines and specifies how interviews will be conducted.</p>	<p>3-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it collects data from at least three stakeholder groups (e.g., the school's board members, students, parents and staff, management company staff, etc.).</p>

Note: The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools, which was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e. e-schools, DOPR schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

D.04 – Site Visit Reports: The sponsor provides its school(s) with a report after each site visit, and it follows up with schools regarding any areas needing improvement.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor provides all schools with a written report following each onsite review that includes the information collected during the site visit, a summary of findings, areas needing improvement and areas of strength.
- If the sponsor identifies areas needing improvement, it specifies the steps or timeframes for doing so and requests and reviews relevant status updates from the school.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF PROVIDING ITS SCHOOL(S) WITH A SITE VISIT REPORT WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor submitted at least one instance of providing its school(s) with a report following onsite reviews regarding the school's compliance with laws and rules for the areas reviewed.	The sponsor submitted evidence of providing each selected school with a report following each of two onsite reviews regarding the school's compliance with laws and rules for the areas reviewed –and– If the sponsor identifies an area needing improvement, the report cites that the school must take action.	2-Point Requirements –and– Each submitted report includes the information collected, a summary of findings and, if applicable, areas needing improvement. –and– If the sponsor identifies an area needing improvement, it specifies the steps or timeframes for doing so and requests and reviews status updates from the school regarding its progress in the area.	3-Point Requirements –and– Each submitted report recognizes each school's areas of strength.

Note: The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools, with a minimum of 2 reports per selected school. The set was randomly selected by the vendor and includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e. e-schools, DOPR schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

D.05 – Performance Monitoring: The sponsor reviews each school's academic performance annually using data related to the terms in each school's performance framework.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor has a process for evaluating each school's academic outcomes against their performance frameworks on at least an annual basis.
- The sponsor collects data related to its schools' contract performance measures throughout the year.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF REVIEWING THE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF ITS SCHOOL(S) WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor submitted evidence of reviewing at least one of its school's academic performance during the review year.	The sponsor submitted evidence of reviewing academic performance of all schools that receive a renewed or extended contract during the review year.	The sponsor submitted evidence of reviewing the academic performance measures outlined in the contract for each of its schools during the review year.	3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it collects data related to the terms in each school's contract performance measures during the school year.

Note: The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools, which was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e. e-schools, DOPR schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

D.06 – Intervention: The sponsor defines its systems for intervention and corrective action, and it intervenes when a school violates the contract and/or is academically deficient.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor describes conditions that may trigger intervention apart from statutorily required language.
- The sponsor describes the types of actions and consequences that may ensue apart from statutorily required language.
- The sponsor outlines a process for resolving issues to avoid possible actions and consequences apart from statutorily required language.
- If the school violates the contract or is academically deficient, the sponsor intervenes.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE THAT IT IS AWARE OF ITS OBLIGATION TO INTERVENE IN ACCORDANCE WITH OHIO LAW WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor’s reviewed contract(s) state conditions that may trigger intervention according to statutorily required language.	1-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it communicates, apart from statutory language, the conditions that may trigger intervention through the contract or separate guidance. -OR- 1-Point Requirements –and– If there is evidence of a school contract violation and/or performance deficiency, the sponsor provides evidence of intervening.	2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it communicates, apart from statutory language, the types of actions and consequences that may ensue, through the contract or separate guidance.	3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it communicates a process for resolving issues to avoid possible actions and consequences, through the contract or separate guidance.

NOTE: The entire body of submitted documentation may be taken into account during the review of this standard.

Optional: The sponsor may submit a narrative explanation of how the submitted documents support the sponsor’s practice as it pertains to this standard. Evaluators may use narrative explanations in the scoring process if they are substantiated by documentary evidence.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

D.07 – Reports: The sponsor annually provides reports to its school(s) that summarize fiscal, operational, and academic performance.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor annually provides each school with a report summarizing its fiscal performance and operational compliance to date against the terms of the contract.
- The sponsor annually provides each school with a cumulative report that summarizes the school's academic record over the contract term against the performance framework.
- The sponsor directly informs each board about its school's performance.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF PROVIDING ITS SCHOOL(S) WITH REPORTS REGARDING COMPLIANCE OR ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides its school(s) with a report regarding compliance and academic performance that is broad in nature, and only when compliance problems arise.</p>	<p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides each of its schools with an annual report that summarizes the school's fiscal and operational compliance and academic performance.</p>	<p>2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides each of its schools with an annual performance report that relates the school's performance against its contract <u>and</u> includes multiple years of data.</p>	<p>3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor's submitted annual performance reports identify areas of strength and areas for improvement –and– The sponsor's annual performance reports summarize the school's performance over the contract term and state the school's prospects for renewal.</p>

Note: The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools, which was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e. e-schools, DOPR schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

E. Termination and Renewal Decision-Making

E.01 – Renewal Application: The sponsor clearly communicates its renewal application process and defines criteria used to evaluate the application, which include multiple sources of evidence.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor requires all schools seeking renewal to apply through a renewal application.
- The criteria for renewal are transparent and specific.
- The criteria for renewal include multiple sources of evidence (e.g. multiple years of student achievement, multiple measures of student achievement, financial audits and/or site visit and compliance reports).

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT A RENEWAL APPLICATION THAT REQUIRES RENEWAL APPLICANTS TO SUBMIT AT LEAST ONE OF THE ITEMS LISTED UNDER THE 1-POINT REQUIREMENTS BELOW WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal application process, which includes <u>one or two</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a defined timeline - criteria used to evaluate the application - review of the school's most recent state report card - review of recent financial audits - review of recent compliance monitoring reports 	<p>The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal application process, which includes <u>at least three</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a defined timeline - criteria used to evaluate the application - review of the school's most recent state report card - review of recent financial audits - review of recent compliance monitoring reports 	<p>The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal application process, which includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a defined timeline - criteria used to evaluate the application -and- <p>The application includes <u>at least three</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - multiple years of student achievement - multiple measures of student achievement - financial audits - site visit reports and/or other compliance reports 	<p>The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented, systematic renewal application process, which includes <u>all</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a defined timeline - criteria used to evaluate the application - multiple years of student achievement - multiple measures of student achievement - financial audits - site visit reports and/or other compliance reports - if applicable, status reports on corrective action plans or other required interventions

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

E.02 – Renewal and Non-Renewal Decisions: The sponsor has clear standards and processes to make renewal decisions.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor grants renewal only to schools that are fiscally and operationally viable, have achieved their contractual academic standards, and are faithful to the terms of the contract.
- The sponsor’s staff provide evidence-based recommendations to the sponsor’s board regarding renewal decisions.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF ITS DECISION-MAKING PROCESS FOR ANY SCHOOL THAT WAS UP FOR RENEWAL DURING THE REVIEW YEAR WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The sponsor submitted general board minutes as evidence of the renewal decision-making process, but did not submit evidence of that decision being informed by either a completed renewal application or school performance data.</p>	<p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it required all schools up for renewal to submit an application, but granted renewal to one or more schools for which one or more of the following was true:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - failed to meet the academic achievement targets in their contract - failed to remedy documented issues of fiscal or operational viability - unresolved non-compliance with one or more laws or terms of the contract 	<p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it granted renewal only to schools that are fiscally and operationally viable and meet <u>one</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - achieve the academic achievement targets in their contract - are faithful to the terms of their contract <p>–and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence that its staff provides evidence-based recommendations to the sponsor’s board regarding renewal decisions.</p>	<p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it granted renewal only to schools that are fiscally and operationally viable and meet <u>both</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - achieve their contractual academic standards - are faithful to the terms of their contract <p>–and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence that its staff provides evidence-based recommendations to the sponsor’s board regarding renewal decisions.</p>

NOTE: The entire body of submitted documentation may be taken into account during the review of this standard.

Optional: The sponsor may submit a narrative explanation of how the submitted documents support the sponsor’s practice as it pertains to this standard. Evaluators may use narrative explanations in the scoring process if they are substantiated by documentary evidence.

SPONSORS THAT DID NOT HAVE ANY SCHOOLS UP FOR RENEWAL DURING THE 2017-18 SCHOOL YEAR MUST UPLOAD A MEMO STATING THAT THE STANDARD IS NOT APPLICABLE AND WHY. THE DEPARTMENT MAY SUPPLY THE EVALUATION TEAM WITH CORROBORATING INFORMATION.

- Evaluators: Check this box if the sponsor did not have any schools up for renewal during the 2017-18 school year. Such sponsors are not evaluated on this standard.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

E.03 – Non-Renewal Notification: If the sponsor non-renews a school, it explains its rationale for this decision in writing and provides timely notice to the school’s families.

Key Indicators:

- When the sponsor non-renews a school, it explains its decision with a prompt, written notification.
- The sponsor also provides prompt written notification of non-renewal to the school’s families.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF COMMUNICATING ITS DECISION TO NON-RENEW A SCHOOL DURING THE REVIEW YEAR TO THE SCHOOL OR THE SCHOOL’S FAMILIES WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of its non-renewal to the school but did not include any explanation</p> <p>–or–</p> <p>The sponsor did not submit evidence that it notified the school’s families of the non-renewal as of April 30.</p>	<p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school citing statutory language only</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it notified the school’s families of the non-renewal no later than April 30.</p>	<p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal within 14 days of making the decision that included an explanation beyond statutory language</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it notified the school’s families of the non-renewal no later than March 1.</p>	<p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal within 14 days of making the decision that included an explanation beyond statutory language</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it notified the school’s families of the non-renewal no later than January 15.</p>

SPONSORS THAT DID NOT NON-RENEW ANY SCHOOLS DURING THE 2017-18 SCHOOL YEAR MUST UPLOAD A MEMO STATING THAT THE STANDARD IS NOT APPLICABLE AND WHY. THE DEPARTMENT MAY SUPPLY THE EVALUATION TEAM WITH CORROBORATING INFORMATION.

- Evaluators: Check this box if the sponsor did not non-renew any schools during the 2017-18 school year. Such sponsors are not evaluated on this standard.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

E.04 – Contract Termination: The sponsor has clear standards and processes to make termination decisions, and it consistently follows these standards in making termination decisions.

Key Indicator:

- The sponsor has a written policy apart from the contract template that explains the criteria for termination and the procedures to be followed if termination is required.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR’S REVIEWED CONTRACTS TO HAVE A TERMINATION PROVISION WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor has only the statutory language for grounds for termination in the reviewed contract(s) –or– The sponsor has not consistently applied the termination policy.	1-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor explains, through the contract or separate written policy apart from statutory language, the grounds for termination.	2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor has written procedures to be followed if termination occurs.	3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor's written termination policy defines the criteria for termination, includes the specific evidence it will collect and/or document, and the procedures outline responsibilities for both the sponsor and the school in the event of a termination.

NOTE: The entire body of submitted documentation may be taken into account during the review of this standard.

SPONSORS THAT DID NOT TERMINATE ANY SCHOOLS DURING THE 2017-18 SCHOOL YEAR MUST UPLOAD A MEMO STATING THAT A PORTION OF THIS STANDARD IS NOT APPLICABLE AND WHY. THE DEPARTMENT MAY SUPPLY THE EVALUATION TEAM WITH CORROBORATING INFORMATION.

- Evaluators: Check this box if the sponsor did not terminate any schools during the 2017-18 school year. Such sponsors are evaluated on the policy portion of this standard only.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

E.05 – Closure Process: The sponsor has a plan for overseeing school closure, and it follows this plan whenever a school closes.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor has a formal policy for overseeing school closure, which includes procedures for timely notification to parents, orderly transition of student records, disposition of school funds and assets, and submitting closing assurances.
- If one or more of the sponsor's schools closed during the review year, the sponsor submits evidence of having overseen the closure process.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF A POLICY FOR OVERSEEING SCHOOL CLOSURE WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The sponsor submitted documentation that explains its obligation to oversee school closure in its school contract(s) –but– One or more of the sponsor's schools closed during the review year, and the sponsor did not submit evidence of informing parents and/or transitioning student records –and/or– One or more of the sponsor's schools closed during the previous review year, and the sponsor did not submit the Closing Assurances.</p>	<p>The sponsor submitted documentation that explains its obligation to oversee school closure in its school contract(s) –and– For each of the sponsor's schools that closed during the review year, the sponsor submitted evidence of the following: - informing parents - transitioning student records –and– For each of the sponsor's schools that closed during the previous review year, the sponsor submitted the Closing Assurances.</p>	<p>2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted the Department's closure guidance or its own formal policy apart from statutory language in the contract.</p>	<p>3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of a formal policy apart from the Department's guidance document –and– For each of the sponsor's schools that closed during the review year, the sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring parents were notified of the school's closure within two weeks and received assistance in finding a new school.</p>

SPONSORS THAT DID NOT CLOSE ANY SCHOOLS DURING THE 2016-17 AND/OR THE 2017-18 SCHOOL YEAR MUST UPLOAD A MEMO STATING THAT A PORTION OF THIS STANDARD IS NOT APPLICABLE AND WHY. THE DEPARTMENT MAY SUPPLY THE EVALUATION TEAM WITH CORROBORATING INFORMATION.

- Evaluators: Check this box if the sponsor did not close any schools during the 2017-18 school year. Such sponsors are not evaluated on informing parents or transitioning school records during the review year.
- Evaluators: Check this box if the sponsor did not close any schools during the 2016-17 school year. Such sponsors are not evaluated on the submitting Closing Assurances for the previous review year.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

F. Technical Assistance

F.01 – Ongoing Technical Assistance*: The sponsor has an established process for determining the needs of its schools and it conducts a needs assessment to determine what type of technical assistance it offers.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor provides timely assistance to its schools in response to issues, problems and concerns identified by either the school or the sponsor.
- The sponsor solicits information from the school about its needs for technical assistance and about the quality and impact of previous technical assistance.
- The sponsor uses the results of a needs assessment to plan proactive technical assistance to its schools.

*Technical assistance is defined in OAC 3301-102-02 as "the provision of targeted and customized supports by professionals with subject matter expertise relevant to the operations of a community school toward successfully fulfilling its obligations under applicable rules, laws and the terms of its community school contract."

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO ITS SCHOOL(S) WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides reactive technical assistance to its school(s).	1-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it solicits information about the technical assistance needs of its school(s).	2-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it solicits feedback on the quality and impact of the technical assistance that it provides to its school(s).	3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of using the results of a needs assessment to provide at least three instances of proactive technical assistance to its school(s).

Note: The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools, which was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e. e-schools, DOPR schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter.

Optional: The sponsor may submit a narrative explanation of how the submitted documents support the sponsor’s practice as it pertains to this standard. Evaluators may use narrative explanations in the scoring process if they are substantiated by documentary evidence.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

F.02 – Legal and Policy Updates: The sponsor updates schools on relevant legal changes.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor has a method by which it informs its school(s) of changes to rule and law that impact the community school operations.
- The sponsor offers an annual training to assist its school(s) in understanding changes to rule and law that impact community school operations.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF UPDATING ITS SCHOOL(S) ON CHANGES TO RULE AND LAW THAT IMPACT COMMUNITY SCHOOL OPERATIONS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor did not submit evidence of providing schools with written guidance on changes to rule and law that impact community school operations –but– The sponsor did submit evidence of directing its schools to another source.	The sponsor submitted evidence of providing schools with written guidance on changes to rule and law that impact community school operations –but– The sponsor did not submit evidence of doing so on a regular basis (i.e. annually).	The sponsor submitted evidence of having a regular publication (i.e. annually) with written guidance on changes to rule and law that impact community school operations.	3-Point Requirements –and– The sponsor submitted evidence that it offers an annual training to assist its school(s) in understanding changes to rule and law that impact community school operations.

Note: The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools, which was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e. e-schools, DOPR schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

F.03 – Professional Development for Schools: The sponsor uses the results of a needs assessment to determine which professional development opportunities to offer.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor shares and/or offers professional development opportunities with its school(s) regularly.
- The sponsor shares and/or offers professional development opportunities based on data about school needs.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF SHARING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES WITH ITS SCHOOL(S) WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
<p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it shares and/or offers information about professional development opportunities with its community schools once or twice per year</p> <p>–or–</p> <p>The sponsor mandates that its school(s) participate in specific professional development, beyond any training that is a requirement of the contract.</p>	<p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it shares and/or offers information about professional development opportunities with its community school(s) three or more times per year.</p>	<p>2-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence that it shares and/or offers information about professional development opportunities with its school(s) according to a process.</p>	<p>3-Point Requirements –and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence that at least one of the professional development opportunities it shared and/or offered was specific to community schools</p> <p>–and–</p> <p>The sponsor submitted evidence of using the results of a needs assessment to determine which professional development opportunities it shares and/or offers.</p>

NOTE: The entire body of submitted documentation may be taken into account during the review of this standard.

Note: The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools, which was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e. e-schools, DOPR schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter.

Optional: The sponsor may submit a narrative explanation of how the submitted documents support the sponsor’s practice as it pertains to this standard. Evaluators may use narrative explanations in the scoring process if they are substantiated by documentary evidence.

2017 – 2018 Sponsor Quality Practices Rubric

F.04 – Relationships with Schools’ Governing Authorities: The sponsor takes steps to build a positive working relationship with each school’s governing authority.

Key Indicators:

- The sponsor communicates regularly with each school’s governing authority.
- The sponsor attends at least two board meetings annually for each school.

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF ATTENDING ITS SCHOOLS’ BOARD MEETINGS OR EVIDENCE OF COMMUNICATING REGULARLY WITH SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points
The sponsor submitted evidence of attending at least one school board meeting –or– There is evidence that the sponsor communicates with and/or provides guidance to its schools’ boards beyond monthly financial and enrollment reviews.	The sponsor submitted evidence of attending at least one board meeting per school –and– There is evidence that the sponsor communicates with and/or provides guidance to its schools’ boards beyond monthly financial and enrollment reviews.	The sponsor submitted evidence of attending at least two board meetings per school –and– There is evidence that the sponsor communicates with and/or provides guidance to its schools’ boards at least bimonthly, beyond monthly financial and enrollment reviews.	The sponsor submitted evidence of attending three or more board meetings per school –and– There is evidence that the sponsor communicates with and/or provides guidance to its schools’ boards at least monthly, beyond monthly financial and enrollment reviews.

Note: The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools, which was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e. e-schools, DOPR schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter.