

November 30, 2018

Sherry Kuehnle, Governing Authority Chairperson
A + Children's Academy
100 Obetz Road
Columbus, Ohio 43207

Re: **2017-2018 Annual Report**

Dear Ms. Kuehnle,

Ohio law requires the Department to complete an annual review of the performance of the School. The Ohio Department of Education, Office of School Sponsorship, evaluates the School based upon its academic, fiscal, organizational/operational performance, and legal compliance. During the 2017-2018 school year, the Department began working on its strategic plan which looks at the impact of education on the whole child. As a result, a large part of the School's evaluation will consider the School's impact on the whole child.

As a result of the review, the Office of School Sponsorship has determined that the School has had some struggles over the past year, but is now working towards ensuring that the needs of the whole child are met. The school has recently changed its leadership and has experienced some staff turn-over during the past year. Based upon the school's stated commitment to work towards continuous improvement, the School is rated as **working towards meeting the expectations of the Office of School Sponsorship**. Our office is looking forward to working with the School during the upcoming school year.

Academic Performance

Overall, the School is performing at the level of similar schools in Columbus, Ohio. Academics and professional development is a key focus of the school this year. A more detailed review of the School's overall academics is contained in the attachments as well as available on the Department's website at reportcard@education.ohio.gov. The School's governing authority and leadership are dedicated to improving academics over the next school year. As we continue to partner with the School to work towards overall improvement, the School will continue to be a quality school choice in the Columbus, Ohio area.

Fiscal Performance

Overall the School is working toward meeting the expectations of fiscal performance. A detailed analysis may be reviewed in the attachment.

Legal Compliance

During the 2017-2018 school year, we reviewed the School's policies and procedures to ensure compliance with the over 200 state laws and rules applicable to community schools. We appreciate the School's desire to work closely with our office in drafting and revising policies to ensure compliance with our office's standards as well as statutory requirements. We have

broken down the compliance into several sections and your compliance with each section is identified in the chart:

Sherry Kuehnle, Governing Authority Chairperson
November 30, 2018
Page 2

Category	Total Compliance Items	Items Compliant
Academic	80	79
Data and Technology	16	16
Enrollment/Admissions/Attendance	20	20
Fiscal	20	20
Governance and Employment	60	57
Health and Safety	34	32
Transportation	17	17
Other policies	11	11

We appreciate the School's hard work over the year.

Organization and Operational Performance

Operationally, the School is working towards improving its organizational and operational leadership. The School has recently hired new leadership to oversee the school. It is important for the school leadership to be committed to the students and the overall improvement of the School. The School's governing authority is working on ensuring that the school remains viable for many years to come and in filling all available seats on the governing authority as permitted by the by-laws. Overall the School tries to remain in compliance with its contract, the staff training will be a priority this year, and the governing authority is working towards overall compliance.

The 2018-2019 School Year

Looking ahead to the 2018-2019 school year, we hope to continue to partner with the school and works towards overall school improvement. There are many changes in the school this year and with a continued focus towards comprehensive improvement, the School will see the results of its hard work. Our office will continue to be a partner to the School this year and in the future as the School continues serve as a quality school choice for Columbus families.

Sincerely,

Sheila P. Vitale

Sheila P. Vitale, Esq.
Director, Office of School Sponsorship

A+ Children's Academy, 2018 Performance Framework

The Performance Framework serves as the foundation for the performance and accountability plan for schools sponsored by the Ohio Department of Education's Office of School Sponsorship. The framework evaluates the school in four equally rated areas: academic and student performance; financial performance; operational performance; and additional evidence of the effectiveness of the community school.

Academic and Student Performance

The goals in this section are measured based on the school's own academic and student performance measures, as well as the statewide similarly situated schools and comparable community schools.

In measuring the school's academic indicators, certain report card measures identified as "weighted report card measures" are areas that are weighted more heavily in considering whether the school is showing marked improvement in academics. The weighted report card measures include a look at the past three years of school performance and include a narrative regarding whether the school is making improvement year over year.

Additional consideration is given to schools that increase any component grade one level over the previous year. The school must have received a rating for the component grade in the prior school year for the school to receive additional consideration that it is meeting or exceeding goals.

The comparison groups by which the school is measured is an important tool in determining whether the school is meeting its academic goals. If a school meets or exceeds the results of the comparison group, the school will be considered to have met its goals. This measure also includes a narrative regarding the school's performance over the past three years compared to the comparison groups.

Weighted Report Card Measures

Key	Exceeds Goals	Meets Goals	Making Progress Toward Goals	Needs Improvement	Three-Year Comparison
Performance Index	Grade A or B or exceeded the overall statewide average.	Grade C or meets the overall statewide average.	Grade D and is below the overall statewide average or an increase of 10 percent.	Grade F and is below the overall statewide average.	Statistically, data appears somewhat unchanged.
Value-Added	Grade A or B	Grade C	Grade D	Grade F	Overall value added made improvement in index score

K-3 Literacy	Grade A or B	Grade C	Grade D	Grade F	Not Rated, too few students
4-Year Graduation Rate	Meets district average	10 percent below district average.	Greater than 10 percent below but less than 20 percent below district average.	Greater than 20 percent below district average.	n/a
5-Year Graduation Rate	Meets district average as identified on report card	10 percent below district average as identified on report card.	Greater than 10 percent below district average as identified on report card.	Greater than 20 percent below district average as identified on report card.	n/a

A+ Children's

A+ Children's Academy, 2018 Performance Framework

Key	Notes	Meets Goal	
Any component grade increased one level	Includes only component grades that were graded on the two most recent report cards.		N/A

Comparison with Peers

Key	Meets	Needs Improvement
Achievement (Overall)	A-C	D-F
Indicators Met	A-C	D-F
Progress (Overall)	A-C	D-F
Mobility		
Value-Added Gifted Students	A-C	D-F
Value-Added Lowest 20% in Achievement	A-C	D-F
Value-Added Students with Disabilities	A-C	D-F
Gap Closing	A-C	D-F

Performance Framework

Prepared for Success		A-C	D-F	
Chronic Absenteeism rate		Equal to or less than 10%	Greater than 10%	
Key	Notes/Considerations	Meets Goals	Need Improvement	Three-Year Comparison
Performance v. District of Residence – Performance index		Performed at the level of or above the district of residence.	Performed below the level of the district of residence.	The school performed slightly above district of residence.
Performance v. Statewide Similarly Situated Community Schools – Performance Index	Similar schools are based on the community school's characteristics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brick and Mortar; • Special Education; • E-schools 	Performed at the level of or above similar community schools.	Performed below the level of similar community schools.	Performed significantly above comparable schools.

Other Report Card Measures

Notes:

Notes:

A+ Children's Academy is transitioning under new leadership. The school is currently reviewing data and engaging in professional development to improve classroom teaching methodologies and student performance.

A+ Children's Academy has implemented a new attendance plan to address the chronic absenteeism rate.

Academic and Student Performance – Dropout Prevention and Recovery Schools Only

Weighted Report Card Measures

Key	Meets	Making Progress	Needs Improvement	Three-Year Comparison
Progress	Rated Exceeds Standards.	Rated Meets Standards.	Rated Does Not Meet Standards.	
Gap Closing	Rated Exceeds Standards.	Rated Meets Standards.	Rated Does Not Meet Standards.	
4-Year Graduation Rate	Rated Exceeds Standards.	Rated Meets Standards.	Rated Does Not Meet Standards.	
5-Year Graduation Rate	Rated Exceeds Standards.	Rated Meets Standards.	Rated Does Not Meet Standards.	

Key	Notes	Meets Goal	
Any Component Grade Increased One Level	Only includes component grades that were rated for two consecutive report cards.		N/A

Comparison with Peers

Key	Meets	Making Progress	Needs Improvement	Three-Year Comparison
Performance v. District of Residence – Performance index		Performed at the level of or above the district of residence.	Performed at the level of or above the district of residence.	
Performance v. Statewide Similarly Situated Community Schools – Performance Index	Similar schools are based on the community school's characteristics: - Dropout Prevention and Recovery Schools.	Performed at the level of or above similar community schools.	Performed below the level of similar community schools.	

Performance Framework

Notes:

N/A

Other Report Card Measures

Notes:

Corrective Action Plan for years 2015 and 2016 show items that were not corrected in 2017. Additionally, two findings were documented in 2017 with an anticipated completion date of 5/1/2018. Finding 2017-001 addresses the complexities of their current account structure. 2017-022 addresses Student Enrollment, timeline for action (FAPE) and lack of parent signatures.

4 of 12
August 2018

UNTTY
Office of School Sponsorship

Key	Notes	Compliant	Noncompliant and Corrective Action Required
Annual Audit		The most recent audit contains no findings for recovery, noncompliance citations, questioned costs or material weaknesses.	The most recent audit contains findings for recovery, noncompliance citations, questioned costs, material weaknesses or findings for recovery.
Fiscal Officer		The governing authority ensures that the fiscal officer (treasurer) timely and accurately provides financial information to the sponsor.	The fiscal officer (treasurer) did not timely and accurately provide financial information to the sponsor.
Key		Meets	Needs Improvement
School Rating		Exceeds	Rated Meets Standards or Below
High School Test Passage Rate		32-100%	31.9% and below

6-Year Graduation Rate	12-100%	11.9% and below
7-Year Graduation Rate	12-100%	11.9% and below
8-Year Graduation Rate	12-100%	11.9% and below
Combined Graduation Rate	12-100%	11.9% and below
Attendance	80-100%	79.9% and below

Notes:

N/A

Financial Performance

The financial performance looks at the financial status of the school to determine whether the school is financially viable.

Key Financial Indicators of Fiscal Stability

Key	Definition	Measure	Meets Fiscal Standards	Approaching Fiscal Standards – Fiscal Plan Should be Adopted by the Governing Authority	Not Meeting Fiscal Standards – Corrective Actions Re-quired and Sponsor-Approved Fiscal Plan Required
Current Ratio	Current Assets divided by Current Liabilities.	Identifies the current assets an agency has that easily can be changed into cash to pay current expenses.	≥ 1.5	$\geq 1.0, < 1.5$	< 1.0

Performance Framework

Current Ratio (Multi-Year)	Current Assets divided by Current Liabilities for multiple years (three to five years).	Identifies the current assets an agency has that easily can be changed into cash to pay current expenses.	=>1.5 & Trends Up	=>1.0, <1.5 & Stable	<1.0 Trends Down
Working Capital	Current Assets minus Current Liabilities.	Measure of an entity's liquidity. If current assets exceed current liabilities, the entity is not expected to suffer from liquidity crunch in the near future. A negative working capital amount indicates the entity may not be able to pay its current liabilities when due.	Positive	Zero	Negative
Debt Ratio	Total Liabilities divided by Total Assets.	Measures the portion of the assets of a business that are financed through debt; a lower value is favorable because it indicates that a lower portion of assets is claimed by creditors. The amount identifies the percentage of assets financed through debts.	0 – 20%	>20%, <40%	>40%

Performance Framework

Key Financial Indicators of Fiscal Stability – Continued

Key	Definition	Measure	Meets Fiscal Standards	Approaching Fiscal Standards – Fiscal Plan Should be Adopted by the Governing Authority	Not Meeting Fiscal Standards – Corrective Actions Re-quired and Sponsor-Approved Fiscal Plan Required
Days Cash	Number of calendar days an entity can meet its current obligations using current cash balance including cash equivalents.	Measures calendar days a business can continue to operate without additional cash or resources from external sources.	30-60 Days	15-30 Days	<15 Days
Accounts Payable Past Due	Amounts owed to suppliers.	Identifies ability of entity to pay suppliers in a timely manner, usually within 30 days or payment is considered late. Identifies ability of entity to pay suppliers in a timely manner, usually within 30 days or payment is considered late.	=<30 Days	30-60 Days	>60 Days
Cash Flow (Operating)	Identifies how changes in balance sheet accounts and income affect cash and cash equivalents. (Source: Online)	Measures an entity's ability to generate positive cash flow from its primary (core) business activities. OCF=Income before interest and taxes + Depreciation + Amortization – Taxes.	Positive	Zero	Negative

Performance Framework

Total Margin (Ratio)	A measure of the ability of an entity to generate excess revenue over expenditures. (Source: Online)	Measures the financial health of an entity. Total Margin = (Revenues – Expenses)/Total Revenue. Favorable if 25 per-cent (0.25) or greater.	>25% or >0.25	=>15% <25%	<15% or <0.15
----------------------	--	---	---------------	------------	---------------

Key Financial Indicators of Fiscal Stability - continued

Key	Definition	Measure	Meets Fiscal Standards	Approaching Fiscal Standards – Fiscal Plan Should be Adopted by the Governing Authority	Not Meeting Fiscal Standards – Corrective Actions Re-quired and Sponsor-Approved Fiscal Plan Required
FTE claw back	The school over-reported the number of full-time equivalent students and has received an overpayment from the Department.	Measures the financial health of the school and the addition-al debt of the school.	No claw back	Claw back less than \$500,000	Claw back greater than \$500,000

Current Assets: Cash, cash equivalents, accounts receivable, prepaid expenses, inventories and other items of value that can be converted to cash quickly.

Current Liabilities: Accounts payable, accrued expenses and liabilities, notes payable or short-term borrowings and the current portion of long-term debt.

Notes:

At the end of the 2017-18 school year, the school did not meet the standard in current Ratio, working capital, debt ratio, days cash and Enrollment. However, the school had only one month that reflected accounts payable at 60 days and days cash on hand hovered between 21 and 30. There was no claw-back for the 2017-18 school year.

Performance Framework

Operational Performance

The operational performance of the school looks at various areas of the school's compliance with laws and rules and licensure. Specifically, operational performance looks to how the school operationally takes steps to ensure it is able to offer a quality educational option to its students. This factor looks at teachers, special education, use of federal funds and the effectiveness of the school's governing authority.

Key	Notes	Compliant	Noncompliant and Corrective Action Required
Appropriate Certification and Licensure		Each credentialed staff member holds the appropriate credential for his/her assigned position.	Some educators are not appropriately licensed for their assignment according to state statute.
Annual Report		Parents and sponsor received the school's annual report by the last day of October. The report was complete, accurate and included a self-evaluation of the school's performance over a multi-year period.	Parents and sponsor did not receive the school's annual report by the last day of October. The report was not complete and/or not accurate and/ or did not include a self-evaluation of the school's performance over a multi-year period.
Management Company Evaluation	n/a	Governing authority annually evaluates the management company's performance and provided the sponsor a copy of the evaluation.	Governing authority did not annually evaluate the management company's performance or did not provide the sponsor a copy of the evaluation.
Corrective Action Plans		School satisfied all corrective action plans in a timely manner.	School did not fully satisfy all corrective action plans in a timely manner.

Performance Framework

Notes:

The school has experienced a change in administration for the 2018-19 school year. The new administration corrected any outstanding compliance issues and we look forward to working with the school on their academic performance and professional development opportunities for their teachers.

Operational Performance Continued

Key	Compliant	Not Compliant	N/A
Federal Programs: Carryover Funds ¹	No large carryover of funds indicating ---.	Large carryover.	School does not receive federal program funds.
Federal Programs: Timely Submission of Consolidated Application	Application submitted by July 1.	School submitted application late.	School did not submit an application.
Federal Programs: Timely and Complete Monitoring Documentation	Requested documentation or self-survey was submitted by the requested date.	Requested documentation and/or self-survey was submitted with incomplete information and/or did not meet deadline.	Transition to new administration caused CCIP deadlines to be missed
Federal Programs: Noncompliance Issues with ESEA Law	School has no programmatic or fiscal compliance issues over the last three years.	School did experience a programmatic or fiscal compliance issue over the last three years or the school has unresolved programmatic issues.	

¹ "Large carryover" is defined as 15 percent or more of Title I-A and more than 30 percent from other grants.

Notes:

The CCIP application was submitted late to the office of federal programs. However, we believe this will not be a problem with the appointment of new administration.

Special Education

Key	Meets	Does Not Meet
-----	-------	---------------

Performance Framework

Special Education Indicator 3c: Reading Proficiency Rate	24.18 percent or more students with disabilities scored at or above the proficient level on statewide reading assessments; compliant.	Fewer than 24.18 percent of students with disabilities scored at or above the proficient level on statewide reading assessments; noncompliant.
Special Education Indicator 3c: Math Proficiency Rate	28.57 percent or more students with disabilities scored at or above the proficient level on statewide math assessments; compliant.	Fewer than 28.57 percent of students with disabilities scored at or above the proficient level on statewide math assessments; noncompliant.
Special Education Indicator 4b: Disproportionality Discipline - Expulsion	Risk ratio less than or equal to 3.50 : A risk ratio of 3.5 signifies that students with disabilities within a given racial/ethnic group are 3.5 times more likely to be expelled for greater than 10 days than all students without disabilities; compliant.	Risk ratio more than 3.50: A risk ratio of 3.5 signifies that students with disabilities within a given racial/ethnic group are 3.5 times more likely to be expelled for greater than 10 days than all students without disabilities; noncompliant.

Special Education - Continued

Key	Meets	Does Not Meet
Special Education Indicator 4b: Disproportionality – Discipline – Suspension	Risk ratio less than or equal to 3.5 : A risk ratio of 3.5 signifies that students with disabilities within a given racial/ethnic group are 3.5 times more likely to be suspended for greater than 10 days than all students without disabilities; compliant.	Risk ratio more than 3.5: A risk ratio of 3.5 signifies that students with disabilities within a given racial/ethnic group are 3.5 times more likely to be suspended for greater than 10 days than all students without disabilities; noncompliant.
Special Education Indicator 9: Identification by Race	Risk ratio less than or equal to 3.5 : A risk ratio of 3.5 signifies that students within a specific racial/ethnic group are 3.5 times more likely to be identified for special education than students NOT in that racial/ethnic group; compliant.	Risk ratio more than 3.5: A risk ratio of 3.5 signifies that students within a specific racial/ethnic group are 3.5 times more likely to be identified for special education than students NOT in that racial/ethnic group; noncompliant.
Special Education Indicator 10: Identification for Specific Disability Categories by Race	Risk ratio less than or equal to 3.5 : A risk ratio of 3.5 signifies that students within a specific racial/ethnic group are 3.5 times more likely to be identified in a specific disability category than students NOT in that racial/ethnic group; compliant.	Risk ratio more than 3.5: A risk ratio of 3.5 signifies that students within a specific racial/ethnic group are 3.5 times more likely to be identified in a specific disability category than students NOT in that racial/ethnic group; noncompliant.

Performance Framework

Special Education Indicator 1: Graduation	82.80 percent or more students with disabilities graduated from high school with regular diplomas within four years; compliant.	Fewer than 82.80 percent of students with disabilities graduated from high school with regular diplomas within four years; noncompliant.
Special Education Indicator 2: Dropout	21.80 percent or fewer students with disabilities dropped out of high school; compliant.	More than 21.80 percent of students with disabilities dropped out of high school; noncompliant.
Special Education Indicator 13: Secondary Transition	100 percent: All students with an IEP ages 16 and older must have compliant transition plans in place; compliant.	Less than 100 percent: All students with IEPs ages 16 and older must have compliant transition plans in place; noncompliant.

Notes:

The district received a "Meets Requirements" on their 2017-2018 Special Education Rating. There were no special education compliance issues. The school was rated only on two areas – all others above were scored as "NR".

Performance Framework

Additional Evidence of Effectiveness of the School in the Community:

This section measures the school's effectiveness in the community, taking in account the whole child and community involvement. This section is important in determining whether the school is meeting the goal of being a quality school choice in the community.

Key	Meets	Does Not Meet
Community Engagement	Evidence of one or more community engagement activities for the school year.	Some educators are not appropriately licensed for their assignment according to state statute.
Social/Emotional	Evidence of a plan to address social/emotional needs of the students.	Did not provide sufficient evidence of a plan to address social/emotional needs of the students.
Parent Satisfaction	The school obtained 85 percent or higher parent satisfaction based on surveys of parents during the evaluation year.	The school obtained less than 85 percent parent satisfaction based on surveys of parents during the evaluation year or the school failed to take a parent satisfaction survey.
The School Enrolls a Sufficient Number of Students and Receives Sufficient State Foundation Payments to Support the School's Programs		

Notes:

I was unable to locate a parent satisfaction survey for the past year; however, I am confident that we will see an acceptable rating for the 2018-19 school year. The school participates in a Thanksgiving meal and community choir during the holiday season.

Key	Exceeds	Meets	Does Not Meet
-----	---------	-------	---------------

Performance Framework

School's Climate, As Measured by Sponsor During the Site Visit	The school meets all three: (1)The school has a program in place to support the diverse needs of its students; (2)The school's core mission is clearly incorporated throughout all the school's programs; and (3) The school's professional climate incorporates professional collaboration and teacher development and formal teacher evaluations	The school meets at least two of the following: (1) The school has a program in place to support the diverse needs of its students; (2) The school's core mission is clearly incorporated throughout all the school's programs; or (3) the school's professional climate incorporates professional collaboration and teacher development and formal teacher evaluations.	The school only meets one or none of the following: (1) The school has a program in place to support the diverse needs of its students; (2) The school's core mission is clearly incorporated throughout all the school's programs; or (3) The school's professional climate incorporates professional collaboration and teacher development and formal teacher evaluations.
--	--	--	--

Notes:

The school integrates an Arts program into their school day. This includes movement, drama and visual arts and music. Additionally, a teacher evaluation plan is in place.

Overall Results of School Performance Evaluation Narrative:

The Office of School Sponsorship has observed some struggle with the transition of leadership. However, past compliance issues, concerns with academics and teacher performance is being addressed by the new administration. With these new changes, we anticipate an increase in test scores, less compliance issues, and more professional development opportunities and trainings for faculty.

Financially, the school must continue to look for ways to decrease expenses or increase revenue. This may include a renegotiation of vendor contracts, ways to increase facility space for increased enrollment, or a personnel audit.

It is important that the board fills its 5th board seat and continue to take an active role in the management of the school.

For additional comments, please review the fall site visit report.

Performance Framework

L'>7=52 7AA@DD2,A512CCB111-C#:G&22\$2M85+S1<665s;-&?8(<)21\$-+G2>3H)('-&)229sO5-<(-&<\$)(1Y@/:60 (-

'+!_22_"#\$%&'2 6I^P\7[RL\$K;>F722.V1G<S'M(Q3<A1&XG2B'=(&C-HJ2')O:%2G<'1+B(7(;DQ\$ * C-1:\$8+)J<&8+#J)H(3'2\$Z+,3 +-

#JZT3<2\J%;O,<53\$(\$++-)]5<1&(_22._2/ NNNOOO"E12=112UF:7L-R9'S2A9X535cVV1,236"-1?('11%G5+1&+11'23\$MU)G6H4'8226442W542

22 45 E

