

November 30, 2018

Clarence Sanderfer, Governing Authority Chairperson  
Interactive Media and Construction  
215 N. Trimble Road  
Mansfield, Ohio 44906

**Re: 2017-2018 Annual Report**

Dear Mr. Sanderfer,

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 works hard to ensure that the needs of the whole child are met. The School serves a unique population of at-risk students. Based upon the school's willingness to continuously improve, 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 past two years has been a period of transition for the School. Academically, the school serves a unique population of students who have or are at risk of dropping out of high school. The school's staff is dedicated to providing one-on-one attention to the students as the students work at their own pace to recover credits and earn their high school diploma. Currently the school is working toward meeting expectations of the Department and we are continuing to work towards overall school improvement. 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](mailto:reportcard@education.ohio.gov). The School's governing authority and leadership are dedicated to improving academics over the next school year. The School has recently completed a comprehensive plan to improve academics. 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 Mansfield, Ohio area.

### **Fiscal Performance**

Overall the School meets 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:

Category	Total Compliance Items	Items Compliant
Academic	80	80
Data and Technology	16	16
Enrollment/Admissions/Attendance	20	20
Fiscal	20	20
Governance and Employment	60	60
Health and Safety	34	34
Transportation	17	17
Other policies	11	10

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

## Organization and Operational Performance

Operationally, the School has strong organizational and operational leadership. The School has an experienced school leader, the teaching team is strong and committed to the students, and most importantly the School has an active governing authority. Overall the School is compliance with its contract, the staff is trained, and the governing authority follows its bylaws.

It is clear that both the governing authority and the school leadership care deeply about developing the whole child. Social and emotional needs of the children are a priority at the School.

## The 2018-2019 School Year

Looking ahead to the 2018-2019 school year, the School expects to begin to see the results of the comprehensive improvement plan. The School is completing the onboarding process with the Department with a focus on overall academic improvement this year. 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 Mansfield families.

Sincerely,

*Sheila P. Vitale*

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

# IMAC 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.	
Value-Added	Grade A or B	Grade C	Grade D	Grade F	NR
K-3 Literacy	Grade A or B	Grade C	Grade D	Grade F	N/A
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.	
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.	

# IMAC 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	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.	N/A
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"> <li>• Brick and Mortar;</li> <li>• Special Education;</li> <li>• E-schools</li> </ul>	Performed at the level of or above similar community schools.	Performed below the level of similar community schools.	

Notes:

## Other Report Card Measures

Key	Meets	Needs Improvement
Achievement (Overall) NR	A-C	D-F
Indicators Met NR	A-C	D-F
Progress (Overall) NR	A-C	D-F
Mobility		
Value-Added Gifted Students NR	A-C	D-F
Value-Added Lowest 20% in Achievement NR	A-C	D-F
Value-Added Students with Disabilities NR	A-C	D-F
Gap Closing NR	A-C	D-F
Prepared for Success NR	A-C	D-F
Chronic Absenteeism rate	Equal to or less than 10%	Greater than 10%

# IMAC Performance Framework

Notes:

## 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.	N/A
Gap Closing	Rated Exceeds Standards.	Rated Meets Standards.	Rated Does Not Meet Standards.	NR
4-Year Graduation Rate	Rated Exceeds Standards.	Rated Meets Standards.	Rated Does Not Meet Standards.	N/A
5-Year Graduation Rate	Rated Exceeds Standards.	Rated Meets Standards.	Rated Does Not Meet Standards.	N/A

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.	NR
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.	NR

# IMAC Performance Framework

Notes:

## Other Report Card Measures

Key	Meets	Needs Improvement
School Rating	Exceeds	Rated Meets Standards or Below
High School Test Passage Rate NR	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:

## Financial Performance

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

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.

Notes:

# IMAC Performance Framework

## 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 Required 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.	$\Rightarrow 1.5$	$\Rightarrow 1.0, < 1.5$	$< 1.0$
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.	$\Rightarrow 1.5$ & Trends Up	$\Rightarrow 1.0, < 1.5$ & 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%	$> 20\%, < 40\%$	$> 40\%$

# IMAC Performance Framework

Key	Definition	Measure	Meets Fiscal Standards	Approaching Fiscal Standards – Fiscal Plan Should be Adopted by the Governing Authority	Not Meeting Fiscal Standards – Corrective Actions Required 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. $OCF = \text{Income before interest and taxes} + \text{Depreciation} + \text{Amortization} - \text{Taxes}$ .	Positive	Zero	Negative
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. $\text{Total Margin} = (\text{Revenues} - \text{Expenses}) / \text{Total Revenue}$ . Favorable if 25 per-cent (0.25) or greater.	>25% or >0.25	=>15% <25%	<15% or <0.15



# IMAC 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 Required 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: No claw backs.

# IMAC 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	IMAC does not have a management company.	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.

Notes:

# IMAC Performance Framework

## Operational Performance - Continued

Key	Compliant	Notcompliant	N/A
Federal Programs: Carryover Funds <sup>1</sup>	No large carryover of funds indicating ---.	Large carryover.	
Federal Programs: Timely Submission of Consolidated Application	Application submitted by July 1.	School submitted application late.	
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.	
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.	

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

Notes:

## Special Education

Key	Meets	Does Not Meet
Special Education Indicator 3c: Reading Proficiency Rate	<b>24.18 percent or more</b> students with disabilities scored at or above the proficient level on statewide reading assessments; compliant.	<b>Fewer than 24.18 percent</b> of students with disabilities scored at or above the proficient level on statewide reading assessments; noncompliant.
Special Education Indicator 3c: Math Proficiency Rate	<b>28.57 percent or more</b> students with disabilities scored at or above the proficient level on statewide math assessments; compliant.	<b>Fewer than 28.57 percent</b> 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 <b>less than or equal to</b> 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 <b>more</b> 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.

# IMAC Performance Framework

## Special Education - Continued

Key	Meets	Does Not Meet
Special Education Indicator 4b: Disproportionality – Discipline – Suspension	Risk ratio <b>less than or equal to 3.5</b> : 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 <b>more</b> 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 <b>less than or equal to 3.5</b> : A risk ratio of 3.5 signifies that students <b>within a specific racial/ethnic group</b> are 3.5 times more likely to be identified <b>for special education</b> than students NOT in that racial/ethnic group; compliant.	Risk ratio <b>more</b> than 3.5: A risk ratio of 3.5 signifies that students <b>within a specific racial/ethnic group</b> are 3.5 times more likely to be identified <b>for special education</b> than students NOT in that racial/ethnic group; noncompliant.
Special Education Indicator 10: Identification for Specific Disability Categories by Race	Risk ratio <b>less than or equal to 3.5</b> : A risk ratio of 3.5 signifies that students within <b>a specific racial/ethnic group</b> are 3.5 times more likely to be identified in a <b>specific disability category</b> than students NOT in that racial/ethnic group; compliant.	Risk ratio <b>more</b> than 3.5: A risk ratio of 3.5 signifies that students <b>within a specific racial/ethnic group</b> are 3.5 times more likely to be identified <b>in a specific disability category</b> than students NOT in that racial/ethnic group; noncompliant.
Special Education Indicator 1: Graduation	<b>82.80 percent or more</b> students with disabilities graduated from high school with regular diplomas within four years; compliant.	<b>Fewer than 82.80 percent</b> of students with disabilities graduated from high school with regular diplomas within four years; noncompliant.
Special Education Indicator 2: Dropout	<b>21.80 percent or fewer</b> students with disabilities dropped out of high school; compliant.	<b>More than 21.80 percent</b> of students with disabilities dropped out of high school; noncompliant.
Special Education Indicator 13: Secondary Transition	<b>100 percent</b> : All students with an IEP ages 16 and older must have compliant transition plans in place; compliant.	<b>Less than 100 percent</b> : All students with IEPs ages 16 and older must have compliant transition plans in place; noncompliant.

Notes: The school received a rating of “Meets Requirements” on the 2017-2018 Special Education Rating. Any areas not scored received a rating of “NR”.

# IMAC 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	Meets	

Notes:

Key	Exceeds	Meets	Does Not Meet
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.

# IMAC Performance Framework

Notes:

## **Overall Results of School Performance Evaluation Narrative:**

Interactive Media & Construction board, administration team and staff are committed to increasing enrollment, addressing academic needs of the students while still being able to build rapport with students and families. IMAC is currently working on the school improvement plan to address these issues.

# Ohio School Report Cards



**Meets Standards**

School Rating

## Interactive Media & Construction (IMAC)

Districts and schools report information for the Ohio School Report Cards on specific marks of performance, called measures, within broad categories called components. Dropout Recovery Program schools receive ratings for up to eight measures and four components.

### High School Test Passage Rate

The High School Test Passage Rate component represents the number of students who passed all five state tests that are required for graduation.

**Students who Passed all Five Tests**



**Not Rated**

Rating

33.3%

### Gap Closing

The Gap Closing component shows how well schools are meeting the performance expectations for our most vulnerable populations of students in English language arts, math and graduation.

**Annual Measurable Objectives**



**Not Rated**

Rating

0.0%

### Progress

The Progress component looks closely at the growth that all students are making during the school year.

Value-Added

**Overall**



**Meets Standards**

Rating

Does Not Meet Standards

### Graduation Rate

The Graduation Rate component looks at the percent of students who are successfully finishing high school with a diploma in four, five, six, seven, or eight years.

Graduation Rates

**29.7%** is the weighted average of all graduation rates.



**Meets Standards**

Rating

