Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Review (QSPR)

Recent legislation, Amended Substitute House Bill 555, requires the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) to develop and implement a sponsor evaluation system. The purpose of the evaluation system is to assist ODE in its oversight of community school sponsors and to improve the quality of community school sponsor practices.   This may in turn improve community school operations and the academic performance of community school students.

The sponsor evaluation system assesses a sponsor's performance based upon three components:

- academic performance of students enrolled in community schools sponsored by the same entity;
- adherence to quality sponsoring practices prescribed by the department; and
- compliance with applicable laws and administrative rules (subject to proposed Rule 3301-102-08 of the Ohio Administrative Code).

Each component of the evaluation system will be rated exemplary, effective or ineffective and each component contributes one-third to the overall rating of a sponsor's performance. The component measuring academic performance of students enrolled in community schools took effect in 2011; it is known as the composite Sponsor Performance Index.

For over a year, ODE has been working collaboratively with community school and sponsor stakeholder agencies and groups to develop the remaining two components of the sponsor evaluation system. The component assessing a sponsor's compliance with applicable laws and administrative rules has been piloted and is now being implemented. It was prescribed in Ohio Administrative Code Rule 3301-102-08, which is scheduled for adoption by the State Board of Education in June, 2013.

The third component, called Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Review (QSPR) evaluates a sponsor's adherence to quality sponsoring practices. It is being piloted now, with the goal of full implementation during the 2013-2014 academic year.

Background on the Process and Practices

The QSPR is modeled after ODE's School Improvement Diagnostic Review (SIDR) process and ODE's Supplemental Educational Services Quality of Provider Services (QoS) rubric rating tool. Both reviews are built upon research-based practices and ultimately designed to improve student performance.

School Improvement Diagnostic Review (SIDR). The primary purpose of the SIDR is to help schools and districts improve student performance by analyzing current practices against effective evidence and research-based practices, identifying areas of strength and areas needing improvement, prioritizing leveraged opportunities for action and aligning evidence and research-based practices. This diagnostic review is conducted by an external team of experienced and skilled reviewers using standardized processes and protocols for data collection and analysis (i.e., document review, classroom observations, and interviews). The external review provides schools/districts with valuable insight into their current practices, as seen from an outside point of view. Results also help ODE to prioritize state and regional supports for improving student performance.

Supplemental Educational Services – Quality of Provider Services (QOS) rubric rating. The primary purpose of this tool is to determine an SES provider's quality of services and will ultimately be used as one factor in ODE's decision to keep the SES provider on its state approved list. The tool is built around indicators of effective practice and the review process is conducted by an external team of experienced and skilled reviewers using standardized processes and protocols for data collection and analysis (i.e., interviews and observations).

National Quality Principles of Sponsorship. Following the models above, ODE's Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Review is built upon the National Association of Charter School Authorizers' (NACSA) quality principles of sponsorship. In addition to NACSA's standards, Ohio's sponsor requirements as defined in law were also built into the review (e.g., technical assistance, etc.) Six areas of practices are the focus of the review:

1. organizational commitment and capacity,
2. community school application process and decision making,
3. performance contracting,
4. oversight and evaluation of community schools,
5. contract termination and renewal decision making, and
6. technical assistance.

Other resources were drawn upon when developing this tool and are listed in Appendix A of this document.

It is important to note that this review process was developed by a working group of Ohio's community school experts: the Ohio Department of Education, the Ohio Association of Charter School Authorizers (OACSA), representatives from the Ohio Authorizer Collaborative (OAC: representatives from Reynoldsburg City School District and the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation), the Ohio Coalition of Quality Education (OCQE), and the Ohio Association of Public Charter Schools (OAPCS).

Peer Review

The Quality of Sponsor Practice Review relies upon a team of independent reviewers, who are trained on the quality practices of sponsorship and the standardized protocols for data collection and analysis. Members of the review team must not be affiliated with the sponsor or any of the community schools currently or formerly authorized by the sponsor. Review teams must consist of at least three members, at least one of whom is from ODE's Office of Community Schools.

Roles, Responsibilities, and Expectations of Review Team Members

The **Team Leader**, a member of ODE's Office of Community Schools, is responsible for coordinating and leading the review of an assigned community school sponsor. The team leader must complete the following responsibilities:

- Be the main contact for the sponsor;
- Schedule the onsite visit and related agenda and logistics with the sponsor, as well as all related interviews with community schools authorized by that sponsor;
- Collect necessary documents from the sponsor for team review prior to the visit and inform the sponsor of the various documents that must be available onsite during the quality review;
- Coordinate the schedules of the various team members for calls and meetings;
- Pull together and make available to the review team all pre-visit data (e.g., documents, survey results, visit agenda);
- Pull together survey data collected by ODE from the community schools authorized by the sponsor;
- Participate in the document review and lead interviews;
- Complete document review templates and note taking during interviews;

- Facilitate and contribute to team discussions and data analysis;
- Ensure all evidence is documented and lead the completion of the quality of community school sponsor practices rubric by the review team; and,
- Provide guidance and support to all team members on issues related to the process and visit.

All other **Review Team Members** are responsible for the following:

- Participate in review team orientation (which may be conducted virtually)
- Review and analyze all data, including interviews, documents, and surveys;
- Participate in review team meeting to prepare for onsite visit (identify priority areas of interest; necessary interview questions; team roles during visit, etc.);
- Participate in completing document review templates and note taking during interviews;
- Lead interviews when requested by the Team Leader;
- Contribute to all team discussions;
- Contribute to the team's completion of the quality of community school sponsor practices rubric; and,
- Review the teams report for accuracy and ensure that it reflects the team's deliberations.

Expectations of Community School Sponsors
- Schedule and participate in onsite interviews with the review team.
- Provide any documents or data requested of ODE for review by the team before or during the site visit. Note - if the documents or data do not exist – the sponsor should not create them for the purpose of the visit.

Expectations of Community Schools
- If not visited or interviewed by ODE, participate in survey of sponsor schools provided by ODE.
- Schedule and participate in interviews, onsite or via conference call, with the review team as necessary. [Participants include administrative staff, building leadership, and members of the school's governing authority.]

Four-Step Process
The QSPR process involves team members collecting and triangulating multiple sources of data, which are then used to evaluate the sponsor's practices against the quality principles of sponsorship defined in the rubric. All ratings and summary findings of strengths, weaknesses,

and action steps must be supported by evidence. (See Appendix B for the rubric of quality practices and Appendix C for data sources specific to each indicator of practice in the rubric.)

Step 1: Background / Before Site Visit

Prior to the site visit, review team members will review various documents, most of which should be available electronically from ODE or the sponsor. This will not only assist in determining ratings for certain portions of the rubric, but will also assist in establishing priorities of focus for the onsite review. See Appendix D for the complete list of documents that must be reviewed as part of the QSPR.

Step 2: Site Visit to Sponsor and Community School Interviews

During the review team's visit to the sponsor (on-site), the team interviews sponsor administrators and board members. Interview questions are chosen ahead of time by the review team according to findings from the document review. If additional documents are needed, the sponsor will be alerted in advance as to what documents will need to be ready and available for review by the team. Unless otherwise stipulated, a copy of all necessary documents will be provided to the team for their use. Team members will record their notes on the document review template.

For purposes of the pilot, the review team will use both on-site interviews and phone interviews for community schools to see if there is a noticeable difference between the two methods. If phone interviews are found to be effective, phone interviews for the community schools will be used for full implementation.

Step 3: Analyze Data and Complete Rubric

The review team discusses all data collected (before and during the visit) and collectively completes the quality of community school sponsor practices rubric. The team must pull together evidence to support their ratings and the summary findings of strengths, weaknesses, and action steps.

Sponsors will receive an "overall" quality of practices rating and a separate quality rating for each of the six critical areas in the rubric. In order to systematically determine which quality rating the sponsor will receive, ODE applies the following four-point scale to each indicator on the rubric:

4 Levels of Sponsor Quality	Points on the Scale
Exemplary	4
Sufficient	3
Emerging	2

Poor or Undeveloped	1

For the purpose of the pilot, ODE assumes each critical area and the indicators within the area are equal in significance. Part of the purpose of the pilot is to determine if this assumption of equality accurately reflects the ratings.

The team lead will electronically complete the rubric and type up the summary findings. The completion of the rubric and summary of findings should occur with within five business days, during which time the team lead will share these documents with the review team members.

Step 4: Report Findings and Following-up with Sponsor

The team lead will present the report to the sponsor, joined by other members of the review team, if available. For any sponsor desiring technical assistance and for all sponsors rated poor or emerging, ODE's Office of Community Schools will provide technical assistance relevant to the areas of deficiency.

Consequences of the Quality Review

The QSPR establishes clear expectations for performance and practice, promotes best practices among sponsors, and guides ODE technical assistance by identifying areas of sponsor strength and sponsor need. The rating will comprise one of the three components of the Sponsor Evaluation System, called for in Amended Substitute House Bill 555. In addition, the results of each review informs ODE's sponsorship agreement decisions regarding renewal, ODE's sponsor application and approval process, and supports an ODE decision to revoke sponsorship.

Appendix A: Resources Used to Generate Ohio's Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Review

Cass, R., Hassel, B. ,and Lin, M. (September 2009). "The Charter School Application Process," NACSA Policy Guide, National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

Cass, R., Hassel, B. ,and Lin, M. (October 2009). "Charter School Contracts," NACSA Policy Guide, National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

DiBiase, W. (July 2004). "The Value of Quality On-Site School Reviews: Seeing is Believing," NACSA Issue Brief #4, National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

Haft, W. (February 2009). "The Terms of the Deal: A Quality Charter School Contract Defined," NACSA Authorizing Matters Issue Brief, National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

Lin, M. and Hassel, B. (September 2009). "Charter School Performance Accountability," NACSA Policy Guide, National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

Minnesota Sponsor Assistance Network. (December 2006). *Standards for Quality Sponsoring/Authorizing of Chartered School.*

National Association of Charter School Authorizers. (2010). Accountability *in Action: A Comprehensive Guide to Charter School Closure*.

National Association of Charter School Authorizers. (June 2004). "Built for Quality: The Capacity Needed to Oversee Charter Schools," NACSA Issue Brief #3.

National Association of Charter School Authorizers. (2010). Principles *& Standards for Quality Charter Schools.*

Ohio Department of Education. (2011). *School Improvement Diagnostic Review Process.*

Ohio Department of Education. (2011). *SES Quality of Services Rubric.*

O'Neill, P., Hassel, B., and Lin, M. (October 2009). "Charter School Contract Renewal," NACSA Policy Guide, National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

Richmond, G. (October 2004). "Charter School Authorizers and Oversight: Where is the Line Between Effectively Holding Schools Accountable and Overregulation?" NACSA Issue Brief #5, National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

Shaw, M. (May 2011). "Navigating the Closure Process," NACSA Authorizing Matters Issue Brief, National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement. (2007). Supporting *Charter School Excellence Through Quality Authorizing*.

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
Sponsor Commitment & Capacity				
A. Clear Mission	• The sponsor's **mission** for authorizing charter schools is **broad or has no mission**. • The sponsor's **vision** for chartering is **vague, with no defined priorities and no strategic goals**.	• The sponsor states a **clear mission** for authorizing charter schools. • The sponsor articulates a **broad vision** for chartering, with **broad goals over an undefined period of time**.	• The sponsor states a **clear mission for quality authorizing**. • The sponsor articulates and **implements a vision and plan for chartering,** including **general goals and timelines for achievement**.	• The sponsor states a **clear mission for quality authorizing**. • The sponsor articulates and **implements an intentional strategic vision and plan** for chartering, including **clear priorities, specific goals, and time frames for achievement.**
B. Self-Evaluation	• The sponsor **rarely examines** its work to ensure it is meeting its authorizing obligations and applicable laws.	• The sponsor **occasionally examines** its work to ensure it is meeting its authorizing obligations and applicable laws.	• The sponsor **regularly examines** its work to ensure it is meeting its authorizing obligations and applicable laws.	• The sponsor **regularly examines** its work to ensure it is meeting its authorizing obligations and applicable laws.

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
Sponsor Commitment & Capacity				
C. Self-Improvement	• The sponsor **does not examine** its operations **for the purpose of improvement**.	• The sponsor **occasionally looks to improve** its operations, but **does not follow a structured process**.	• The sponsor **follows an improvement process to evaluate** its work **against its goals and outcomes**.	• The sponsor **regularly evaluates its work against national standards for quality charter school sponsors.** • The sponsor uses a **structured continuous improvement process** to evaluate its work against its goals and outcomes, and **implements strategic action steps to improve its performance as a sponsor**. • The sponsor **reports annually** on its progress and its performance in **meeting its strategic goals to ODE and the public**.
D. Defined Relationships	• The sponsor has no written policy and **no explanation that defines the roles and responsibilities** between the sponsor staff and the community schools it sponsors.	• While **not documented**, the sponsor is **able to explain in general** terms how the roles and responsibilities differ between its staff and the community schools it sponsors.	• **While not documented, the sponsor has and is able to clearly explain** the roles and responsibilities of its staff relative to those of the community schools it sponsors.	• **Roles and responsibilities of the authorizing staff are clearly separated, documented and delineated** from the community schools it sponsors.
E. Conflicts of Interest	• **Schools** authorized by the sponsor **have limited or no autonomy**. • **Numerous conflicts of interest exist between the sponsor and the community schools** it	• **Occasional conflicts of interest** exist between the sponsor and the community schools it authorizes. [*e.g., need examples of legal conflicts of interest.*]	• **No conflicts of interest** (both in staffing and funding) exist between the sponsor and the community schools it sponsors. • **While decision making is transparent to community**	• **No conflicts of interest** (both in staffing and funding) exist between the sponsor and the community schools it sponsors. • The sponsor has a **written policy that effectively**

9

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

		Sponsor Commitment & Capacity		
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
	authorizes. [e.g., *staff and boards may overlap, sponsor may require school to purchase services from sponsor, schools may not be afforded appropriate autonomy, funds may be comingled.*] • **Decision making is not transparent**; it **is unclear what or if criteria are being used** by the sponsor to make decisions. • **Community schools are improperly offered incentives** by the sponsor. [e.g., *may only contract with the sponsor for various services.*]	• **Decision making is not transparent** and the **criteria used to make them are inconsistently applied and not fully understood** by sponsor staff. • In some instances, the **sponsor's decisions are improperly influenced by a management company or a community school's governing authority**. [e.g*., for example, a management company with multiple affiliated schools implies action related to one school will impact the others*]	schools and appears to be **based upon merit, the process and criteria for making decisions are not fully transparent to the public**.	**prevents conflicts of interest, assures decision making is transparent and based upon merit.** • The **sponsor's funding is structured** in a manner that **avoids conflicts of interest, inducements, incentives, or disincentives that might compromise its judgment** in charter approval and accountability decision making.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Sponsor Commitment & Capacity			
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
F. Staff Expertise	• The sponsor has **at least one** staff member **with a basic understanding of school finance**. • **No external sources are sought** in education related areas for which the sponsoring staff lacks expertise.	• The sponsor **has at least one** staff member who is **knowledgeable in school finance**, with **other staff** having a **limited understanding** of curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, or law. • When existing staff do not have the range of expertise needed, the sponsor **sometimes contracts with external sources** to complete particular aspects of work.	• In additional to having **a staff member who is knowledgeable in school finance**, the **other staff** has a **general understanding** of curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, or law. • When existing staff do not have the range of expertise needed, the sponsor **contracts with external sources** to complete particular aspects of work.	• Authorizing **staff have diverse expertise** in the areas of curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance law, and charter schools. • When existing staff do not have the range of expertise needed, the **sponsor contracts with external sources** to complete particular aspects of work.
G. Staff Professional Development	• Staff **rarely participates in professional development**, internally or externally provided. • PD shows **no alignment** with the sponsor's functions.	• Staff **occasionally participates in professional development** internally or externally provided. • PD shows **some alignment** with the sponsor's functions or in response to needed corrections.	• Staff **regularly participates in professional development**, internally or externally provided, and beyond what is required by ODE. • PD is **aligned with sponsor functions and takes into account some identified needs** (as determined by its self-improvement process).	• Staff **regularly participates in professional development** beyond what is required by ODE and that **complements the sponsor's improvement efforts and that takes into account staff member's strengths and weaknesses**. • The sponsor is able to provide examples of how professional development is incorporated into its ongoing work.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Commitment & Capacity				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
H. Allocation of Resources	• **Resource decisions are not data driven**. • No evidence that the sponsor has examined and allocated its resources to fulfill its sponsor obligations.	• **Some** resource decisions are **data driven**. The sponsor **occasionally examines its needs** and allocates its resources to fulfill its statutory requirements.	• **Most** resource decisions **are data driven**. The sponsor **regularly examines its need**s and allocates its resources to fulfill its statutory responsibilities.	• **All** resource decisions **are data driven**. • The sponsor **determines its needs** and **devotes resources to exceed its statutory responsibilities and meet national quality standards** for authorizing. • Resource **allocations are commensurate with the sponsor's identified needs**.

Sponsor Commitment & Capacity

Strengths in Commitment & Capacity:

- A
- B
- C.....

Weaknesses in Commitment & Capacity:	**Strategies and Action Steps for Improved Commitment & Capacity:**
• A • B • C.....	• A (These should align with weaknesses. However, you would not expect to see more than 3 or 4 strategies per critical area.) • B • C....

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Sponsor Application Process & Decision Making			
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
A. Application Process & Clarity of Directions	• The sponsor has **no formal application process – no written application and no defined timeline**. • Application **guidance** is **absent** or **undocumented** and **varies depending upon** which **staff** member **responds to questions** by the public.	• The sponsor has an application process; however, it is **undocumented, loosely defined** and/or **inconsistently followed**. • The sponsor's application **guidance is undocumented and inconsistently explained** by authorizing staff **when requested** by the public.	• The sponsor **consistently follows** and **explains a systemic application process**; however, it is **not** fully **documented**. • While **not documented**, the sponsor's application **guidance is consistently explained** by the authorizing staff **when requested** by the public.	• The sponsor **consistently follows a documented** systematic application **process**. • The sponsor's **application guidance is clear, documented, detailed** and **readily available to the public** through the sponsor's website.
B. Application Depth	• Broad application **questions do not provide enough data to thoroughly evaluate** the applicant's plans and capacities. • The application provides **no directions on the content and format** expected of applicants.	• **General** application **questions provide enough** data for **understanding an applicant's plan**, but are **insufficient for determining its capacity** for operating. • The application provides **limited directions on the content and format** expected of applicants.	• Application **questions provide adequate data for analyzing an applicant's plan and capacities**. • The application provides **general directions on content and format** expected of applicants.	• **Comprehensive** application questions provide **extensive data for rigorous evaluation** of the applicant's plans and capacities. • The application provides **clear directions on required content and format**. • Application **clearly states** the sponsor's **chartering priorities.**

13

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Sponsor Commitment & Capacity			
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
C. Technical Assistance to Applicants	• Assistance and responses to questions are **very inconsistent and rarely completed** in a timely manner**.**	• **Multiple staff** members **inconsistently respond** to questions from applicants. Responses are **not always** completed **in a timely manner**.	• **Multiple staff** members **consistently assist and respond to questions** from applicants in a **timely manner**.	• A **single point of contact** is identified to assist, respond to questions, and **consistently follow-up with all applicants**. *Or*, if multiple contacts, the **messages and assistance are consistent across areas**. Responds to questions in a timely manner.
D. Quality Application Timeframe	• The sponsor's application **timeline is not defined**.	• Timelines are **loosely defined** and **inconsistently followed** depending upon the staff resources available.	• The sponsor **typically follows a defined timeline** for reviewing charter applications. • Allows **enough time for each stage** of the application process to be carried out in **accordance with state law**.	• The sponsor **consistently follows a systematic timeline** for reviewing charter applications. • Allows **sufficient time for each stage** of the application process to be **carried out with quality and integrity**. • The sponsor's **timeline aligns with the school year** and provides **ample time to** adequately complete the application, plan, and **prepare for the school's opening**.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Commitment & Capacity				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary

E. Rigorous Criteria for New Applicants	• The sponsor may require applicants to **outline** the following:
	  o an educational program;
	  o staffing plan;
	  o a business plan; and/or
	  o governance and management structure.
	• Application criteria are minimal and **focus mainly on meeting state and federal statutory requirements**.
		• The sponsor requires all applicants to **describe in general terms** the following:
		  o **a mission and vision**;
		  o an educational program;
		  o staffing plan;
		  o a business plan; and/or
		  o governance and management structure.
			• The sponsor requires all applicants to **present in detail** the following:
			  o a mission and vision;
			  o an educational program;
			  o staffing plan;
			  o a business plan;
			  o governance and management structure; and
			  o **capacity to carry out its plan**.
				• The sponsor requires all applicants to **present the following**:
				  o a **clear and compelling** mission and vision;
				  o a **quality** educational program;
				  o a **solid business plan**;
				  o an **effective** governance and management structure;
				  o **staffing for people with diverse knowledge** in education, school finance, etc.; and
				  o clear **evidence** of capacity to **successfully** execute its plan.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
Sponsor Commitment & Capacity				
F. Rigorous Criteria for Existing School Operators / Replicators	• **No additional criteria** are required of existing school operators and/or replicators of existing schools. • Sponsor **does not look for any evidence of past success or the capacity for growth**.	• While **no additional criteria** are required, the sponsor **completes a cursory look** of the current school's **academic success** *or* a **consideration** for the **school's capacity to expand**.	• While **no additional criteria** are required, the **sponsor carefully reviews** the existing school's **financial audits** (where available), **academic success and the applicant's capacity to expand or replicate**.	Sponsor **requires** the applicant to meet the **following criteria**: • **Clear evidence of capacity to operate new school successfully while maintaining quality in existing schools**; • Document **educational, organizational, and financial performance records** based on all existing schools; • **Explain any never-opened, terminated, or non-renewed schools**; • Present **growth plan, business plan, and most recent financial audits**; and, • **Meet high academic, organizational, and financial success** to earn approval for replication.

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Commitment & Capacity				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
G. Rigorous Criteria for Schools Changing Sponsor/ Assignment of Contract (if applicable)	• **No additional criteria** are required of the existing school seeking to be switch sponsors. • Sponsor **does not look for any evidence of past success or the capacity to operate successfully.**	• While **no additional criteria** are required, the sponsor **completes a cursory look** of the current school's **academic success** *or* a **consideration** for the **school's capacity to operate successfully.**	• While **no additional criteria are required**, the **sponsor reviews** the existing school's **financial audits** (where available), **academic success and the school's capacity to operate successfully, meeting and/or exceeding it performance targets.**	Sponsor **requires** the applicant to provide **educational, organizational, and financial performance records** to evaluate **the school's capacity to operate successfully, meeting and/or exceeding its performance targets.**
H. Reviewer Expertise	• **Review team** members have a **cursory understanding** of school finance, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, and school law in the context of community schools.	• **At least one reviewer is knowledgeable in school finance**; however, review team members **have limited expertise** in curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, and school law in the context of community schools.	• Review team members evaluating applications **have varying degrees of expertise** in school finance, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, and school law in the context of community schools.	• The review team members evaluating applications have **diverse expertise** in school finance, curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, and school law in the context of community schools.

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
Sponsor Commitment & Capacity				
I. Protocols and Training	• **No defined selection criteria or protocols** are used to evaluate applications. • Staff **simply reviews the written application and only asks clarifying questions**. • Reviewers receive no training.	• **Selection criteria are broad** and **no protocols** are used. • Review team members **receive limited training on the overall framework of selection criteria**. • Reviewers **ask clarifying questions as needed**.	• Evaluation includes a **careful review of the written application, a brief interview** to clarify points in the written application, and a **careful review of the applicant's experience and capacity**. • While **not always documented in protocols**, review team members are trained on the selection criteria. •	• Evaluation includes a **detailed review** of the **written application**, an **in-depth interview** with the applicant, and a **thorough background review of the applicant's experience and capacity**. • **Application evaluators are trained on the selection criteria and the protocols**.
J. Reviewer Conflict of Interests	• **No process is followed** to ensure that all reviewers do not have a conflict of interest with the applicants they are reviewing.	• A **limited process is inconsistently followed** to **prevent** reviewers from having **conflicts of interest** with the applicants they are reviewing.	• A **process is consistently followed that prevents** internal and external reviewers from having **conflicts of interest** with the applicants they are reviewing.	• An **extensive policy and process are consistently followed that ensures all** internal and external reviewers **do not have a conflict of interest** with the applicants they are reviewing.
K. Rigorous Decision Making	• **Almost all** applicants that apply **are approved, regardless of the strength** of the application.	• The **majority** of applications that **meet a general framework** of criteria are approved. (Criteria are defined in E – G in this critical area.)	• Applicants that **meet the majority of the criteria** are approved. (Criteria are defined in E – G in this critical area.)	• Only applicants **meeting all, or almost all, of the criteria** are approved. Any perceived minor deficiencies are addressed in the contract process. (Criteria are defined in E – G in this critical area.)

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Application Process & Decision Making

Strengths in Application Process & Decision Making:
- A   - B   - C.....

Weaknesses in Application Process & Decision Making:	**Strategies and Action Steps for Improved Application Process & Decision Making:**
- A - B - C.....	- A (These should align with weaknesses. However, you would not expect to see more than 3 or 4 strategies per critical area.) - B - C....

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Performance Contracting				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
A. Contract Terms Related to School Autonomy	• Sponsor contracts **rarely establish and recognize** the **autonomy** to which the schools are entitled - authority over educational programming, staffing, budgeting, and scheduling.	• Sponsor contracts **occasionally establish and recognize** the **autonomy** of the school from the sponsor. A few contracts **might include general terms** related to the school's authority over educational programming, staffing, budgeting, **or** scheduling.	• **Most contracts** establish and recognize **some autonomy** to which the schools are entitled, which **might include** specific authority over educational programming, staffing, budgeting, **or** scheduling.	• **All contracts** establish and recognize the autonomy to which the schools are entitled, **including** authority over educational programming, staffing, budgeting, **and** scheduling.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Sponsor Performance Contracting			
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
B. Contract Performance Framework	• Sponsor contracts include the statutory reference to academic goals, method of measurement and performance standards by which the sponsor will evaluate the school's success, but **does not specify the specific goals and measurements**.	• Sponsor contracts include the statutory reference to academic goals, method of measurement and performance standards by which the sponsor will evaluate the school's success • The performance framework **may or may not go beyond the statewide academic achievement requirements; and/or or the targets are broad in nature and do not include non-academic goals.**	• **Most** contracts **specify clear academic and financial performance standards** that schools must meet as a condition for renewal. • The performance framework **regularly surpasses minimum standards** required by rule and law, but may not be aligned with the school's mission.	• **All** contracts include **rigorous indicators of student performance that are clear, measurable, and attainable**. • **All** contracts include performance **goals for financial soundness and operational performance**. • All schools must meet the targets specified in their contract as a condition for renewal. • The **performance framework surpasses minimum** standards required by rule and law **and is school specific**. • **Objective and verifiable measures of student achievement are the primary measure of school quality and required for contract renewal.**

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Performance Contracting				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
C. Contract Student Performance Measures	• Most contracts include vague measures of student performance, such as local report card ratings or overall proficiency rates on statewide assessments. • Few contracts require multiple measures of student performance.	• Most contracts include multiple measures of student performance, as measured only by statewide assessments.	• **All** contracts **specify multiple measures** of student performance, **which may include** the following: ○ proficiency rates on state assessments (for all students and by subgroups), ○ student academic growth, ○ graduation rates, ○ attendance, and ○ *if applicable*, post-secondary enrollment after high school.	• **All** contracts **specify rigorous and measurable indicators** of student performance, **which include** the following: ○ **proficiency rates** on state assessments (**for all students and by subgroups**), ○ **student academic growth**, ○ **graduation rates**, ○ **attendance,** ○ *if applicable*, **post-secondary enrollment** after high school, and ○ **student performance on other valid and reliable assessments** as laid out in the contract.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Performance Contracting				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
D. Contract Non-Academic Performance Measures	• Contracts **may** include **vague measures** of **financial performance**.	• **Most** contracts include **broad measures** of **financial performance**.	• **Most** contracts include **specific measures** of **financial performance and governance board performance**.	• **All** contracts include specific performance measures for **financial performance and sustainability**. • **All** contracts include **measures** related to **governance board performance and stewardship** (e.g., strategic goals specifically for the governing authority).

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Performance Contracting				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
E. Contract Sources of Data	• **Most** contracts **do not state specific data** that must be collected as part of the evaluation and renewal process.	• **Most** contracts **include broad measures** of academic and non-academic performance, thus **implying (without clearly defining) what data are needed** as part of the evaluation and renewal process.	• **Most** contracts **state the data that will be collected** as part of the school's evaluation process. • **Most** contracts note **multiple sources of data** that are needed as part of the evaluation and renewal process.	• **All** contracts **clearly state the data** that will be collected as part of the school's evaluation process, **including how frequently that data will be reported by the school**. • **All** contracts **clearly define multiple sources of data** that will form the evidence base **for ongoing evaluation and renewal**. • **Multiple sources include** state-mandated and other **standardized assessments, internal assessments, qualitative reviews**, and/or **performance comparisons** with other public schools in the district and state.
F. Contract Terms for Intervention	• Contracts **do not define the criteria and conditions** for intervention, including probation and suspension.	• **Most** contracts **broadly define the criteria and conditions** for intervention, including probation and suspension.	• **Most** contracts **define the criteria and conditions** for intervention, including probation and suspension.	• **All** contracts **clearly define and detail the criteria and conditions** for intervention, including probation and suspension.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Performance Contracting				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
G. Contract Terms for High-Stakes and Ongoing Reviews	• Contract **renewal is essentially automatic** and contract language may specify automatic renewal as the default. • Sponsor contracts **rarely** specify a **high-stakes review** to take place **prior to contract renewal**.	• Contract **renewal is essentially automatic** and contract language may specify automatic renewal as the default. • Sponsor contracts **occasionally** specify a high-stakes review to take place prior to contract renewal, but at least every 5 years for extended contracts.	• Sponsor contracts **regularly** specify a **required** high-stakes review **to take place prior to contract renewal**, but at least every 5 years for extended contracts.	• **All sponsor contracts** specify a **required** high-stakes review to take place prior to contract renewal, and at least every 5 years for extended contracts.
H. Contract Terms for Renewal and Non-renewal	• Contracts **rarely define** the performance standards and criteria and conditions for renewal. • Contracts **rarely define** the consequences for meeting or not meeting standards and conditions.	• **Most** contracts **broadly define** the performance standards and criteria and conditions for renewal. • **Most** contracts **broadly define** the consequences for meeting or not meeting standards and conditions.	• **Most** contracts **define** the performance standards and criteria and conditions for renewal. • **Most** contracts **define** the consequences for meeting or the consequences for not meeting standards and conditions.	• **All** contracts **clearly define** and **detail** performance standards and criteria and conditions for renewal. • **All** contracts **clearly define** and **detail** the consequences for meeting or the consequences for not meeting standards and conditions.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Performance Contracting				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
I. Contract terms for Amendments	• **No specific conditions** for amendment or modifications are noted in the contract. • Sponsor **rarely considers the need for or** allows amendment and modification of the contract.	• **No specific conditions** for amendment or modifications are noted in the contract. • Sponsor **occasionally considers** amendment and modification of the contract as the need arises.	• **General conditions** for amendment or modifications are noted in the contract. • Sponsor **regularly considers** amendment and modification of the contract as the need arises.	• Sponsor **regularly** encourages **and is receptive to** amendment and modification of the contract in support of higher achievement or to ensure compliance. • **Sponsor regularly assesses contract language to ensure consistency with changes in state and/or federal law.**
J. Contract terms for 3% oversight and monitoring fee by sponsors	• **Contracts reference the sponsor's fee for oversight and monitoring and statutory listing of the duties of the sponsor,** but **provide no details on** the sponsor's **specific responsibilities** related to oversight and monitoring.	• **Contracts reference the sponsor's fee for oversight and monitoring and statutory listing of the duties of the sponsor** and provide few details on the sponsor's specific responsibilities related to oversight and monitoring.	• **Contracts reference the sponsor's fee for oversight and monitoring and statutory listing of the duties of the sponsor and m**ost contracts **clearly define the sponsor's fees** and broadly define the sponsor's specific responsibilities related to oversight and monitoring.	• **Contracts reference the sponsor's fee for oversight and monitoring and statutory listing of the duties of the sponsor and all** contracts **clearly define the sponsor's responsibilities and fees** related to oversight and monitoring.

NOTE: All community school contracts must specify the duties of the sponsor and shall include the following: (1) Monitor the community school's compliance with all laws applicable to the school and with the terms of the contract; (2) Monitor and evaluate the academic and fiscal performance and the organization and operation of the community school on at least an annual basis; (3) Report on an annual basis the results of the evaluation conducted under division (D)(2) of this section to the department of education and to the parents of students enrolled in the community school; (4) Provide technical assistance to the community school in complying with laws applicable to the school and terms of the contract; (5) Take steps to intervene in the school's operation to correct problems in the school's overall performance, declare the school to be on probationary status pursuant to section 3314.073 of the Revised Code, suspend the operation of the school pursuant to section 3314.072 of the Revised Code, or terminate the contract of the school pursuant to section 3314.07 of the Revised Code as determined necessary by the sponsor; and (6) Have in place a plan of action to be undertaken in the event the community school experiences financial difficulties or closes prior to the end of a school year. (ORC 3314.03(D))

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Performance Contracting	
Strengths in Performance Contracting:	
- A - B - C…..	
Weaknesses in Performance Contracting:	**Strategies and Action Steps for Improved Performance Contracting:**
- A - B - C…..	- A (These should align with weaknesses. However, you would not expect to see more than 3 or 4 strategies per critical area.) - B - C….

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Oversight & Evaluation				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
A. System of Oversight & Evaluation	• The sponsor's oversight and evaluation system is **reactive, focused only on** the school's **compliance** with laws. • The sponsor **rarely enforces consequences** for failing to meet compliance requirements or performance expectations.	• The sponsor's oversight and evaluation system is **minimal; focusing mainly on** the school's **compliance** with laws and with **limited** examination of **academic performance**. • The sponsor **occasionally enforces consequences** for failing to meet compliance requirements or performance expectations.	• The sponsor's oversight and evaluation system is **proactive, collecting &/or accessing and reviewing and/or analyzing data on** the school's **compliance with laws** and **against performance targets** stated in the contract. Combined, these sources of **data inform** contract renewal, revocation, and intervention **decisions**. • The sponsor **regularly enforces consequences** for failing to meet **compliance requirements**, and **sometimes performance expectations**.	• The sponsor implements a **comprehensive performance accountability and compliance monitoring** system that is defined by the charter contract and that **provides the information necessary to make rigorous and standards-based** renewal, revocation, and intervention **decisions**. • The sponsor **predetermines intervention actions for failure to meet contract requirements and** clearly articulates and **enforces stated consequences** for **failing to meet performance expectations or compliance requirements.**

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
Sponsor Oversight & Evaluation				
B. Transparency of Process	• The sponsor's major oversight and evaluation processes for application, renewal and closure are **not transparent**.	• The sponsor's major oversight and evaluation processes for application, renewal and closure are **not transparent**; **however**, the **timelines** are **communicated.**	• The sponsor's major oversight and evaluation processes for application, renewal and closure **are transparent - clearly communicated to schools** through contract and documented guidance and acknowledging that some aspects of oversight necessitate flexibility (e.g., a testing investigation).	• The sponsor's oversight and evaluation process is **fully transparent**; it **defines and communicates** to schools through the school contract and documented guidance the **process**, **methods**, and **timing** of **gathering and reporting** school performance and compliance **data, while** acknowledging that some aspects of oversight necessitate flexibility (e.g., a testing investigation).
C. Enrollment & Financial Reviews	• The sponsor **rarely reviews** the enrollment and financial records of each school. When or **if reviewed**, the sponsor provides **few details** and that is **rarely of value to the school**. • **No consideration** is given to the **qualifications** of the individual performing the review on behalf of the sponsor.	• The sponsor **minimally reviews** the enrollment and financial records of each school, and provides **occasional feedback with limited details** and that are of **limited use to the school**. • **Some consideration** is given to appropriate **qualifications** of the sponsor's reviewer.	• The sponsor **regularly reviews and provides feedback** on the enrollment and financial records of each school. • **All revenue sources are considered against the school's annual school budget**. • **Consideration is given to the qualifications** of the sponsor's reviewer respecting school financial reviews.	• The sponsor **comprehensively reviews** and provides **monthly feedback** on the enrollment and financial records of each school which results in timely intervention when problems arise. • **All revenue sources are considered against the school's annual school budget**. • **The sponsor employs a licensed school treasurer or equivalent** to conduct school financial reviews.

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" style="background-color: yellow; text-align: center;">Sponsor Oversight & Evaluation</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Poor or Undeveloped</td><td>Emerging</td><td>Sufficient</td><td>Exemplary</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Financial Audit Follow-up</td>
<td>

The sponsor never attends the school's closing audit conference.
The sponsor either rarely follows-up with schools on issues identified in a school's annual audit by the Auditor of State or is excessive in its follow-up and direction to the school.

</td>
<td>

The sponsor never or rarely attends the school's closing audit conference.
The sponsor may follow-up on legal compliance issues identified in a school's annual audit by the Auditor of State.

</td>
<td>

The sponsor generally attends the closing audit conference.
The sponsor addresses the majority of issues identified in a school's annual audit by the Auditor of State, including findings for recovery, issues of material non-compliance, and so on.
If the sponsor requires the school to engage in a Corrective Action Plan, the sponsor monitors the school's implementation of the plan.

</td>
<td>

The sponsor consistently attends the school's closing audit conference.
The sponsor thoroughly addresses issues identified in a school's annual audit by the Auditor of State, including findings for recovery, issues of material non-compliance, and so on.
The sponsor engages in follow-up to measure the school's progress in ensuring that similar future findings are avoided, with or without a formal Corrective Action Plan.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
Sponsor Oversight & Evaluation				
E. Site Visit Protocols	• During an onsite review, **data are collected from** a school employee **available** at the school on the **day of the review**. • Onsite reviewers receive **very little training** on the site visit process and **no protocols** are used.	• During an onsite review, **data are collected from** a school employee **available** at the school on the **day of the review**. • The sponsor has site-visit **protocols**; however, reviewers are **not trained** in the tools and therefore do **not consistently use** them during site visits.	• During an onsite review, **data are collected from school administrators** and a **sample of instructors**. • Onsite reviewers are **trained on and regularly use observation and interview protocols**.	• During an onsite review, **data are collected from a variety of stakeholders**, which may include **governing board members**, administrators, **teachers**, students, **parents**, and staff from the **management company (if applicable)**. • Reviewers receive **ongoing training on the purpose, criteria, process and protocols** of conducting site-visits.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Sponsor Oversight & Evaluation			
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
F. Site Visit Reviewer Expertise	• The sponsor **has at least one** staff member **with a basic understanding of school finance**, who **may or may not inform the site-visit team**. • **No external sources are sought** in education related areas for which the sponsoring staff lacks expertise.	• The sponsor has **at least one** staff member whose work informs the site visit and who is k**nowledgeable in school finance**, with other staff having a limited understanding of curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, or law. • When existing staff do not have the range of expertise needed, the sponsor **sometimes engages with external sources** to complete particular aspects of work.	• In additional to having **at least one** staff member who is **knowledgeable in school finance**, the **other** reviewers have a **general understanding of curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, or law**. • When existing staff do not have the range of expertise needed, the **sponsor engages with external sources** to complete particular aspects of work.	• **Reviewers have diverse expertise** in the areas of curriculum, instruction, management, facilities, finance and/or law. • **If** the school has a **distinct focus** (e.g., online delivery, special education, dropout recovery), the reviewers of these schools are **knowledgeable in the area of the school's focus**. • When existing staff do not have the range of expertise needed, the **sponsor engages with external sources** to complete particular aspects of work.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Oversight & Evaluation				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
G. Site Visit Reports	• Based upon information from site visits, the sponsor may provide the school with a **written report but which fails to provide any relevant information about the school's operations.** • **There is no follow-up.**	• Based upon information from site visits, the sponsor provides the school with a written report of **general findings, may include areas needing improvement**. • There **may or may not be follow-up** for improvement areas.	• Based upon information from site visits the sponsor provides the school with a written report **detailing the information collected** and **identifying areas needing improvement**. • **Ongoing, the sponsor requests and reviews status updates** from the school pertaining to any areas needing improvement.	• Based upon information from site visits throughout the year, the sponsor provides the school with a report **detailing the information collected** and **identifying areas of strength** and **areas needing improvement**. • **Ongoing, the sponsor requests and reviews status updates** pertaining to any areas needing improvement.
H. Communica-tion with the School	• The sponsor is **fails to communicate** with the school's Governing Authority; or • The sponsor is **inappropriately overly involved** in the school's operations, directing it or making decisions on the Governing Authority's behalf.	• The sponsor's communication with the school's Governing Authority is **limited, vague and/or inconsistent**.	• The sponsor's communication with the school's Governing Authority is **frequent, specific and informative regarding the school's operations.**	• The sponsor's communication is **frequent, specific and informative regarding the school's operations and includes** both the **school operator and governing authority**.

Ohio Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
Sponsor Oversight & Evaluation				
I. Respecting Governing Authority Autonomy in Operations	• The sponsor is **inappropriately overly involved** in the day-to-day operational decisions of the schools it sponsors and/or operates more as a "program" of the sponsor. • Regardless of demonstrated success, all schools have limited or no autonomy over decision-making. • The sponsor collects data in a manner that is **burdensome** to the school, without though to protect students and public interests. • The sponsor **never examines** its own compliance requirements to possibly minimize burden and increase the autonomy of its schools.	• The sponsor is **inappropriately slightly involved** in the day-to-day operational decisions of the schools it sponsors. • The sponsor collects data in a manner that is **burdensome** to the school, without though to protect students and public interests. • Sponsor **may or rarely examines** its own compliance requirements to possibly minimize burden and increase the autonomy of its schools.	• The sponsor has **limited involvement** in the day-to-day operations of the schools' it sponsors, targeting those that have demonstrated poor performance or non-compliance. • The sponsor **collects data** in a manner that **minimizes administrative burden** on the school, and **protects** student and public interests. • Sponsor **occasionally examines** its own compliance requirements to possibly minimize burden and increase the autonomy of its schools.	• The sponsor has **no involvement** in any school's authority over its day-to-day operations, unless required to as part of its contractual obligations pertaining to intervention. • The sponsor **collects data** in a manner that **minimizes administrative burden** on the school, and **protects** student and public interests. • The sponsor **periodically reviews its own compliance requirements and evaluates the potential to increase school autonomy** based on flexibility in the law, streamlining requirements or other considerations.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
Sponsor Oversight & Evaluation				
J. Intervention	• The sponsor is **unaware of its obligation to intervene** in accordance with Ohio law. • The **conditions that trigger** intervention are **never articulated** by the sponsor to its schools. • The sponsor **never or rarely provides** schools with **timely notice of contract violations** and/or provides little to **no information on performance** deficiencies. • The **sponsor rarely intervenes or follows-up** with schools in which compliance problems are identified during its own oversight or when identified by an external agency, such as ODE.	• The sponsor is **generally aware** of its obligation to intervene with a community school in accordance with Ohio law. • **The community school contract states the conditions that may trigger intervention**. • The sponsor **occasionally provides schools with timely notice of contract violations**, and/or **minimal notice of performance** deficiencies • The sponsor **occasionally intervenes with problems related to compliance** are identified during its own oversight or when identified by an external agency, such as ODE. When intervention occurs, it is usually **very prescriptive** in nature and/or the sponsor defaults to another entity, such as ODE, for intervention guidance.	• The sponsor establishes and **makes known to the school in the contract conditions that may trigger intervention and** the **types of actions and consequences** that may ensue. • The sponsor **provides timely notice of contract violations and performance deficiencies**. • The sponsor **intervenes in the community school's operations** to correct **compliance issues or** problems in the school's **overall performance**. •	• The sponsor establishes and **makes known to schools at the outset an intervention policy** stating the general **conditions that may trigger intervention** and the **types of actions and consequences** that may ensue. • The sponsor gives schools **clear, adequate, evidence-based, and timely notice of contract violations and performance deficiencies**. • **The sponsor initiates intervention** in the community school's operations **in a timely manner and clearly linked to correcting specific deficits in** the school's overall performance. • **The sponsor allows school reasonable time and opportunity for remediation in non-emergency situations**. • **Intervention strategies clearly preserve school autonomy and responsibility** (e.g., identifying what the school must remedy without prescribing solutions).

35

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
Sponsor Oversight & Evaluation				
K. Oversight & Evaluation Report to Schools	• Provides a report, very broad in nature, when **compliance problems** arise that must be addressed by the school.	• Provides a report to each school, **summarizing fiscal and operational compliance**.	• Provides a report to each school, summarizing its **performance and compliance to date**.	• Provides a report to each school, summarizing its **performance and compliance to date** and **identifying areas of strength** and **areas needing improvement**.
L. Annual Report to the Public	• The sponsor provides the general public and ODE with a **very brief report on the school's compliance with the laws** for each of the schools it authorizes.	• The sponsor produces an annual report for each of the schools that it authorizes. These reports provide **limited information on the school's compliance with the laws** and **meeting the terms of its contract**.	• The sponsor produces an annual report on the individual schools that it oversees. These reports **include informative data on the school's compliance with the laws** and **meeting the terms of its contract**.	• The sponsor produces an annual public report that **provides clear, accurate performance data** for the community schools it oversees, **reporting on individual schools and its overall portfolio performance**.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Oversight & Evaluation
Strengths in Oversight & Evaluation: • A • B • C…..

Weaknesses in Oversight & Evaluation:	**Strategies and Action Steps for Improved Oversight & Evaluation:**
• A • B • C…..	• A (These should align with weaknesses. However, you would not expect to see more than 3 or 4 strategies per critical area.) • B • C….

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Sponsor Termination & Renewal Decision Making			
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
A. Revocation	• The sponsor **never revokes** a school's contract during its charter term.	• The sponsor **seldom revokes** a school's contract when there is **an egregious violation of law**. • The sponsor **does not seek evidence** that might result in revocation, but **will consider evidence brought before it**.	• The sponsor **may revoke** a school's contract during its charter term when there is **evidence of egregious violations of law or unfaithfulness to the terms of the contract**. • The sponsor's **ongoing oversight and evaluation provides evidence** for these decisions to be made.	• The sponsor **revokes** a school's contract during its charter term when there is **clear evidence of extreme underperformance or egregious violation of law or the public trust that imperils students or public funds**.
B. Evidence Based Renewal	• **Contract renewal** is almost always **assumed** or made based upon factors other than school performance.	• The contract renewal decision is based upon a **limited body of evidence**.	• The contract renewal decision is based upon a substantial body of **evidence of legal compliance and performance**. These data **inform renewal decisions**.	• The sponsor bases the renewal process and renewal decisions on **thorough analysis** of a **comprehensive body** of **objective evidence defined by the performance framework** in the charter contract.
C. Renewal Decisions	• The sponsor **grants renewal to all schools regardless of fiscal or organizational problems**, or failure **to meet the terms** and achievement **targets** in their contract, or **non-compliance** with the law.	• The sponsor **inconsistently grants renewal to schools**, even those that have **fiscal or organizational problems**, have **failed to meet the terms** and achievement **targets** in their contract, or have been **out of compliance** with the law.	• The sponsor **grants renewal to fiscally viable schools** that **meet most** of the following **criteria**: o organizationally viable, o faithful to the terms of their contract, and/or o achieve their contractual academic standards and targets.	• The sponsor **only grants renewal to fiscally viable schools** that **meet all** of the following **criteria**: o **organizationally viable**, o **faithful to the terms of their contract,** and o **achieve** their contractual **standards and targets**.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Termination & Renewal Decision Making				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
D. Cumulative Report on Performance	• Des not annually provide the school a cumulative report on its performance.	• Annually provides the school a cumulative report that is vague and unclear as it relates to the school's performance in contract terms.	• Annually provides each school with a report of its performance, but only includes the most recent academic year.	• Provides each school, in advance of the renewal decision, a **cumulative performance report** that s**ummarizes** school's **performance record over charter term**.
E. Transparent Renewal Application Process	• The sponsor **does not have an application process** for contract renewal.	• The sponsor **may have an application renewal** process, but **does not consistently require** schools to follow the process.	• The sponsor has an application process and **requires all schools seeking renewal to apply** for it through a renewal application. • The process **does not allow a school to present additional evidence** regarding its performance.	• The sponsor requires any school seeking renewal to **apply for it through a renewal application**. • The sponsor clearly communicates the process and criteria for renewal, and provides written guidance regarding required content and format for renewal applications. • The application **provides** the school a **meaningful opportunity** and **reasonable time to respond** to the cumulative report; correct the record, if needed; and **present additional evidence** regarding its performance.

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Termination & Renewal Decision Making				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
F. Prompt Notification of Revocation, Renewal, or Termination	• The sponsor's written notification of renewal decision is **typically late** in the school year and **rarely includes an explanation** of the reasons for the decision. • **Parents** and **students** have almost **no time** and **no information to make informed choices** for the coming school year.	• The sponsor's written notification of renewal is **timely, but** includes a **very limited explanation** of the reasons for the decision. • **Parents** and **students** have **little time** and **limited information to make informed choices** for the coming school year.	• The sponsor **promptly notifies** each school of its renewal decision, **including written explanation** of the reasons for the decision. • **Parents** and **students** have **enough time and information to make informed choices** for the coming school year. • Gives schools a **180 day notice to terminate** their contract.	• The sponsor **promptly notifies** each school of its renewal decision, **including a detailed written explanation** of the reasons for the decision. • **Parents and students** have **ample time and information to make informed choices** for the coming school year. • Gives schools a **180 day notice to terminate** their contract.

Ohio | Department of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Termination & Renewal Decision Making				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary

G. Closure Process	• The sponsor is **unaware of its obligation to oversee** school closure.
	• In the event of a school closure, the **sponsor has no formal policy or procedure for school's to follow.** The closing school might default to the ODE guidance.
	• The **sponsor does not oversee** the closure process.
		• The sponsor is **aware of its obligation** to oversee school closure; **however**, it **lacks the capacity** to oversee.
		• In the event of a school closure, the **sponsor has no formal policy or procedure for school's to follow.** The closing school might default to the ODE guidance.
		• The sponsor **does ensure that student records are returned** to the home school district.
			• The sponsor is **aware of its obligation** to oversee school closure.
			• The sponsor **may have a formal policy**, but at a minimum follows ODE's guidance.
			• In the event of a school closure, the **sponsor oversees** the school's governing board and leadership in carrying out a **closure process** that seeks to:
			  o **inform parents,**
			  o **transition student records** to the home school district, and
			  o **dispose of school funds, property, and assets** in accordance with law.
				• In the event of a school closure, the **sponsor oversees and works with** the school's governing board and leadership in carrying out a **detailed closure protocol** that **ensures**:
				  o **timely notification to parents,**
				  o **orderly transition of students records** to home school district, and
				  o **disposition of school funds, property, and assets** in accordance with law.
				• The sponsor **carries out the closure to the extent possible if school's governing authority fails** to carry out the protocols.

41

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Sponsor Termination & Renewal Decision Making
Strengths in Termination & Renewal Decision Making: • A   • B   • C…..

Weaknesses in Termination & Renewal Decision Making:	**Strategies and Action Steps for Improved Termination & Renewal Decision Making:**
• A • B • C…..	• A (These should align with weaknesses. However, you would not expect to see more than 3 or 4 strategies per critical area.) • B • C….

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

	Technical Assistance and Sponsor Requirements in Rule and Law			
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
A. Ongoing Technical Assistance to Schools	• Technical assistance, if provided to schools, is **reactive to problems** that arise. • The sponsor **does not assess** the technical assistance **needs** of the schools it authorizes.	• **Most** technical assistance provided by the sponsor is **reactive to problems**. • The sponsor **occasionally** solicits information about the technical assistance **needs** of the schools it authorizes. • The sponsor **occasionally provides** the technical assistance identified as needed by the schools.	• **Most** technical assistance is **proactive**, intended to **prevent problems** from arising in the schools it authorizes. • The sponsor **regularly** assesses or solicits **information about** the technical assistance **needs** of the schools it authorizes.	• **Almost all** technical assistance is **proactive**, intended to prevent problems from arising in the schools it authorizes. • The sponsor **regularly** assesses or solicits **information about** the technical assistance **needs** of the schools it authorizes. • The sponsor regularly solicits **feedback on the quality and impact of the technical assistance** that it provides to the schools it authorizes.
B. Ongoing Updates of Legal and Policy Changes	• The sponsor **never or rarely** updates schools on changes to rule and law that impact the schools' operations.	• The sponsor **occasionally** updates schools on changes to rule and law that impact the schools' operations, but has no process for doing so.	• The sponsor has a process that it uses to at **least annually**, informs schools on changes to rule and law that impact the schools' operations.	• The sponsor **continually ensures** that schools are **informed in a timely manner** of changes to rule and law that impact the schools' operations.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Technical Assistance and Sponsor Requirements in Rule and Law				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
C. Ongoing Professional Development (PD) for Schools	• The sponsor **never provides information** about PD opportunities for its schools.	• The sponsor **occasionally** provides information about PD opportunities for its schools. *Or* • Is **prescriptive or mandating** that its schools participate in certain PD.	• The **sponsor shares information** about PD opportunities for its schools.	• The sponsor **provides** its schools with multiple sources of information about PD opportunities for its schools. • The sponsor **encourages and promotes high quality** PD.

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Technical Assistance and Sponsor Requirements in Rule and Law				
	Poor or Undeveloped	Emerging	Sufficient	Exemplary
C. Effective Working Relationships with Schools' Governing Authorities	• The sponsor has no written policy and **no explanation that defines the roles and responsibilities** between the sponsor staff and the governing authorities of the community schools it sponsors. In the absence of clarity, both parties frequently have misunderstandings and their mutual respect is low. • The sponsor **rarely** works to maintain a solid relationship with their assigned schools' governing authority members (e.g., rare communication). • The sponsor **provides little guidance** to its governing authorities *Or* • **Is overbearing and prevents school autonomy**.	• While **not documented**, the **sponsor is able to explain in general terms** how the **roles and responsibilities** differ between its staff and the governing authorities of the community schools it sponsors. **However**, the **Governing Authority may view** the delineation of roles and responsibilities **differently**. • While the sponsor **tries to maintain** a solid relationship with their assigned schools' governing authority members, differing opinions and **misunderstandings** between the sponsor and governing authorities **occasionally** leads to a **lack of respect between both parties** (e.g., limited communication). • **School autonomy is inconsistent**.	• While not documented, the sponsor and governing authority **generally** have delineated roles and responsibilities that are **understood and respected** by both parties. • The sponsor **regularly** works to maintain a solid relationship with their assigned schools' governing authority members (e.g., regular communication). • **School autonomy is maintained** to the extent permitted by law.	• **Roles and responsibilities of the authorizing staff are clearly separated, documented and delineated** from the governing authorities of the community schools it sponsors. This clear delineation is **understood and respected by both parties**. • The sponsor **continuously** works to maintain a solid relationship with their assigned schools' governing authority members (e.g., frequent communication). • **The sponsor's organizational approach ensures that school autonomy is maintained** to the extent permitted by law.

Ohio | **Department** of Education

Appendix B: Quality of Community School Sponsor Practices Rubric

Technical Assistance and Sponsor Requirements in Rule and Law
Strengths in Technical Assistance and Sponsor Requirements in Rule and Law: • A • B • C…..

Weaknesses in Technical Assistance and Sponsor Requirements in Rule and Law:	**Strategies and Action Steps for Improved Technical Assistance and Sponsor Requirements in Rule and Law:**
• A • B • C…..	• A (These should align with weaknesses. However, you would not expect to see more than 3 or 4 strategies per critical area.) • B • C….

	Documents	Sponsor Interview	School Interviews	School Survey
Critical Area 1: Commitment & Capacity				
A. Clear Mission	X	X		
B. Self-Evaluation	X	X		
C. Self-Improvement	X	X	X	X
D. Defined Relationships	X	X	X	
E. Conflicts of Interest	X	X	X	X
F. Staff Expertise	X	X		
G. Staff Professional Development	X	X		
H. Allocation of Resources	X	X		
Critical Area 2: Application Process & Decision Making				
A. Application Process & Clarity of Directions	X	X	X	
B. Application Depth	X			
C. Technical Assistance to Applicants	X	X	X	
D. Quality Application Timeframe	X	X	X	
E. Rigorous Criteria for New Applicants	X	X		
F. Rigorous Criteria for Existing School Operators / Replicators	X	X		
G. Rigorous Criteria for Schools Changing Sponsor/ Assignment of Contract (if applicable)		X		
H. Reviewer Expertise	X	X		
I. Protocols and Training	X	X		
J. Reviewer Conflict of Interests	X	X		
K. Rigorous Decision Making	X	X		
Critical Area 3: Performance Contracting				
A. Contract Terms Related to School Autonomy	X			
B. Contract Performance Framework	X	X		
C. Contract Student Performance Measures	X	X		
D. Contract Non-Academic Performance Measures	X	X		
E. Contract Sources of Data	X	X	X	
F. Contract Terms for Intervention	X	X	X	
G. Contract Terms for High-Stakes and Ongoing Reviews	X			
H. Contract Terms for Renewal and Non-renewal	X	X		
I. Contract terms for Amendments	X	X		
J. Contract terms for 3% oversight and monitoring fee by sponsors	X		X	

	Documents	Sponsor Interview	School Interviews	School Survey
Critical Area 4: Oversight & Evaluation				
A. System of Oversight & Evaluation	X	X		
B. Transparency of Process	X	X	X	X
C. Enrollment & Financial Reviews	X	X	X	X
D. Financial Audit Follow-up	X	X	X	
E. Site Visit Protocols	X	X	X	X
F. Site Visit Reviewer Expertise	X	X		
G. Site Visit Reports	X	X	X	X
H. Communication with the School	X	X	X	X
I. Respecting Governing Authority Autonomy in Operations	X	X	X	X
J. Protecting Student Rights – Enrollment Practices & Policies (may delete)	X	X	X	
K. Intervention	X	X	X	X
L. Oversight & Evaluation Report to Schools	X	X	X	X
M. Annual Report to the Public	X	X		
Critical Area 5: Termination & Renewal Decisions				
A. Revocation	X	X		
B. Evidence Based Renewal	X	X	X	
C. Renewal Decisions	X	X	X	
D. Cumulative Report on Performance	X	X	X	X
E. Transparent Renewal Application Process	X	X	X	X
F. Prompt Notification of Revocation, Renewal, or Termination	X	X		
G. Closure Process	X	X		
Critical Area 6: Technical Assistance				
A. Ongoing Technical Assistance to Schools	X	X	X	X
B. Ongoing Updates on Legal and Policy Changes				X
C. Ongoing Professional Development (PD) for Schools	X	X	X	
D. Effective Working Relationships with Schools' Governing Authorities	X	X	X	
Total # of Indicators Impacted by the Method of Data Collection	51	48	26	14

Quality of Sponsor Practices:
Document Review

The following **sponsor provided documents**, *if they exist*, should be reviewed by the team before or during the site visit. The data in these documents provide evidence of effective practices, and therefore should be used to triangulate data collected from interviews and surveys. While the table is organized by the six critical areas, certain documents will provide evidence across multiple areas. Other documents not included on this list may be available on-site and reviewed as supporting sources of information. Team members must look for clarity and depth of information, and are expected to record their reviews electronically in the Document Review Template.

Examples of Documents Reviewed for Indicators of Quality Practice in the Rubric

Area	#	Sponsor Documents
Capacity	1	Mission Statement
	2	Strategic Plan
	3	Continuous Improvement Plan of the sponsor
	4	Sponsor's annual report of its performance
	5	Staff organizational chart
	6	Resumes/bios of sponsor staff and sponsor board members
	7	Written policies & procedures for staff conflicts of interest
	8	List of external agencies/individuals that the sponsor contracts with to carry out various sponsorship activities.
	9	Documents specific to professional development, including minutes, materials, and/or membership in professional organizations.
	10	Annual independent audits of the sponsor
	11	Annual budget
Applications	12	Blank Application for Sponsorship
	13	Application Materials, including instructions, evaluation standards, timelines and/ or criteria for approval
	14	Written policies & procedures for evaluating applications, including rubrics
	15	Application reviewer training materials
	16	List of applications submitted
	17	Application review results (accepted/denied)
	18	Sample of applications submitted, including approved and denied
	19	Sample of letters/ communications to applicants that were denied sponsorship
Contracts	20	Written policies & practices for establishing preliminary agreements
	21	Materials describing the process & timelines for establishing and approving contracts
	22	Sample of Community School Contracts, including current and formerly sponsored schools
	23	Templates used to construct contracts
	24	Rubrics to evaluate contracts
	25	Sample of contract amendments

Examples of Documents Reviewed for Indicators of Quality Practice in the Rubric

Area	#	Sponsor Documents
Oversight	26	Sponsor annual assurances
	27	Training materials for on-site review team
	28	Materials detailing the processes for monitoring and oversight, including: • Standards for evaluation • Criteria for performance • Criteria for compliance • Criteria for intervention • Methods of data collection • Methods of communication • Tools • Timelines
	29	Protocols and rubrics used to monitor and oversee community schools, including: • Onsite reviews • Interview guides • Schedules • Document review guides • Observation guides
	30	Samples of data collected as part of oversight, including: • School site visit reports • School monthly enrollment and financial review reports • Local report cards • Additional assessment results
	31	Sample of corrective action plans for individual community schools
	32	Sample of financial audits of community schools
	33	Sample of annual reports on each school
	34	The sponsor's annual report of self to ODE and the public.
	35	Sample of regular communications with schools
Contract Renewal	36	Materials detailing the processes for contract renewal, contract revocation, and school closure, including: • Standards for evaluation • Criteria for performance • Criteria for compliance • Criteria for intervention • Methods of data collection • Methods of communication
	37	Sample of initial contracts and renewed contracts
	38	Contracts non-renewed or revoked, along with evidence to support the decision/action to terminate
	39	Communications of renewal or non-renewal to sponsored schools
	40	Performance reports on each school
	41	Sponsor policy / procedures when a community school closes

Examples of Documents Reviewed for Indicators of Quality Practice in the Rubric

Area	#	Sponsor Documents
T.A.	42	Sponsor's survey on the technical assistance needs of the schools it sponsors: instruments, survey results, and/or other documentation of need
	43	Samples of regular communications with schools regarding professional development
	44	Samples of sponsor provided updates on laws impacting schools – any written communication or guidance provided by the sponsor
	45	The sponsor's survey of schools on the quality and impact of technical assistance provided by the sponsor: instrument and survey results
	46	Sponsor's written conflict management policies or related guidance.