

COMMUNITY SCHOOL SPONSOR EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

- 1) **Governed by Ohio Revised Code Section 3314.016.**
- 2) **Three components – Academic Performance, Compliance with Laws and Rules, and Quality Practice.**
- 3) **All weighted equally.**

OVERALL FRAMEWORK

- 1) **The sponsor evaluation framework must be transparent.**
 - All related information (report cards, compliance reports, Quality Review measures, audit findings, related links) will be easily accessible from a central site on the department's website.
- 2) **The process for implementing, calculating and reporting sponsor evaluations must be thoroughly reviewed by the Ohio Department of Education Data Governance Committee. Recognizing the substantive impact of the sponsor evaluations on students' quality school opportunities, the Ohio Department of Education Data Governance Committee will review the implementation life cycle, ensuring the evaluations are designed, carried out and reported with integrity, accuracy and legal fidelity.** The Department's data governance process will ensure that the sponsor evaluation process will include extensive quality assurance on data, senior leadership (including legal staff), approval of protocols and reporting, and cross-agency engagement in implementation and ongoing evaluations.
- 3) **Public reporting mechanisms must be strengthened.**
- 4) **The system will be focused on continuous improvement with appropriate resources linked to ratings, so sponsors and schools have access to aligned technical assistance and professional development.**
- 5) **The Department will require the sponsor to use best efforts to include in its contract with the community school a provision that the Department be referenced as an intended third party beneficiary under the contract between the sponsor and the community school for limited purposes (i.e., if the sponsor fails to enforce opening assurance requirements or there is a misappropriation of assets or funds).**
- 6) **To the extent possible, resources will be allocated to support the Department in conducting this evaluation process on an ongoing basis.**
 - The Department's internal organizational structure will reflect a separation of its duties regarding sponsorship and evaluation.
- 7) **While this framework applies to the 2016-2017 sponsor evaluations, additional guidance needs to be provided to sponsors.**
 - The 2016-2017 sponsor evaluations must be posted between Oct. 1 and Oct. 15, 2017.
 - These evaluations will include academic data from the 2016-2017 school year, compliance data based on the current administrative rule consistent with the changes in House Bill 2 and quality practice data based on the updated scoring structure.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE COMPONENT

- 8) **The Academic Performance component must align to the Ohio School Report Cards, so there is a coherent state accountability evaluation of academic performance.**
- It will include *all* applicable report card measures. For example, if a community school is an elementary school, it would not have a graduation rate.
 - It will be weighted by the number of students enrolled in each school.
- 9) **The Academic Performance component must meet statutory requirements in Ohio law (Ohio Revised Code 3314.016) in terms of which schools are included/excluded.¹**
- Schools that are excluded:
 - Community schools that have been in operation for not more than two full school years; and
 - Special needs community schools described in law (Ohio Revised Code 3314.35(A)(4)(b)).
 - Schools to be included:
 - All other community schools, including eSchools; and
 - Dropout Recovery Community Schools.

COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND RULES COMPONENT

- 10) **Compliance reviews must be based on the respective sponsor's certification of ALL relevant laws and rules.**
- 11) **Consistent with HB 2, the Department must conduct a comprehensive review of the list of all applicable laws and rules and update as necessary.**
- This may include specialized lists for different types of entities. For example, not all laws are applicable to eSchools.
 - The department will provide the list(s), and the list(s) will be updated annually.
- 12) **The Department will strengthen data protocols for verification of sponsor evidence of compliance.**
- Verification will be based on a judgment (i.e., not predetermined), which includes, but is not limited to, critical items (not pre-identified) and selection of laws and rules.
- 13) **The scoring structure for the Compliance component will be updated to reflect the provisions of this section.**
- 14) **The Department will explore opportunities for additional enhancements and efficiencies, such as:**
- Coordination with the state auditor's annual audits.
 - Third-party (contracted) review and verifications.
- 15) **The Department will focus on the importance of compliance regarding submission of data to the Department from the sponsor and its schools including, but not limited to, enrollment data, which is used for funding purposes. The department also will validate and verify data using internal data sources and publicly available data sources from other state agencies.**

QUALITY PRACTICE COMPONENT

- 16) **The implementation of the Quality Practice rubric is time and resource intensive.**
- In consultation with stakeholders, the number of standards was reduced from 42 to 32 in order to streamline the standards and remove duplicative standards.

¹ This also would include year-to-year changes in the sponsor's academic performance.

17) The student performance items in the performance contracting section of the Quality Practice rubric was updated to align with the Academic Performance component requirements.

SUMMATIVE FORMULA FOR OVERALL RATING

18) Create a fair, transparent and not overly complex calculation for the summative ratings.

The summative rating scoring structure is determined by the following framework:

- Pursuant to Ohio law (Ohio Revised Code 3314.016(B)(6)), all three components will be weighted equally.
- All three components will be scored on a common scale (0-4 points) to allow for simple calculations. Each sponsor will receive points for each component that, when added together, provide a summative rating. The scoring table is as follows:

Academic Performance				Compliance			Quality Practice	
Report Card Grade (or Equivalent)	Dropout Recovery Report Card Rating	Points		Compliance Rating	Points		Quality Rating	Points
A	Exceeds	4		Exemplary	4		Exceeds Standards	4
B		3	+		3	+	Meets Standards	3
C	Meets	2		Effective	2		Progressing Toward Standards	2
D		1			1		Below Standards	1
F	Does Not Meet	0		Ineffective	0		Significantly Below Standards	0

Overall Points	Sponsor Rating
10,11,12	Exemplary
7,8,9	Effective
3,4,5,6	Ineffective
0,1,2	Poor

- Each of the three components will be given a separate rating based on the common numerical scale.
- The following additional business rules will be included to address sponsors with the lowest performance ratings in one or more components, which apply equally to all of the components:
 - Rule 1 – A sponsor can score no better than “Ineffective” if it receives 0 points in any component.
 - Rule 2 – If a sponsor scores 0 in any two components, then the Overall rating is “Poor.”

- The Academic Performance grade will be based on the Ohio School Report Cards and utilize the report card methodology for determining an overall letter grade on the Ohio School Report Cards.

Report Card Grade (or Equivalent)*	Dropout Recovery Report Card Rating	Points Earned for Academic Component
A	Exceeds	4
B		3
C	Meets	2
D		1
F	Does Not Meet	0

*As required by Ohio law, the Department will not issue overall grades until the 2017-2018 report card, so the equivalent score will be used based on the formula for component and overall letter grades.

- The original statutory language references the academic performance of students, and HB 2 then added additional language regarding this component being derived from the report card.
 - A hybrid approach will be utilized to aggregate report card data for the schools in the portfolio. Individual, school-level report card data is translated to the common scale for each school in the portfolio and then weighted by the total percentage of the average daily membership of the entire statewide portfolio.
- HB 2 also specifies that “the academic performance component also shall include year-to-year changes in the overall sponsor portfolio.”
 - Therefore, each sponsor’s rating will include relevant data from the schools in the sponsor’s portfolio at the time of the evaluation, as outlined in the [technical documentation](#).
- HB 2 includes the provision “for a community school for which no graded performance measures are applicable or available, the Department shall use non-report card performance measures specified in the contract between the community school and the sponsor under division (A)(4) of section 3314.03 of the Revised Code.”
 - This provision may apply in very limited cases as nearly every school has at least one report card measure.
 - In the event that this applies, the Department has developed a rubric to evaluate the non-report card measures in the contract that will translate into the common scale in the framework, as outlined in the [technical documentation](#).
- During the data verification process for the Compliance component, compliance misses may be adjusted, as outlined in the administrative rule.
 - If items were reported in compliance but cannot be verified, the misses will be adjusted accordingly.
- The Quality Practice component summative scoring scale will be updated to reflect the common scoring scale.
 - The new Quality Rating component scale is based on the percentage of the points in the Quality Review measures.

Quality Rating	Percentage of Points in the Quality Review	Points Earned for Quality Component
Exceeds Standards	90 – 100%	4
Meets Standards	75 – 89.9%	3
Progressing Toward Standards	55 – 74.9%	2
Below Standards	35 – 54.9%	1
Significantly Below Standards	0 – 34.9%	0

- A comprehensive example for a hypothetical sponsor with three community schools:

School	Report Card Grade	Points	ADM	Weight	Weighted points
Community School 1	A	4	250	X (250/1000)	1
Community School 2	D	1	500	X (500/1000)	.5
Dropout Recovery School 1	C	2	250	X (250/1000)	.5
Rating earned for Academic Performance component					2.0 = "C"
Points earned for the Academic Performance component					2
Rating earned for Compliance component					Fully Compliant
Points earned for the Compliance component					4
Rating earned for Quality Practice component					Progressing Toward Standards
Points earned for the Quality Practice component					2
Summative Overall Rating for Sponsor					2 + 4 + 2 = 8 Effective

19) Expectations for sponsor performance will increase as best practices are implemented and this evaluation framework becomes fully embedded. Accordingly, the summative scoring scale will be adjusted starting with the 2017-2018 school year.

Overall Points	Sponsor Rating	Overall Points (2017-2018)
10,11,12	Exemplary	11,12
7,8,9	Effective	8,9,10
3,4,5,6	Ineffective	4,5,6,7
0,1,2	Poor	0,1,2,3

20) The formula, including rating thresholds, will continue to be reviewed on an annual basis. This may include, but will not be limited to:

- Calibrating component and summative rating thresholds;
- Factor analysis of Quality Practice rubric items;
- Updating evaluation based on future legislative changes, including compliance.