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History

Sponsor Evaluation System

• Created in HB 555 (129th GA, 2011-2012)
  
  o Assist the Department in its oversight of sponsors
  
  o Improve the quality of sponsor practices

  o Improve community school operations and academic performance
Sponsor Performance Evaluations (ORC 3314.016)

Three Equally-Weighted Components

• Academic performance
• Compliance with laws and rules
• Adherence to quality practices
Overall Sponsor Rating

- Academic Performance
- Compliance with Laws and Rules
- Quality Practices

Sponsor Rating
The department, in consultation with entities that sponsor community schools, shall prescribe quality practices for community school sponsors and develop an instrument to measure adherence to those quality practices. The quality practices shall be based on standards developed by the national association of charter school authorizers or any other nationally organized community school organization.
Quality Practices Component

Six Critical Areas:

• A – Commitment and Capacity
• B – Application Process and Decision-Making
• C – Performance Contracting
• D – Oversight and Evaluation
• E – Termination and Renewal Decision-Making
• F – Technical Assistance
Critical Area A
Commitment and Capacity
A. Commitment and Capacity

Critical Area Evaluates:

• Sponsorship capacity
• Sponsor’s internal processes for improvement
• Sponsor’s resources
• Sponsor’s roles and responsibilities clearly delineated from those of its school(s)
A. Commitment and Capacity

7 Standards:

• A.01 – Mission and Strategic Plan
• A.02 – Goals and Self-Evaluation
• A.03 – Roles and Responsibilities
• A.04 – Conflicts of Interest
• A.05 – Staff Expertise
• A.06 – Staff Development
• A.07 – Allocation of Resources
Changes to Quality Rubric

A.01 – Mission and Strategic Plan

2017-2018

3 Points

2-Point Requirements –and–

The sponsor submitted a strategic plan that includes goals, strategies and action steps that align with sponsoring priorities.

–and–

The sponsor submitted evidence that the strategic plan was in operation by March 1 of the review year.

2018-2019

3 Points

2-Point Requirements –and–

The sponsor submitted a strategic plan that includes goals, strategies and action steps that align with sponsoring priorities.

–and–

The sponsor submitted evidence that the strategic plan was in operation for a majority of the review year.
Changes to Quality Rubric

A.02 – Goals and Self-Evaluation

2017-2018

2-Point Requirements – and –

The sponsor submitted evidence that by March 1 of the review year it develops and implements action steps based on the findings from its improvement process.

2018-2019

2-Point Requirements – and –

The sponsor submitted evidence that for the majority of the review year it develops and implements action steps based on the findings from its improvement process.
Changes to Quality Rubric

• A.03 – Roles and Responsibilities

Revised the third key indicator

– 2017-2018: The sponsor offers training to school leaders and/or governing authority members on the written guidance by March 1 of the review year.

– 2018-2019: The sponsor offers training to school leaders and/or governing authority members on the written guidance by Nov. 30 of the review year.
## Changes to Quality Rubric

### A.04 – Conflicts of Interest

#### 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2-Point Requirements –and–  
The sponsor’s conflict of interest policy requires the submission of conflict of interest statements from each board member (when applicable) and staff members and contractors with sponsoring responsibilities at the onset of each sponsoring responsibility  
–and–  
The sponsor submitted evidence of collecting signed conflict of interest statements by March 1 of the review year from each board member and staff members and contractors with sponsoring responsibilities as listed in the organizational chart in standard A.05. |

#### 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2-Point Requirements –and–  
The sponsor’s conflict of interest policy requires the submission of conflict of interest statements from each board member (when applicable) and staff members and contractors with sponsoring responsibilities at the onset of each sponsoring responsibility  
–and–  
The sponsor submitted evidence of collecting signed conflict of interest statements by Sept. 30 of the review year from each board member and staff members and contractors with sponsoring responsibilities as listed in the organizational chart in standard A.05. |
Changes to Quality Rubric

No changes made to:

• A.05

• A.06
### Changes to Quality Rubric

#### A.07 – Allocation of Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-2018</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 Points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3-Point Requirements —and—  
The sponsor submitted evidence of implementing a needs assessment and conducting a data analysis for resource allocation that aligns with its strategic plan and the needs of its sponsored schools —and—  
The sponsor submitted evidence of making data-driven decisions regarding resource allocation from its needs assessment. | 3-Point Requirements —and—  
The sponsor submitted evidence of implementing a needs assessment and conducting a data analysis for resource allocation that aligns with its strategic plan and the needs of its sponsored schools —and—  
The sponsor submitted evidence of making data-driven decisions regarding resource allocation from its needs assessment. |
Critical Area B
Application Process and Decision-Making
B. Application Process and Decision-Making

• ALL sponsors will be evaluated on this critical area
• Including sponsors with an *Ineffective* rating
• Including sponsors that do not intend to take on additional schools
B. Application Process and Decision-Making

Critical Area Evaluates:

- Application process
- Rigorous criteria for all types of applications
- Application reviewers and their training
- Application decision-making
B. Application Process and Decision-Making

6 Standards:

• B.01 – Application Process, Timeline and Directions
• B.02 – Rigorous Criteria for New Schools
• B.03 – Rigorous Criteria for Replicators and Schools Seeking a Change in Sponsor
• B.04 – Reviewer Expertise
• B.05 – Reviewer Protocols
• B.06 – Rigorous Decision-Making
Changes to Quality Rubric

B.01 – Application Process, Timeline and Directions

Revised the standard statement

2017-2018:

B.01 Application Process, Timeline and Directions: For new community schools, replicators and schools seeking a change in sponsor, the sponsor uses a documented, systematic application process that includes a defined development timeline, clear directions, detailed guidance, defined evaluation criteria and an interview.

2018-2019:

B.01 Application Process, Timeline and Directions: For new community schools, replicators and schools seeking a change in sponsor, the sponsor uses a documented application process that includes a defined development timeline, clear directions, detailed guidance, defined evaluation criteria and an interview.
Changes to Quality Rubric

B.01 – Application Process, Timeline and Directions

2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a documented, systematic application process and a written application, which include all the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A defined timeline, which includes a planning stage of at least nine months for new schools and replicators;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prescriptive requirements for the submission of the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prescriptive criteria used to evaluate the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sponsoring priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An interview of final applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public availability on the organization’s website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a documented application process and a written application that include all of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A defined timeline that includes a planning stage of at least nine months for new schools and replicators;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Requirements for the submission of the application;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Criteria used to evaluate the application;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sponsoring priorities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An interview of final applicants;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public availability on the organization’s website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Quality Rubric

• B.03 – Rigorous Criteria for Replicators and Schools Seeking a Change in Sponsor

  • Under the key indicators for replicators, removed “school’s governing authority meeting minutes” from the list of items to be reviewed.
Changes to Quality Rubric

No changes made to:

- B.02
- B.04
- B.05
Changes to Quality Rubric

B.06 – Rigorous Decision-Making

**2017-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The documentation submitted by the sponsor demonstrates reviewers cite evidence to support whether the applicant meets <em>each</em> selection criterion —and— Sponsor submitted evidence that all school applicants receiving a preliminary agreement earned at least 66 percent of possible points or the equivalent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2018-2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The documentation submitted by the sponsor demonstrates reviewers cite evidence to support whether the applicant meets <em>each</em> selection criterion —and— Sponsor submitted evidence that all school applicants receiving a preliminary agreement earned at least 66 percent of possible points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3

Critical Area C

Performance Contracting
C. Performance Contracting

Critical Area Evaluates:

• Contract performance measures

• Contract terms for renewal and non-renewal

• Contract terms and processes for amendment and modification
C. Performance Contracting

3 Standards:

• C.01 – Contract Performance Measures

• C.02 – Contract Terms for Renewal and Non-Renewal

• C.03 – Contract Amendment and Updates
Changes to Quality Rubric

C.01 – Contract Performance Measures

–2017-2018:

FAILURE OF THE MAJORITY OF THE SPONSOR’S REVIEWED CONTRACTS TO CONTAIN A PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK THAT INCLUDES ALL APPLICABLE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE MEASURES INCLUDED ON THE STATE REPORT CARD WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

–2018-2019:

FAILURE OF THE MAJORITY OF THE SPONSOR’S REVIEWED CONTRACTS TO CONTAIN A PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK THAT INCLUDES ALL APPLICABLE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND INDICATORS INCLUDED ON THE STATE REPORT CARD WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.
## Changes to Quality Rubric

### C.01 – Contract Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-2018</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The majority of reviewed contracts include all applicable state performance measures included on the state report card. <strong>--but--</strong> The majority of reviewed contracts do not include financial and organizational/operational performance measures.</td>
<td>The majority of reviewed contracts include all applicable state performance measures <strong>and indicators</strong> included on the state report card. <strong>--but--</strong> The majority of reviewed contracts do not include financial and organizational/operational performance measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Changes to Quality Rubric

**C.01 – Contract Performance Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-2018</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Point Requirements –and–</td>
<td>2-Point Requirements –and–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All reviewed contracts include specific metrics and targets for all applicable state report card measures of student performance</td>
<td>All reviewed contracts include specific metrics and targets for all applicable state report card measures of student performance –and–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–and–</td>
<td>–and–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All reviewed contracts include mission-specific performance measures(^{10})</td>
<td>All reviewed contracts include mission-specific performance measures and targets –and–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–and–</td>
<td>–and–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All reviewed contracts include specific metrics and targets for financial and organizational/operational performance measures.</td>
<td>All reviewed contracts for schools serving specific subgroups of students include additional measures and targets beyond the Gap Closing measure –and–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All reviewed contracts include specific metrics and targets for financial and organizational/operational performance measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Quality Rubric

No changes made to:

• C.02

• C.03
Critical Area D

Oversight and Evaluation
D. Oversight and Evaluation

Critical Area Evaluates:

• System of oversight, including financial, enrollment and onsite reviews

• Process for monitoring schools’ academic performance

• Intervention guidance and action

• Yearly reports on schools’ performance
D. Oversight and Evaluation

7 Standards:

• D.01 – Oversight Transparency
• D.02 – Enrollment and Financial Reviews
• D.03 – On-Site Visits
• D.04 – Site Visit Reports
• D.05 – Performance Monitoring
• D.06 – Intervention
• D.07 – Annual Performance Reports
Changes to Quality Rubric

• D.03: On-Site Visits
  – Revised the standard statement

  ▪ 2017-2018:

  **D.03 Onsite Visits:** The sponsor conducts onsite reviews at least twice per year while school is in session, which includes an examination of the school’s compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures.

  ▪ 2018-2019:

  **D.03 On-Site Visits:** The sponsor conducts on-site reviews (beyond the monthly enrollment and financial reviews) at least twice per year and three months apart while school is in session, which include an examination of the school’s compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures.
Changes to Quality Rubric

• D.03: On-Site Visits
  – Revised the failure statement

  ▪ 2017-2018:
    
    FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF HAVING CONDUCTED AT LEAST TWO ONSITE REVIEWS (BEYOND THE MONTHLY ENROLLMENT AND FINANCIAL REVIEWS) FOR EACH SELECTED SCHOOL WHILE SCHOOL IS IN SESSION WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

  ▪ 2018-2019:
    
    FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF HAVING CONDUCTED AT LEAST TWO ON-SITE REVIEWS (BEYOND THE MONTHLY ENROLLMENT AND FINANCIAL REVIEWS), AT LEAST THREE MONTHS APART FOR EACH SELECTED SCHOOL WHILE SCHOOL IS IN SESSION, WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.
# Changes to Quality Rubric

## D.03 – On-Site Visits

### 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The sponsor submitted evidence of having conducted at least two onsite reviews (beyond the monthly enrollment and financial reviews) while school is in session for all selected schools regarding the school’s compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures.  
–and–
During the onsite review, data are collected from a school employee on the day of the review. |

### 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The sponsor submitted evidence of having conducted at least three onsite reviews (beyond the monthly enrollment and financial reviews) at least three months apart while school is in session for all selected schools regarding the school’s compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures.  
–and–
During the onsite review, data are collected from a school employee on the day of the review. |
Changes to Quality Rubric

D.03 – On-Site Visits

2017-2018

2-Point Requirements –and–
The sponsor submitted evidence that it collects data from school employees, including at least one administrator and a sample of instructors.

–and–
The submitted onsite visit protocol includes observation guidelines and specifies how interviews will be conducted.

2018-2019

2-Point Requirements –and–
The sponsor submitted evidence that it collects data from school employees, including at least one administrator and one or more instructors.

–and–
The submitted onsite visit protocol includes observation guidelines and specifies how interviews will be conducted.
Changes to Quality Rubric

D.04 – Site Visit Reports

**2017-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The sponsor submitted evidence of providing each selected school with a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment review reports) following each of two onsite reviews conducted while school is in session\(^{15}\) regarding the school’s compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures—and—
| If the sponsor identifies an area needing improvement, the report cites that the school must take action. |

**2018-2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The sponsor submitted evidence of providing each selected school with a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment review reports) following each of two onsite reviews conducted while school is in session and at least three months apart regarding the school’s compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures—and—
| If the sponsor identifies an area needing improvement, the report cites that the school must take action. |
Changes to Quality Rubric

No changes made to:

• D.01
• D.02
• D.05
• D.06
Changes to Quality Rubric

• D.07: Annual Performance Reports
  – Revised the failure statement

  ▪ 2017-2018:
  FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF PROVIDING ITS SCHOOL(S) WITH REPORTS REGARDING THE SCHOOL’S ACADEMIC, FISCAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL/OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

  ▪ 2018-2019:
  FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF PROVIDING AT LEAST ONE OF ITS SCHOOLS WITH A REPORT REGARDING THE SCHOOL’S ACADEMIC, FISCAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL/OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.
Changes to Quality Rubric

D.07 – Annual Performance Reports

2017-2018

1 Point

The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides its school(s) with a report regarding the school's academic, fiscal and organizational/operational performance that is broad in nature.

2018-2019

1 Point

The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides at least one of its schools with a report regarding the school's academic, fiscal and organizational/operational performance that is broad in nature.
Critical Area E
Termination and Renewal Decision-Making
E. Termination and Renewal Decision-Making

Critical Area Evaluates:

• Renewal application process
• Renewal and non-renewal decisions and notification
• Contract termination
• School closure
• Renewal application reviewer protocols
E. Termination and Renewal Decision-Making

6 Standards:

• E.01 – Renewal Application
• E.02 – Renewal and Non-Renewal Decisions
• E.03 – Non-Renewal Notification
• E.04 – Contract Termination
• E.05 – Closure Process
• E.06 – Renewal Application Reviewer Protocols
# Changes to Quality Rubric

## E.01 – Renewal Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-2018</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal application process, which includes one or two of the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A defined timeline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Criteria used to evaluate the application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of the school’s most recent state report card.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of recent financial audits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of recent compliance monitoring reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal application process, which includes at least three of the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A defined timeline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Criteria used to evaluate the application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of the school’s most recent state report card.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of recent financial audits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of recent compliance monitoring reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal process and a written renewal application that include one or two of the following:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A defined timeline;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scoring rubric used to evaluate the application;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of the school’s most recent state report card;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of recent financial audits;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of recent compliance monitoring reports;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Posted to its website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal process and a written renewal application that include at least three of the following:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A defined timeline;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scoring rubric used to evaluate the application;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of the school’s most recent state report card;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of recent financial audits;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review of recent compliance monitoring reports;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Posted to its website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Changes to Quality Rubric

### E.01 – Renewal Application

#### 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Points</th>
<th>4 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal application process, which includes:</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented, systematic renewal application process, which includes all the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A defined timeline.</td>
<td>- A defined timeline;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Criteria used to evaluate the application.</td>
<td>- Scoring rubric used to evaluate the application that includes an evaluation of the high-stakes review results that align to the performance framework in the contract;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--and--</td>
<td>-Posted to its website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application includes at least three of the following:</td>
<td>and--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multiple years of student achievement.</td>
<td>The renewal application includes at least three of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multiple measures of student achievement.</td>
<td>- Multiple years of student achievement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Financial audits.</td>
<td>- Multiple measures of student achievement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Site visit reports and/or other compliance reports.</td>
<td>- Financial audits;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Points</th>
<th>4 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal process and a written renewal application that include all the following:</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of a documented renewal process and a written renewal application that include all the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A defined timeline;</td>
<td>- A defined timeline;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scoring rubric used to evaluate the application that includes an evaluation of the high-stakes review results that align to the performance framework in the contract;</td>
<td>- Scoring rubric used to evaluate the application that includes an evaluation of the high-stakes review results that align to the performance framework in the contract;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Posted to its website.</td>
<td>-Posted to its website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and--</td>
<td>- Multiple years of student achievement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The renewal application includes at least three of the following:</td>
<td>- Multiple measures of student achievement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multiple years of student achievement.</td>
<td>- Financial audits;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multiple measures of student achievement.</td>
<td>- Site visit reports and/or other compliance reports;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Financial audits;</td>
<td>- If applicable, status reports on corrective action plans or other required interventions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Site visit reports and/or other compliance reports.</td>
<td>- If the sponsor renewed community schools during the review year, training for application reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If applicable, status reports on corrective action plans or other required interventions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If the sponsor renewed community schools during the review year, training for application reviewers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Quality Rubric

E.02 – Renewal and Non-Renewal Decisions

– Revised the first key indicator listed

- 2017-2018:

The sponsor grants renewal only to schools that are fiscally and operationally viable, have achieved their contractual academic standards and are faithful to the terms of the contract.

- 2018-2019:

The sponsor grants renewal only to schools that are fiscally and operationally viable, have achieved their contractual academic *targets* and are faithful to the *non-academic terms of the contract*.
Changes to Quality Rubric

E.02 – Renewal and Non-Renewal Decisions

– Added a fourth key indicator:

The sponsor grants renewal only to schools that earn at least 75 percent of possible points on the renewal rubric
Changes to Quality Rubric

**E.02 – Renewal and Non-Renewal Decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-2018</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that it required all schools up for renewal to submit applications but granted renewal to one or more schools for which any of the following was true:</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that it required all schools up for renewal to submit renewal applications —and— The sponsor granted renewal to one or more schools for which at least one of the following was true:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Failed to meet the academic achievement targets in their contract.</td>
<td>- Failed to meet the academic achievement targets in their contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Failed to remedy documented issues of fiscal or operational viability.</td>
<td>- Failed to remedy documented issues of fiscal or operational viability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unresolved non-compliance with one or more laws or terms of the contract.</td>
<td>- Had unresolved non-compliance issues with one or more applicable laws or contract terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Changes to Quality Rubric

### E.02 – Renewal and Non-Renewal Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-2018</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that it granted renewal only to schools that are fiscally and operationally viable and meet one of the following:</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that it granted renewal only to schools that earned at least 66 percent of possible points on the renewal rubric; and, the sponsor’s renewal rubric includes both academic and non-academic measures; and, the sponsor submitted evidence that its staff provides evidence-based recommendations to the sponsor’s board regarding renewal decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Achieve the academic achievement targets in their contract.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are faithful to the terms of their contract.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-and–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that its staff provides evidence-based recommendations to the sponsor’s board regarding renewal decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Changes to Quality Rubric

**E.02 – Renewal and Non-Renewal Decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-2018</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 Points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The sponsor submitted evidence that it granted renewal only to schools that are fiscally and operationally viable and meet both of the following:  
- Achieve their contractual academic standards.  
- Are faithful to the terms of their contracts.  
-and–  
The sponsor submitted evidence that its staff provides evidence-based recommendations to the sponsor’s board regarding renewal decisions. | The sponsor submitted evidence that it granted renewal only to schools that earned at least 75 percent of possible points on the renewal rubric  
- and–  
The sponsor’s renewal rubric includes both academic and non-academic measures  
- and–  
The sponsor submitted evidence that its staff provides evidence-based recommendations to the sponsor’s board regarding renewal decisions. |
Changes to Quality Rubric

E.03 – Non-Renewal Notification

2017-2018

1 Point
The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school's governing authority by Jan. 15 but did not include any explanation—or—
The sponsor did not submit evidence of ensuring the school’s families were notified of the non-renewal decision as of April 30 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision.

2018-2019

1 Point
The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school’s governing authority by Jan. 15 but did not include any explanation—or—
The sponsor did not submit evidence of ensuring the school’s families were notified of the non-renewal decision as of May 30 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision.
Changes to Quality Rubric

E.03 – Non-Renewal Notification

2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school's governing authority by Jan. 15 citing statutory language only—and—
| The sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring the school’s families were notified of the non-renewal no later than April 30 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision. |

2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school's governing authority by Jan. 15 citing statutory language only—and—
| The sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring the school’s families were notified of the non-renewal no later than May 30 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision. |
Changes to Quality Rubric

E.03 – Non-Renewal Notification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Points</th>
<th>3 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school's governing authority within 14 days of making the decision and before Jan. 15 that included an explanation beyond statutory language and— The sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring the school’s families were notified of the non-renewal no later than April 1 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision.</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school's governing authority within 14 days of making the decision and before Jan. 15 that included an explanation beyond statutory language and— The sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring the school’s families were notified of the non-renewal no later than April 30 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Quality Rubric

E.03 – Non-Renewal Notification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-2018</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 Points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school's governing authority within 14 days of making the decision and before January 15 that included an explanation beyond statutory language
--and--
The sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring the school’s families were notified of the non-renewal no later than March 15 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision. | The sponsor submitted evidence that it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school’s governing authority within 14 days of making the decision and before Jan. 15 that included an explanation beyond statutory language
--and--
The sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring the school’s families were notified of the non-renewal no later than **April 15** if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision. |
Changes to Quality Rubric

E.04 – Contract Termination

– Added a fifth key indicator:

*The sponsor communicates its written termination policy and procedures with its schools before Sept. 30 of the review year*
Changes to Quality Rubric

E.04 – Contract Termination

2017-2018

3 Points

2-Point Requirements —and—
The sponsor has written procedures, beyond the Department’s closing procedures, to be followed if termination occurs.\(^{26}\)

2018-2019

3 Points

2-Point Requirements —and—
The sponsor submitted evidence that it communicated the written policies and procedures for termination before Sept. 30 the review year.

—and—
If the sponsor terminated a contract during the review year, the sponsor submitted evidence of following its written procedures.
Changes to Quality Rubric

E.04 – Contract Termination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-2018</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Points</td>
<td>4 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3-Point Requirements —and—
The sponsor’s written termination policy defines the criteria for termination, includes the specific evidence it will collect and/or document, and the procedures outline responsibilities for both the sponsor and the school in the event of a termination.

— and —
The sponsor submitted evidence that it communicated the written policies and procedures for termination during the review year.

— and —
If the sponsor terminated a contract during the review year, the sponsor submitted evidence of following its written procedures.
Changes to Quality Rubric

E.05 – Closure Process

2017-2018

2-Point Requirements –and–
The sponsor submitted the Department’s closure guidance and its own closure policy apart from statutory language in the contract.

2018-2019

3 Points

2-Point Requirements –and–
The sponsor submitted the Department’s closure guidance and its own closure policy apart from statutory language in the contract and the Department’s closure guidance and procedures.

And

The sponsor submitted evidence that its closure policy was adopted by its governing board and in effect by Sept. 30 of the review year.

And

The policy and procedures include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 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 3314.023(F)).
- Disposition of school funds and assets.
- Submission of Closing Assurances.
### Changes to Quality Rubric

#### E.05 – Closure Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Points</th>
<th>4 Points</th>
<th>4 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-Point Requirements – and –&lt;br&gt;The sponsor submitted its own closure procedures, apart from the Department’s closure guidance and procedures, which specify the steps necessary to complete the Department’s Closing Assurances Form and outlines the responsibilities of all the following:&lt;br&gt;  - Sponsor;  - School governing authority;  - School staff;  - Management company;  - School treasurer.&lt;br&gt;- and –&lt;br&gt;The policy and procedures include, but are not limited to, the following:&lt;br&gt;- 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 3314.023(F)).&lt;br&gt;- Disposition of school funds and assets.&lt;br&gt;- Submission of Closing Assurances.&lt;br&gt;- and –&lt;br&gt;For each of the sponsor’s schools that closed during the review year, the sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring parents were notified of the school’s closure within two weeks and received assistance in finding a new school.</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Changes to Quality Rubric

### E.05 – Closure Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Points</th>
<th>4 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3-Point Requirements –and–<br>The sponsor submitted its own closure procedures, apart from the Department’s closure guidance and procedures that specify the steps necessary to complete the Department’s Closing Assurances Form and outlines the responsibilities of all the following:<br>- Sponsor;<br>- School governing authority;<br>- School staff;<br>- Management company;<br>- School treasurer.| –and–<br>For each of the sponsor's schools that closed during the review year, the sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring parents were notified of the school's closure within two weeks and were offered assistance in finding a new school.

### 2018-2019
Changes to Quality Rubric

• Addition of Standard E.06 - Renewal Application Reviewer Protocols
  – Previously included as part of Standard B.05 (Reviewer Protocols)
  – Broken out into its own standard to distinguish renewal protocols from protocols for new school applicants, school replicators and schools seeking a change in sponsor
For schools seeking to renew, reviewers carefully and consistently examine renewal application materials and the results of the high-stakes review.
E.06 – Renewal Application Reviewer Protocols

Key Indicators

- The sponsor has specific protocols for evaluating renewal applications that include a rubric with renewal criteria.

- The renewal rubric takes into account a high-stakes review that aligns to the performance framework in the contract.

- The results of the high-stakes review are evaluated and account for at least 67 percent of the renewal application scoring.
E.06 – Renewal Application Reviewer Protocols

Key Indicators

- The rubric identifies the lowest possible points that an applicant can earn to have its contract renewed.
- The protocols require each reviewer to score and document the rating for each selection criteria.
- Reviewers are trained on the protocols prior to reviewing applications.
E.06 – Renewal Application Reviewer Protocols

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Point</th>
<th>2 Points</th>
<th>3 Points</th>
<th>4 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of written protocols for evaluating renewal applications or There is some evidence that reviewers receive training on the protocols.</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of written protocols for evaluating and scoring individual renewal application criteria and the results of the high-stakes review that aligns with the performance framework or There is some evidence that reviewers receive training on the protocols.</td>
<td>2-Point Requirements —and— The sponsor’s submitted written protocols for evaluating renewal applications include a rubric (per the definition contained in this Quality Rubric) for all renewal criteria and the high-stakes review results —and— The sponsor’s rubric includes a cut score that identifies the lowest possible points that the school must earn to have its contract renewed —and— New reviewers receive training on the protocols and rubrics.</td>
<td>3-Point Requirements —and— The sponsor submitted evidence that it requires each reviewer to individually score and document the rating for each renewal criteria —and— All reviewers receive training on the protocols and rubrics annually, which includes reviewer calibration. —and— The results of the high-stakes review are evaluated and account for at least 67 percent of the renewal application scoring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

SPONSORS THAT DID NOT RECEIVE ANY APPLICATIONS DURING THE 2018-2019 SCHOOL YEAR MUST UPLOAD A MEMO STATING THAT A PORTION OF THE STANDARD IS NOT APPLICABLE AND WHY. THE DEPARTMENT MAY SUPPLY THE EVALUATION TEAM WITH CORROBORATING INFORMATION.
E.06 – Renewal Application Reviewer Protocols

***Please refer to the Glossary of Definitions located at the beginning of this document for the definition(s) of “protocol,” “rubric,” “high-stakes review” and “performance framework.”
### E. Termination and Renewal Decision-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Rubric Standard</th>
<th>Examples of Relevant Documents</th>
<th>Examples of Unacceptable Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.06 – Renewal Application Reviewer Protocols</strong></td>
<td>- Protocols and/or procedures for evaluation of renewal applications</td>
<td>- Emails from sponsor to reviewers regarding renewal application review team meeting logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>For schools seeking to renew, reviewers carefully and consistently examine renewal application materials and the results of the high-stakes review.</em></td>
<td>- Renewal scoring criteria and/or renewal application rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Attendance sheets and/or materials used to train reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- List of renewal application review team members with start years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Area F
Technical Assistance
F. Technical Assistance

Critical Area Evaluates:

• Provision of technical assistance
• Legal and policy updates
• Professional development for schools
• Relationships with schools’ governing authorities
F. Technical Assistance

4 Standards:

• F.01 – Ongoing Technical Assistance
• F.02 – Legal and Policy Updates
• F.03 – Professional Development for Schools
• F.04 – Relationships with Schools’ Governing Authorities
Changes to Quality Rubric

No changes made to any of the four standards included in the critical area of Technical Assistance.
F. Technical Assistance

• Entire body of submitted documentation may be taken into account for the following standard: F.03

• Documentation for a subset of randomly-selected sponsored schools for the following standards: F.01, F.02, F.03 and F.04.
F. Technical Assistance

**Note:** The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools, which was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (i.e. e-schools, dropout prevention and recovery schools, etc.). All sponsors received a list of the selected schools and the list is available to sponsors in Epicenter.
F.02 Legal and Policy Updates: The sponsor updates schools on relevant legal and policy changes.

Key Indicators:
- The sponsor has a method by which it informs its schools of changes to rule, law and/or policy that impact the community school operations.
- The sponsor provides an annual training to assist its schools in understanding changes to rule, law and policy that impact community school operations.

***Please refer to the Glossary of Definitions located at the beginning of this document for the definitions of “policy” and “guidance.”

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF UPDATING ITS SCHOOLS ON CHANGES TO RULE, LAW AND/OR POLICY THAT IMPACT COMMUNITY SCHOOL OPERATIONS WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Point</th>
<th>2 Points</th>
<th>3 Points</th>
<th>4 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor did not submit evidence of providing schools with written guidance on changes in rule, law and/or policy that impact community school operations.</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of providing schools with written guidance on changes in rule, law and/or policy that impact community school operations.</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of having a regular publication (e.g., semi-annually, three times a year, quarterly) with written guidance on changes in rule, law and/or policy that impact community school operations.</td>
<td>3-Point Requirements—and—The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides an annual training to assist its schools in understanding changes in rule, law and policy that impact community school operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—but—The sponsor did submit evidence of directing its schools to another source.</td>
<td>—but—The sponsor did submit evidence of doing so on a regular basis (e.g., semi-annually, three times a year, quarterly).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resources

• **Quality Practices Document Upload Guidance**
  – Provides examples of both relevant and unacceptable documents
  – Serves as a guide; the list is not exhaustive
  – Submitting examples listed does not guarantee a specific rating on any standard

• **Quality Practices Change Log**
  – Shows changes made from 2017-2018 rubric to the 2018-2019 rubric
Not Applicable Standards
Not Applicable Standards

– **Entire standard** is NA (sponsor is not scored on any part)

– **Only a portion** of the standard is NA (sponsor not scored on the part that is NA)
Not Applicable Standards

• If a **portion** of the standard is Not Applicable to a sponsor, the sponsor must upload a document with a statement explaining why.

• Sponsors that believe a portion of the standard is Not Applicable, but do not upload such a memo, will **be rated on the entire standard.**
Not Applicable Standards

• If an **entire** standard is Not Applicable to a sponsor, the sponsor must upload a document with a statement explaining why.

• Sponsors that believe the standard is not applicable to them but do not upload a memo will **earn a score of 0**.

• If a sponsor uploads a Not Applicable memo but the standard is actually applicable to the sponsor, then sponsor will **earn a score of 0**.
Not Applicable Standards

- **Entire** standard may be NA: B.04, B.06, E.02, E.03

- **Portion** of the standard may be NA: B.05, E.04, E.05, E.06
Selected Subset of Schools
Selected Subset of Schools

• Randomly selected by the evaluator

• Includes at least one of each type of sponsored school for the sponsor (e-schools, dropout prevention and recovery schools)

• Sponsor needs to submit evidence for its selected schools for the standard in question
Selected Subset of Schools

The following note is included on standards for which documentation from a subset of schools is required:

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

- Will be available in Epicenter
- Will be available on the Department’s website
Narratives and Interviews
Narratives

• Optional for all 33 standards; sponsors are not required to submit narratives

• Sponsors may upload a narrative explanation for 31 of the 33 standards using the Department’s narrative form

• Sponsors may enter a narrative explanation for Standards C.01 and C.02 into the Narrative field in Epicenter
Narratives

Sponsors electing to submit a narrative for a standard must use the Department’s Narrative Form.
Interviews

• Optional; sponsors are not required to participate in an interview

• Opportunity to help explain documentation (similar to narrative option)

• No additional documents will be collected during or after the interview
Interviews

• Sponsors must complete the *Interview Intent Form* and upload it into Epicenter by the specified deadline to indicate whether or not they want to participate in an interview.

• Evaluators will contact sponsors to set up an interview.
Calculation of Quality Rating
Quality Rating and Score

Scoring

For each quality standard, sponsors receive between 0 and 4 points (or “NA” if applicable).
Quality Rating and Score

• Rating is calculated using formula of B/A
  
  o \( A \) = the number of possible points for standards that are applicable to the sponsor being reviewed
  
  o \( B \) = the total points scored in the standards included in \( A \)

• Scores for each standard are combined to determine overall percentage and rating
Quality Rating and Score

Example

• Rating = B/A
  – A = 132
  – B = 125

• $\frac{125}{132} = 94.7\%$
## Quality Rating and Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 – 100%</td>
<td>Exceeds Standards</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 – 89.9%</td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 74.9%</td>
<td>Progressing Toward Standards</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 54.9%</td>
<td>Below Standards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 34.9%</td>
<td>Significantly Below Standards</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sponsor Adjustment Requests

Preliminary Compliance and Quality Ratings
• Uploaded into Epicenter in mid/late September 2019

Sponsor Adjustment Request Period
• Sponsors have at least 10 business days to review their ratings and scores, and to submit an adjustment request form.
Sponsor Adjustment Requests

Sponsor Adjustment Request Review

• Department staff will review the adjustment requests and make the adjustments if necessary.

Final Ratings and Scores

• Department staff recalculate the compliance and quality data scores to determine the final compliance and quality ratings and scores.
Document Submission
2018-2019 Document Submission

• Documents must be uploaded into Epicenter

• Required submission types will be listed in the sponsor’s task queue

• Use correct submission type
2018-2019 Document Submission

• Sponsors must upload **ALL** documents they want the reviewers to consider for each individual standard.
  – This is true **even if** a document was uploaded for an earlier submission type
  – Sponsors may upload the same document to multiple standards

• Unless otherwise specified on the standard, only documents uploaded for an individual standard will be used to evaluate that standard.
2018-2019 Document Submission

Sponsors can replace documents in Epicenter (if needed) until the document submission window closes.

Once the window closes, documents cannot be added, replaced or removed.
2018-2019 Document Submission

Document submission window

Quality Practices:
December 2018 – May 15, 2019
2018-2019 Quality Review Timeline

December 2018:
Epicenter Opens

5/15/2019:
Epicenter Closes

Summer 2019:
Optional Interviews Occur

Sept/Oct 2019:
• Preliminary Results
• Sponsor Adjustment Requests
• Adjustment Request Reviews

By 11/15/2019:
Final Ratings Published
Office of Community Schools

25 S. Front Street, Mail Stop 307
Columbus, Ohio 43215

614-466-7058
877-644-6338 (toll-free)

community.schools@education.ohio.gov

sponsor.evaluation@education.ohio.gov