History

Sponsor Evaluation System

- **Assist** the Department in its oversight of sponsors
- **Improve** the quality of sponsor practices
- **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
Quality Component: Ohio Revised Code

3314.016 (B)(3)

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
A. Commitment and Capacity

Seven 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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 the strategic plan was in operation by Jan. 1 of the review year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Quality Rubric

A.02 – Goals and Self-Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</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>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.</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that prior to Jan. 1 of the review year it develops and implements action steps based on the findings from its improvement process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Quality Rubric

A.04 – Conflicts of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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), as well as staff members and contractors with sponsoring responsibilities, once they begin those sponsoring responsibilities. –and– The sponsor submitted evidence of collecting signed conflict of interest statements by Sept. 30 of the review year (or within 14 calendar days of a person starting the position if hired after Sept. 30) from each board member and staff members and contractors with sponsoring responsibilities as listed in the organizational chart in standard A.05.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Changes to Quality Rubric

### A.06 – Staff Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that demonstrates a majority of the sponsoring staff identified in standard A.05 of this rubric participated in at least one professional development session prior to the second half of the review year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that demonstrates a majority of the sponsoring staff identified in standard A.05 of this rubric participated in at least one professional development session prior to Jan. 1 of the review year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Application Process and Decision-Making

Six 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.04 – Reviewer Expertise

Revised the second key indicator

2018-2019:  • Résumés and/or bios demonstrate that at least one application reviewer has several years of community school and/or sponsoring experience.

2019-2020:  • Résumés and/or bios demonstrate that at least two application reviewers have several years of sponsoring experience.
# Changes to Quality Rubric

## B.05 – Reviewer Protocols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of written protocols for evaluating and scoring individual application criteria that align with the application requirements. <strong>--and--</strong> 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 application criteria that align with the application requirements. <strong>--and--</strong> There is evidence all reviewers receive training on the protocols.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Changes to Quality Rubric

#### B.05 – Reviewer Protocols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Points</td>
<td>3 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2-Point Requirements –and– 2-Point Requirements –and–  
The sponsor submitted written protocols for evaluating applications that include a rubric for all selection criteria  
–and–  
The sponsor’s rubric includes a “cut score” that identifies the lowest possible points that an applicant can earn to receive a preliminary agreement  
–and–  
The sponsor’s rubric includes a “cut score” that identifies the lowest possible points that an applicant can earn to receive a preliminary agreement.  

**New reviewers receive training on the protocols and rubric.**
Changes to Quality Rubric

B.06 – Rigorous Decision-Making

Revised the second key indicator

2018-2019:

- The sponsor approves only those applicants that earn at least 75 percent of possible points.

2019-2020:

- The sponsor enters into preliminary agreements with only those applicants that earn at least 75 percent of possible points.
C. Performance Contracting

Three 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

Revised the language on first part of each key indicator

2018-2019:

- Contracts include all applicable measures and indicators of student performance included on the state report card with specific annual metrics and targets for each measure.

2019-2020:

- Contracts contain a performance framework that includes all applicable measures and indicators of student performance included on the state report card with specific annual metrics and targets for each measure.
Changes to Quality Rubric

C.01 – Contract Performance Measures

2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All reviewed contracts include all applicable state report card measures –and– All reviewed contracts include financial and organizational/operational performance measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All reviewed contracts have a performance framework that includes all applicable state report card measures. –and– All reviewed contracts have a performance framework that includes financial and organizational/operational performance measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Quality Rubric

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

2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The majority of reviewed contracts do not specify a high-stakes review to take place prior to renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—or—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of reviewed contracts do not include a performance framework that defines the measures, metrics and targets required of schools for contract renewal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The majority of reviewed contracts specify a high-stakes review to take place prior to renewal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Quality Rubric

C.03 – Contract Amendment and Updates

2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-Point Requirements –and–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of updating its contract template for the selected schools based on changes in federal and/or state law and its review of school data and Ohio’s accountability system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–or–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that its review of federal and/or state law, school data and Ohio’s accountability system for the selected schools did not require contract modifications during the review period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-Point Requirements –and–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence its review of federal and/or state law, school data and Ohio’s accountability system resulted in updating its contract template for the selected schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–or–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence its review of federal and/or state law, school data and Ohio’s accountability system for the selected schools did not require contract modifications during the review period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Oversight and Evaluation

Seven 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

- **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.

- **2019-2020:**

  D.03 On-Site Visits: The sponsor conducts on-site reviews (beyond the monthly enrollment and financial reviews) at least twice per year while school is in session (with one review during the first half of the review year and the other review during the second half of the review year), 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

- **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.

- **2019-2020:**
  
  FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF AT LEAST TWO ON-SITE REVIEWS (BEYOND THE MONTHLY ENROLLMENT AND FINANCIAL REVIEWS) FOR EACH SELECTED SCHOOL WHILE SCHOOL IS IN SESSION, WITH ONE REVIEW DURING THE FIRST HALF OF THE REVIEW YEAR AND THE OTHER REVIEW DURING THE SECOND HALF OF THE REVIEW YEAR, WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.
## Changes to Quality Rubric

### D.03 – On-Site Visits

#### 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Point</th>
<th>2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The sponsor submitted evidence of having conducted at least two on-site 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 on-site review, data are collected from a school employee on the day of the review. | 1-Point Requirements —and— The sponsor submitted evidence of an on-site visit protocol.  
Across at least two on-site reviews while school is in session (with one review during the first half of the review year and the other review during the second half of the review year), the sponsor reviewed the school's compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures. —and— The sponsor submitted evidence of an on-site visit protocol. —and— During the on-site reviews, data are collected from a school employee on the day of the review. |
Changes to Quality Rubric

D.04 – Site Visit Reports

– Revised the standard statement

▪ 2018-2019:

**D.04 Site Visit Reports**: The sponsor provides its schools with a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment reports) after each site visit, conducted at least twice and three months apart while school is in session, and it follows up with schools regarding any areas needing improvement.

▪ 2019-2020:

**D.04 Site Visit Reports**: The sponsor provides its schools with a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment reports) after each site visit, conducted at least twice while school is in session (with one review during the first half of the review year and the other review during the second half of the review year), and it follows up with schools regarding any areas needing improvement.
Changes to Quality Rubric

D.04 – Site Visit Reports

− Revised the failure statement

- 2018-2019:

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF PROVIDING ITS SCHOOLS WITH A SITE VISIT REPORT CONDUCTED WHILE SCHOOL IS IN SESSION WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.

- 2019-2020:

FAILURE OF THE SPONSOR TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF PROVIDING EACH OF ITS SELECTED SCHOOLS WITH A REPORT (BEYOND THE MONTHLY FINANCIAL AND ENROLLMENT REVIEW REPORTS) FOLLOWING AN ON-SITE REVIEW WHILE SCHOOL IS IN SESSION WILL RESULT IN THE SPONSOR RECEIVING 0 POINTS FOR THIS STANDARD.
Changes to Quality Rubric

D.04 – Site Visit Reports

2018-2019

1 Point
The sponsor submitted at least one instance of providing its schools with a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment review reports) following on-site reviews conducted while school is in session regarding the school’s compliance with all applicable laws, rules, contractual obligations and academic performance measures.

2019-2020

1 Point
For each of its selected schools, the sponsor submitted evidence of providing a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment review reports) following an on-site review conducted while school is in session.
Changes to Quality Rubric

D.04 – Site Visit Reports

2018-2019

2 Points

The sponsor submitted evidence of providing each selected school with a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment review reports) following each of two on-site 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.

2019-2020

2 Points

For each of its selected schools, the sponsor submitted evidence of providing a report (beyond the monthly financial and enrollment review reports) following each of at least two on-site reviews conducted while school is in session (with one review during the first half of the review year and the other review during the second half of the review year) that together covered 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 take appropriate action.
Changes to Quality Rubric

D.05 – Performance Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of collecting data related to all applicable contractual academic, financial and organizational/operational measures for at least one school year for the majority of selected schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence of conducting a review of the performance framework (i.e., academic, financial and organizational/operational) for at least one school year for the majority of its selected schools during the review year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the majority of its selected schools, the sponsor submitted evidence of collecting data related to all applicable contractual academic, financial and organizational/operational measures for at least one school year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Changes to Quality Rubric

**D.06 – Intervention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
<td>The sponsor’s reviewed contracts state its responsibility to intervene as required by ORC 3314.023(E)</td>
<td>The sponsor’s reviewed contracts state its responsibility to intervene as required by Ohio Revised Code 3314.023(E).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—and—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that it communicated with its schools, apart from the contract, through separate guidance, the conditions that may trigger intervention and corrective action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—and—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no evidence of an unaddressed deficiency (i.e., contract violation, academic, financial and/or organizational/operational).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Termination and Renewal Decision-Making

Six 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.02 – Renewal and Non-Renewal Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted board minutes as evidence of the renewal decision-making process.</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted board minutes as evidence of the renewal decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--but--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor did not submit evidence of that decision being informed by either a completed renewal application or school performance data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Changes to Quality Rubric

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>1-Point Requirements –and–</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that it required all schools up for renewal to submit renewal applications</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that it required all schools up for renewal to submit renewal applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor granted renewal to one or more schools for which at least one of the following was true:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Failed to meet the academic achievement targets in their contract.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Failed to remedy documented issues of fiscal or operational viability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Had unresolved non-compliance issues with one or more applicable laws or contract terms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Changes to Quality Rubric

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</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 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. | 3-Point Requirements –and–  
The sponsor submitted evidence it granted renewal only to schools that earned at least 75 percent of possible points on the renewal rubric.  
- AND EITHER-  
1) The sponsor submitted evidence it granted renewal only to schools for which all of the following were true.  
- Met the academic achievement targets in their contract;  
- Had no unresolved compliance issues with any applicable laws or contract terms.  
- If there were any documented issues of fiscal or operational viability, the school remedied those issues.  
- OR-  
2) If the school did not meet all contractual academic targets, contract terms, compliance requirements or documented issues of fiscal/operational viability, the sponsor submitted evidence regarding why such schools were granted renewal and how the decision to renew aligns with its renewal evaluation process and national sponsoring standards. |
## Changes to Quality Rubric

### E.03 – Non-Renewal Notification

#### 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Point</th>
<th>2 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 by Jan. 15 but did not include any explanation.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–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.</td>
<td>–and– The sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring the school’s families were notified of the non-renewal decision no later than May 30 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Point</th>
<th>2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school’s governing authority by Jan. 15 but did not include any explanation.</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence it sent written notification of non-renewal to the school’s governing authority by Jan. 15 citing statutory language only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–or– The sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring the school’s families were notified of the non-renewal decision as of May 15 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision.</td>
<td>–and– The sponsor submitted evidence of ensuring the school’s families were notified of the non-renewal decision no later than May 15 if the sponsor upholds the non-renewal decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Changes to Quality Rubric

### E.04 – Contract Termination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor has only the statutory language for grounds for termination in the reviewed contracts –and– There is no separate written policy apart from the language in the contract. –and– If the sponsor terminated a contract during the review year, the sponsor has not submitted evidence of following statutory requirements for termination.</td>
<td>For each of its selected schools, the sponsor’s reviewed contracts have the statutory language for grounds for termination. –and– The sponsor has a separate written termination policy apart from the language in the contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Changes to Quality Rubric

#### E.04 – Contract Termination

**2018-2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor has the statutory language for grounds for termination in the reviewed contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–and–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor has a separate written policy that goes beyond statutory language in explaining the grounds for termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–and–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the sponsor terminated a contract during the review year, the sponsor submitted evidence of following statutory requirements and its written policy for termination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2019-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Point Requirements –and–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor’s separate written policy goes beyond statutory language in explaining the grounds for termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–and–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the sponsor terminated a contract during the review year, the sponsor submitted evidence of following statutory requirements and its written policy for termination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Quality Rubric

E.04 – Contract Termination

–New note added to this standard

Note: The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools that was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (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. For the 2-point and 3-point requirements of this standard, the sponsor also must submit evidence for all schools whose contracts were terminated during the 2019-2020 review year.
Changes to Quality Rubric

E.05 – Closure Process

–New note added to this standard

Note: The sponsor must submit evidence for a specific set of its sponsored schools that was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (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. For the 1-point, 2-point, 3-point and 4-point requirements of this standard, the sponsor also must submit evidence for all schools that closed during the 2018-2019 review year and the 2019-2020 review year.
F. Technical Assistance

Four 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

### F.01 – Ongoing Technical Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that it provides <em>reactive</em> technical assistance to its schools <em>when made aware</em> of issues, problems or concerns.</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence it provides technical assistance to its schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Changes to Quality Rubric

**F.03 – Professional Development for Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 Point</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence that it shares and/or offers information about professional development opportunities with its community schools once or twice per year. —or— The sponsor mandates that its schools participate in specific professional development, beyond any training that is a requirement of the contract.</td>
<td>The sponsor submitted evidence it shares and/or offers information about professional development opportunities with its community schools <strong>at least once</strong> per year. —or— The sponsor mandates its schools participate in specific professional development, beyond any training that is a requirement of the contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resources

• **Quality Practices Component 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 Rubric Change Log**
  
  – Shows changes made from 2018-2019 rubric to the 2019-2020 rubric
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)

– Sponsor must upload a memo with a statement explaining why standard (or portion) is NA

– If no memo is uploaded, sponsor will be rated on the entire standard
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

• 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 that was randomly selected by the vendor. The list includes at least one of each type of sponsored school (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.
Selected Subset of Schools for 2019-2020

• Will be available in Epicenter (data submission system)

• Will be available on the Department’s website
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 interview.
Calculation of Quality Rating and Score

Scoring

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

• Rating is calculated using formula of B/A
  
  o A = Number of possible points for standards that are applicable to the sponsor being reviewed
  
  o B = Total points scored in the standards included in A

• Scores for each standard are combined to determine overall percentage and rating
Example

• Rating = B/A
  o A = 132
  o B = 116

• 116/132 = 87.9 percent
## 2019-2020 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>0 – 34.9%</td>
<td>Significantly Below Standards</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2019-2020 Document Submission

• Documents must be uploaded into Epicenter

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

• Use correct submission type

• Can upload the same document under multiple standards if needed
Memo template

• Use with documents that exceed 25 pages in length
• Reference the specific page numbers to be reviewed for the standard in question
• Use the template provided by the Department
• Upload the completed template into Epicenter under the submission type of the standard in question
2019-2020 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.
2019-2020 Document Submission

Document submission window

Quality Practices: December 2019 – May 15, 2020
2019-2020 Quality Review Timeline

December 2019: Epicenter Opens

Summer 2020:
Optional Interviews Occur

5/15/2020: Epicenter Closes

Sept/Oct 2020:
- Preliminary Results
- Sponsor Adjustment Requests
- Adjustment Request Reviews

By 11/15/2020: Final Ratings Published
Center for Performance and Impact

Sponsor Evaluation

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

877-644-6338 (toll-free)

sponsor.evaluation@education.ohio.gov
Join the Conversation

- OHEducation
- @OHEducation
- @OHEducationSupt
- @OHEducation
- OhioEdDept
- education.ohio.gov/text