

Public Comment/Feedback on the Draft Documents for the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation- Quality Practices

Sent by	Quality Section	Quality Practices Comments
Dawn Waddell, <i>Director of Community Schools,</i> North Central Ohio ESC	Instructions/Glossary of Definitions	N/A
	Section A: Commitment and Capacity	<p>I have a question regarding A.03, Roles and Responsibilities. NCOESC has a written guidance document that outlines the roles and responsibilities for both the school and the sponsor. Additionally, we have developed a PowerPoint presentation used to train school administrators and the school governing authority on these responsibilities.</p> <p>I am confused about the changes made to A.03 this year. Previously, sponsors were required to share the written guidance document with school administrators and the school governing authority before the first day of school and then offer training on these roles and responsibilities by November 30.</p> <p>This year, however, the requirement has changed. Now the sponsor must provide training to school administrators and the school governing board before the first day of school, covering the content and outlining the roles and responsibilities of both the sponsor and school. Additionally, by November 30, the sponsor must offer training to school administrators and school governing authority members on the written guidance.</p> <p>This appears to be redundant, as it seems we are required to cover similar content twice - once before the first day of school and again before November 30.</p> <p>Duplication of items. For example, you need to upload items for A.01-A.07 in multiple locations through-out the rubric.</p>
	Section B: Application Process and Decision-Making	Duplication of items. For example, you need to upload items for B.01-B.07 in multiple locations through-out the rubric.
	Section C: Performance Contracting	Duplication of items. For example, you need to upload items for C.01-C.03 in multiple locations through-out the rubric.
	Section D: Oversight and Evaluation	<p>D.07, Annual Performance Reports. As I review the requirements for this standard (points 1-4), The annual reports provided compare the school's performance against our performance framework outlined in its contract.</p> <p>Why can't multiple annual reports be uploaded instead of the Sponsor having to show cumulative data on one annual report. This is so much re-work when there are annual reports done every year. The way it is now the Sponsor does an annual report, then has to update the historic data on the report. Why? When previous annual reports can be updated to reflect the historic data.</p>
	Section E: Termination and Renewal Decision-Making	Duplication of items. For example, you need to upload items for E.01-E.06 in multiple locations through-out the rubric.
	Section F: Technical Assistance	Duplication of items. For example, you need to upload items for F.01-F.04 in multiple locations through-out the rubric
	Other Comments	The Quality Practices needs to be streamlined. It is administratively taxing. Items need to belong in one practice only, not in multiple locations in the rubric.
	What other suggestions do you have to improve the sponsor evaluation process?	I suggest templates are created so the Sponsors know what exactly DEW is looking for. The language in the Quality Rubric is very subjective, and there is no room for error on the Sponsor side, a clear and concise template for a Sponsor to complete would take the "guess work" out of it.

Public Comment/Feedback on the Draft Documents for the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation- Quality Practices

Sent by	Quality Section	Quality Practices Comments
<p align="center">Jason Kee, Assistant Legal Counsel, Charter School Specialists</p>	<p align="center">Instructions/Glossary of Definitions</p>	<p>Item 6: Comment: Many documents are more than 25 pages long. A memo adds additional time to the submission of documents. Highlighting a document with relevant information should be sufficient.</p> <p>Definitions: Business Plan: Comment: Please further define "a formal statement of business goals." The business goals of all schools are to educate students according to the mission and vision of the school.</p> <p>Definitions: Planning Stage: Comment: This should include the application period as many applicants begin planning even before they submit the application.</p>
	<p align="center">Section A: Commitment and Capacity</p>	<p>A.01: Comments: 1) Define sponsoring practices. Different reviewers may define it inconsistently. Or use sponsoring priorities or sponsoring responsibilities that are already defined in the glossary of definitions.</p> <p>2) The word clear is used in the key indicators but not in the point boxes. Wording in the key indicators and point boxes should remain consistent to provide clarity for sponsors and reviewers.</p> <p>A.02: Comments: 1) The use of the word strategic is problematic and increases the subjectivity of the evaluation. If the reviewer does not believe the self-evaluation process is "strategic", then it could be discounted. Strategic should be removed as each sponsor should be permitted to implement actions independently and autonomously.</p> <p>2) Sponsoring obligations should be defined. Different reviewers may define it inconsistently. In the alternative use sponsoring priorities or sponsoring responsibilities that are already defined in the glossary of definitions.</p> <p>3) Provide examples of what evidence would be needed to show development and implementation of action steps.</p> <p>A.03: Comments: 1) This should not be an additional requirement as the contract and statutes adequately define the roles and responsibilities of the sponsor and the school.</p> <p>2) This indicator adds a new compliance requirement not evidenced in OAC or ORC. The Department should not be permitted to add new sponsor compliance requirements outside of what is already included in rule and law.</p> <p>A.04: Comment: Is the addition of "each of its sponsoring responsibilities" necessary? How will the timeline of "each of its sponsoring responsibilities" be measured? Why not just use a deadline of September 30th?</p> <p>A.05: Comment: 1) Under 2 points - why must the sponsoring responsibilities be designated to specific staff or contractors? It should be sufficient to delegate to specific departments within the organization.</p> <p>2) Can expertise be more closely defined?</p> <p>3) Under 1 point and in guidance document it indicates that resumes should clearly indicate sponsor staff's relevant responsibilities - please define "clearly". How can a sponsor gauge the amount of information that should be presented in a resume?</p> <p>A.06: Comment: How should sponsors show evidence of alignment of professional development to sponsoring responsibilities? Is this something reviewers are specifically trained to look for and will they be reviewing the subject matter of all professional development?</p> <p>A.07: Comment: 1) Each sponsor submits a yearly sponsor expenditure report to the Department in August. This requirement is covered by submission of that yearly sponsor expenditure report. Any additional requirements: i.e. budget narrative, are outside the scope of the law and should not have to be provided. 2) The answer to the appropriate allocation of funds should be based on performance. In other words, outputs should be used to determine if input (funds) are achieving the desired results.</p>

Public Comment/Feedback on the Draft Documents for the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation- Quality Practices

Sent by	Quality Section	Quality Practices Comments
Jason Kee, <i>Assistant Legal Counsel</i> , Charter School Specialists	Section A: Commitment and Capacity	<p>It will be clear through an assessment of the professional development, technical assistance, interventions and attendance at board meetings exactly how the sponsor is allocating resources.</p> <p>3) Providing a sponsor budget with detailed line items indicating revenues and expenditures could involve a sponsor releasing proprietary information. This should not be required.</p> <p>4) What evidence should be provided that sponsor's fees do not create potential conflict of interest. It is difficult to prove a negative.</p> <p>5) What evidence should be provided to show "data-driven decisions" from the needs assessment.</p>
	Section B: Application Process and Decision-Making	<p>B.01: Comment: 1) The planning stage for the school should not be included as a requirement and is not relevant to the application process. Many schools applying for sponsorship have spent time planning prior to completing the application.</p> <p>2) It should be clarified if the planning stage begins: a) when the application period opens, b) when the application is submitted, or c) when the application is approved.</p> <p>B.02: Comment: 1) Capacity to execute the plan is evidenced throughout the entire application. This is something determined by the sponsor as part of the application review and should not be a required separate section of the application.</p> <p>B.03: Comment: 1) This section should provide for a points deduction for sponsors who accept schools after the statutory December 31 deadline if the school did not provide proper notification to its current sponsor.</p> <p>2) This section should deduct points for sponsors accepting schools that are changing to avoid intervention or corrective action (See Standard E.02).</p> <p>3) The requirement to interview the current sponsor of the applicant should only apply if the existing/transfer school is operated by a management company with no prior relationship (i.e. sponsorship of schools) with the new sponsor.</p> <p>B.04: Comment: "Expertise in the areas of" and "area of specialization" should be more clearly defined.</p> <p>B.05: Comment: 1) The rubric requires "each reviewer to individually score and document the rating for each selection criteria" - this should be changed to allow for individual reviewers to document the rating for each selection criteria to which they are assigned. Individuals who review the educational plans, mission, vision and staffing plans are not always the same reviewers that review facilities, budget and governance.</p> <p>2) Sponsors should not be required to provide a "cut score". Sponsors should have the autonomy to evaluate the applications and score the applications without having to set a minimum score.</p> <p>B.06: Comment: 1) This standard for one point requires that the sponsor show evidence that either reviewers do not cite evidence or at least one school with less than 50 percent of possible points received a preliminary agreement. However, to meet 2, 3, or 4 points, the sponsor must submit evidence that reviewers "do" cite evidence and that there is no school with less than 50 percent of points. So it is impossible for a sponsor to meet 1 point, and then to also meet either 2, 3 or 4 points in the rubric.</p> <p>2) This criteria requires each completed application, scoring documents, and completed rubrics for all applications. We accept between 8 - 12 applications per year which makes submission of these documents cumbersome and thousands of pages. The standard should be revised to allow for the uploading of a sample of applications or at least downsized to only include the scoring documents.</p> <p>3) 75% is not an adequate measure as all sponsors have different applications. The 75% requirement is completely arbitrary and does not allow sponsor autonomy in applications and scoring processes.</p>

Public Comment/Feedback on the Draft Documents for the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation- Quality Practices

Sent by	Quality Section	Quality Practices Comments
Jason Kee, <i>Assistant Legal Counsel</i> , Charter School Specialists	Section C: Performance Contracting	<p>C.01: Comment: 1) This section clearly violates the autonomy of sponsors by requiring all sponsor contracts to mirror each other. Sponsors will not be permitted to draft their own student performance measures, rather they will be forced to use the criteria approved by the Department.</p> <p>2) This criteria requires annual metrics and targets - this needs clarified. Does this mean the performance framework has to be evaluated each year of that it should include 1 year metrics and targets for the length of the contract?</p> <p>3) "Schools serving a specific subgroup of students" should be more clearly defined. Does this mean that the entire school only serves a subgroup of students, or does this mean the subgroups of students within a school's student population?</p> <p>C.02: Comment: 1) The requirement of a high stakes review every five years is unnecessary. One high stakes review at the time of renewal is sufficient, especially taking into account the annual reports that are done each year under D.07. Under D.07, the school is notified annually of its progress toward meeting the high stakes review goals upon renewal.</p> <p>2) This criteria should not include anything beyond what is required in rule and law regarding renewal. The sponsor evaluation is an evaluation of the sponsor's adherence to rule and law and should not subject sponsors to additional requirements.</p>
	Section D: Oversight and Evaluation	<p>D.02: Comment: 1) Financial reviews include budget ledgers and transactional detail reports - in consultation with a community school treasurer who provides services to over 30 community schools, he stated "I could understand the request a little more if the school was having financial difficulties, not paying vendors on time, having material weaknesses/findings in audits, etc. but aside from those types of circumstances, I'm not sure what could be gleaned from reviewing transactional detail on a monthly basis that you can't get from the current financial package. To provide this would result in us having to submit over 400 additional reports annually."</p> <p>D.03: Comment: 1) It is unnecessary and outside of statutory confines to require visits to be in the first half and second half of the year. This is sometimes difficult as the "first half" of the year is typically slightly shorter in number of days and some visits may need to be re-scheduled because of weather/calamity days. Additionally, visits done in the "second half" of the year must be completed and documentation done no later than May 15th for the upload. 2) The requirement to connect with stakeholders should be reduced to 2 stakeholders. Some schools have students that are too young to contact - i.e. smaller K-1 or K-2 schools. Also, it is disruptive to a child's school day to be interviewed by an outsider to the school. Additionally, parents are often not present during school visits or may not be interested in spending time being interviewed by the sponsor. Site visits should not be disruptive to a school day - but used to passively observe the school in action and evaluate how the school is operating.</p> <p>D.04: Comment: 1) It is unnecessary and outside of statutory confines to require visits to be in the first half and second half of the year. This is sometimes difficult as the "first half" of the year is typically slightly shorter in number of days and some visits may need to be re-scheduled because of weather/calamity days. Additionally, visits done in the "second half" of the year must be completed and documentation done no later than May 15th for the upload.</p> <p>2) The first half/second half requirement should only be assessed under one criteria - either D.03 or D.04. It is unfair to penalize sponsors under both criteria for the same metric.</p> <p>3) The sponsor should not be required to provide specific steps or timeframes for the school's areas of improvement. To allow for adequate autonomy in the schools, the school should be allowed to provide these specifics to the sponsor.</p>

Public Comment/Feedback on the Draft Documents for the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation- Quality Practices

Sent by	Quality Section	Quality Practices Comments
Jason Kee, <i>Assistant Legal Counsel</i> , Charter School Specialists	Section D: Oversight and Evaluation	<p>D.05: Comment: 1) This criteria is redundant and is covered in sections C.01, D.01, D.02, D.03, D.04, D.06, D.07 (to name a few). The way the standard is worded, the sponsor should provide all documentation from D.06 (interventions), D.01 (compliance measures and organizational monitoring), and D.02 (financial reviews).</p> <p>2) The guidance document states the sponsor's performance framework would not be applicable to this section. However, the performance framework is very relative to how and what data is collected on a yearly and multi-year basis. In fact, the key indicators mention using the performance framework.</p> <p>D.06: Comment: Comment: 1) Sponsors should not be required to upload contracts for schools. These contracts are provided to the Department and accessible on the Department's website.</p> <p>2) Not every situation will have steps and timeframes for resolving the deficiency and not all deficiencies will need to have status updates requested and reviewed. Sponsors should have autonomy to handle interventions as necessary without being dictated what must be provided and collected.</p> <p>D.07: Comment: 1) These reports should not be required to state a school's prospects for renewal. A school may be in its first year or operation and renewal is several years away. At that point, there is no way to tell if the school is on track for renewal. Many things may change at the school over the course of the term of its contract that affect renewal. Opining on the renewal may open sponsors to liability.</p> <p>2) The report should not require areas for improvement. Some schools are performing well and do not need to be provided areas for improvement.</p>
	Section E: Termination and Renewal Decision-Making	<p>E.01: Comment: A written application should not be required of renewal schools. Sponsors should base renewals on the school's performance which is assessed annually and over multiple years. Based on the criteria in D.07 - schools already know their performance.</p> <p>E.02: Comment: 1) Same comment as E.01 - a written application should not be required. Additionally by assessing the written application in both sections E.01 and E.02 - the sponsor loses points in both sections which is unfair.</p> <p>2) If a sponsor chooses to renew a school, it should not have to align this decision with national practices. Each state is different in how it assesses performance of schools and of how charter schools are operated.</p> <p>3) The school should not have to score a certain percentage. Sponsors should have autonomy to score schools and establish renewal criteria. This percentage has no basis in rule, law or national best practice.</p> <p>E.03: Comment: Sponsors should not be required to provide an explanation "beyond statutory language". The sponsor evaluation was developed to ensure sponsors are complying with rule and law, not add additional obligations beyond that.</p> <p>E.04: Comment: 1) Sponsors should not be required to provide a written policy that goes beyond the statutory language for closing (See Comment E.03)</p> <p>2) The guidance document states the contract is not acceptable as an upload, however to receive 1 point in the section the sponsor must show statutory language in the contract for termination.</p> <p>E.05: Comment: 1) Sponsors should not be required to provide closure guidance beyond the Department's guidance. If the sponsor is following the guidance of the Department - this should be acceptable.</p> <p>2) This standard requests information on schools closed before the review year. The reviewers should be provided this information by the Department and not require submission by the sponsor.</p> <p>3) "Plan of action" should be defined.</p>

Public Comment/Feedback on the Draft Documents for the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation- Quality Practices

Sent by	Quality Section	Quality Practices Comments
Jason Kee, <i>Assistant Legal Counsel</i> , Charter School Specialists	Section E: Termination and Renewal Decision-Making	E.06: Comment: 1) This standard requires each reviewer to individually score and document the rating for each renewal criteria. However part of the renewal criteria that is required is the high stakes review. Reviewers should not be required to score the high stakes review as the scoring is not discretionary and is built in to the performance framework. 2) The high stakes review should not be required to be 67% of the contract renewal scoring. This is an arbitrary number with no basis in rule, law or national best practice.
	Section F: Technical Assistance	F.01: Comment: Three instances of technical assistance should not be required. Often, schools are performing well and are not in need of three instances of technical assistance. Also schools may want to reach out to their own legal counsel for technical assistance. Sponsors should have the autonomy to provide technical assistance as needed instead of providing a mandated amount. F.02: Comment: Sponsors should not be required to provide an annual training to assist schools in understanding changes in rule, law and policy that impact community school operations. Board members and school personnel are already required to attend annual open meetings and public records training. Requiring an additional training is cumbersome and burdensome to people who are already volunteering their time. Additionally, there is no guarantee anyone will attend the training.
	Other Comments	No comments/feedback provided
	What other suggestions do you have to improve the sponsor evaluation process?	No comments/feedback provided
Kury Aey, <i>Executive Director-Community Schools</i> , ESC of Lake Erie West	Instructions/Glossary of Definitions	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Section A: Commitment and Capacity	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Section B: Application Process and Decision-Making	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Section C: Performance Contracting	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Section D: Oversight and Evaluation	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Section E: Termination and Renewal Decision-Making	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.

Public Comment/Feedback on the Draft Documents for the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation- Quality Practices

Sent by	Quality Section	Quality Practices Comments
Kury Aey, <i>Executive Director- Community Schools ,</i> ESC of Lake Erie West	Section F: Technical Assistance	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Other Comments	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	What other suggestions do you have to improve the sponsor evaluation process?	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.

Public Comment/Feedback on the Draft Documents for the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation - Compliance

Sent by	Compliance Document Section	Compliance with All Applicable Laws and Rules Comments
Dawn Waddell <i>Director of Community Schools, North Central Ohio ESC</i>	Compliance Worksheet-Sponsor	N/A
	Compliance Worksheet-Oversight of Schools	No comments/feedback provided
	Other Comments/Feedback	N/A
	What other suggestions do you have to improve the sponsor evaluation process?	The compliance section should be removed from the evaluation. The Sponsor collects thousands of documents from their schools each year based off of the School Compliance worksheet. This is redundant work. DEW needs to get Epicenter access to look at what is collected. The Sponsor should not have to re-submit.
Mark Stallard <i>Director of Federal Programs and Elementary Curriculum, Zanesville City Schools</i>	Compliance Worksheet-Sponsor	Compliance worksheet and change log make sense.
	Compliance Worksheet-Oversight of Schools	Compliance form makes sense, any opportunity to streamline the items would be helpful.
	Other Comments/Feedback	Compliance form makes sense, any opportunity to streamline the items would be helpful.
	What other suggestions do you have to improve the sponsor evaluation process?	Any opportunity to streamline the process would be helpful.
Kurt Aey <i>Executive Director- Community Schools, ESC of Lake Erie West</i>	Compliance Worksheet-Sponsor	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Compliance Worksheet-Oversight of Schools	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Other Comments/Feedback	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	What other suggestions do you have to improve the sponsor evaluation process?	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.

Public Comment/Feedback on the Draft Documents for the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation - Technical Document

Sent by	Technical Document Section	Technical Document Comments
Kurt Aey <i>Executive Director- Community Schools ,</i> ESC of Lake Erie West	Overview	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Academic Performance Component	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Compliance with Laws and Rules Component	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Quality Practices Component	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Review Period	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Overall Rating	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	Other Comments - Technical Document	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	General Comments - Sponsor Evaluation	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.
	What other suggestions do you have to improve the sponsor evaluation process?	The ESC of Lake Erie West does not feel that this current draft version of the 2025-2026 Sponsor Evaluation is an effective process to determine high quality sponsorship/authorization and we look forward to continuing our work with the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce along with NACSA, on the Sponsor Evaluation redesign.

SPONSOR EVALUATION

All aspects of the sponsor evaluation: quality, compliance and academics will consist of two parts. Under the first part, sponsors must provide documentation of performing the basic duties of sponsorship. These duties are outlined in statute. If all the statutory requirements are met, then the sponsor is considered effective. If all of the statutory requirements are not met, the sponsor is considered poor and will be closed.

Once a sponsor has provided documentation of all basic statutory duties, it can begin to add value to its schools. The list provided is the best practices of all sponsors in Ohio. If the sponsor does not meet and show documentation of each value added requirement, it will be rated Effective. If all of these requirements are met, the sponsor will be rated Exemplary.

After the documentation is reviewed, the reviewer and the sponsor will meet to discuss the documents submitted, answer questions and supplement with additional documentation if necessary.

BASIC STATUTORY SPONSOR DOCUMENTATION

*Documentation will be provided for each requirement.

Fiscal Reviews (3314.023):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written report provided to governing authority 10 days after each review • Evidence of review of financial and enrollment records of schools • Evidence of meeting with governing authority or fiscal officer 	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
Monitoring Compliance of Community Schools (3314.023 and 3314.03):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance Spreadsheet • On-Site Visit Report 	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
Communication with Auditor of State regarding audits of each school and maintaining documentation of participating at meetings with the Auditor of State for each school (3314.019):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication with Auditor • Documentation of participation in meetings 	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
Monitoring and Evaluating Academic, Fiscal and Organization and Operation of Community School on Annual Basis (3314.023):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-Site Visit Reports • Documentation or monitoring and evaluating • Performance requirements specified in contract 	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided

SPONSOR EVALUATION

Have a plan in place to be undertaken in the event the community school experiences financial difficulties or closes prior to the end of a school year (3314.03):	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of Plan 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
Termination Process (3314.07):	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Sponsor terminated a school, proper documentation of termination. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Suspension Process (3314.072):	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Sponsor suspended a school, proper documentation of suspension. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
Probation Process (3314.073):	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Sponsor placed a school on probation, proper documentation of probation. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Provide Report on Special Education and Related Services (3314.12):	<input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department confirms report and submission to ODEW 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Confirmed
Opening Assurances (3314.019):	<input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department confirms report and submission to ODEW 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Confirmed
Representative for E-Schools (3314.21):	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proof of maintaining a representative within fifty miles of the base of operation for each e-school. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Monitoring, ensuring and reporting compliance with online learning standards for all e-schools (3314.23):	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of monitoring, ensuring and reporting 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable

SPONSOR EVALUATION

Comply with all Department of Education & Workforce procedures for closing a community school (3314.35 & 3314.351):	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closing procedures documentation 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Provide written response to Auditor of State regarding unauditale community school (3314.51):	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of Written Response 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Provide technical assistance to community schools in complying with laws applicable to the school and terms of the contract (3314.023):	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of technical assistance 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
Intervention (3314.023):	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proof of steps taken to intervene in the school's operation to correct problems in the school's overall performance 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
Other activities (3314.023):	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proof of other activities done by the sponsor designed to specifically benefit the community schools its sponsors 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
Sponsor Expenditure Report (3314.025):	<input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department confirms report and submission to ODEW 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Confirmed
Performance Standards (3314.03):	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of performance standards for all community schools, including but not limited to all applicable report card measures as prescribed by statute 	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided

SPONSOR EVALUATION

EXEMPLARY SPONSOR DOCUMENTATION

*Documentation will be provided for each requirement.

Sponsor's Written Policies and Procedures:	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy/Procedures regarding Sponsor Oversight Policy/Procedures regarding Applications for Sponsorship Policy/Procedures for Fiscal Reviews Policy/Procedures for Collection of Compliance Information 	
Staff Expertise:	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of staff having several years of community school sponsoring experience as well as expertise in multiple areas: DOPR, Online education, legal, transportation, literacy, special education, federal programs 	
Applications:	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications for all schools Scoring Rubrics used to evaluate all applications Application Timeline 	
Contract/Charter Agreement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Confirmed <input type="checkbox"/> Not Confirmed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department confirms contracts go beyond statutory requirements and include provisions that go beyond statutory minimums to protect schools 	
Timelines:	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of providing timelines on expectations from Governing Authority and school 	
Professional Development:	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of providing professional development to schools Documentation of providing professional development to staff 	
Renewal of Schools:	<input type="checkbox"/> Provided <input type="checkbox"/> Not Provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of conducting a thorough high-stakes review of all schools eligible for renewal and making fact based decisions which are in the best interests of students 	

SPONSOR EVALUATION

Board Meeting Attendance:

- Documentation of attending a majority of each school's governing authority meetings

☐ Provided☐ Not Provided